



DOCTOR OF BUSINESS (DBA)

Becoming an Intrapreneurial University: The Role of the External Entrepreneur in the Academic Heartland of Art and Design.

Hunt, Emma

Award date:
2017

Awarding institution:
University of Bath

[Link to publication](#)

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

Copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Access is subject to the above licence, if given. If no licence is specified above, original content in this thesis is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) Licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Any third-party copyright material present remains the property of its respective owner(s) and is licensed under its existing terms.

Take down policy

If you consider content within Bath's Research Portal to be in breach of UK law, please contact: openaccess@bath.ac.uk with the details. Your claim will be investigated and, where appropriate, the item will be removed from public view as soon as possible.

Becoming an Intrapreneurial University: The Role of the External Entrepreneur in the Academic Heartland of Art and Design

Emma Hunt

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of

Business Administration

University of Bath

School of Management

September 2017

Copyright

Attention is drawn to the fact that copyright of this thesis rests with the author. A copy of this thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with the author and that they must not copy it or use material from it except as permitted by law or with the consent of the author.

This thesis may be made available for consultation within the University Library and may be photocopied or lent to other libraries for the purposes of consultation.

.....
Emma Hunt

CONTENTS

	Page no.
Tables	5
Acknowledgements	6
Abstract	7
Chapter 1	
Overview of Study	8
1.1 Introduction and scope	8
1.2 Research context	9
1.3 Primary research questions	12
1.4 Research methodology	13
1.5 Contributions to knowledge and practice	15
1.6 Summary of chapters	16
Chapter 2	
Literature Review	19
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Definition, history and economics	21
2.3 Defining the entrepreneur within entrepreneurship	24
2.4 Intrapreneurship	27
2.5 The concept and establishment of the entrepreneurial university	28
2.6 Modes 1,2 and 3 knowledge production	35
2.7 The concept challenged	37
2.8 The changing environment and policy context	42
2.8.1 <i>Globalisation</i>	42
2.8.2 <i>Innovation</i>	44
2.8.3 <i>Leadership</i>	46
2.9 Translational disciplines	49
2.10 UK policy context	49
2.11 Conclusion	54

Chapter 3

Art and Design Higher Education, and the Creative Economy,	55
3.1 Introduction	55
3.2 Art and design higher education	56
3.3 The creative industries and the creative economy	60
3.4 Design thinking	66
3.5 The EntUni's current faculty of art and design	68
3.6 Conclusion	70

Chapter 4

Research Design and Methodology	71
4.1 Introduction and research question	71
4.2 The research issue and problem	73
4.3 The faculty of art and design in answering the research question	75
4.4 Research methodology, selection and justification	77
4.5 Reflective practice and qualitative methodologies	78
4.5.1 <i>The reflective practitioner</i>	78
4.5.2 <i>Qualitative frameworks</i>	79
4.5.3 <i>Ethnography</i>	82
4.5.4 <i>Self-ethnography</i>	83
4.5.5 <i>Research methodologies in other disciplines</i>	85
4.6 Ethics	86
4.7 Conclusion	88

Chapter 5

Research Design	90
5.1 Introduction	90
5.2 Research design: element 1	90
5.3 Research design: element 2	91
5.4 Research design: element 3	92
5.5 Research design: element 4	94
5.6 Conclusion	94

	Page no.
Chapter 6	
Policy Networks as Distance	96
6.1 Introduction	96
6.2 National subject association	97
6.3 Colloquium	98
6.4 Visiting professor scheme	99
6.5 Parliamentary commission	101
6.6 Conclusion	102
Chapter 7	
The Entrepreneurs and their Contribution to	104
Entrepreneurial Activity within the Academic Heartland of the University	
7.1 Introduction	104
7.2 The Ten Entrepreneurs	106
7.2.1 <i>Entrepreneur 1 (E1)</i>	106
7.2.2 <i>Entrepreneur 2 (E2)</i>	108
7.2.3 <i>Entrepreneur 3 (E3)</i>	111
7.2.4 <i>Entrepreneur 4 (E4)</i>	113
7.2.5 <i>Entrepreneur 5 (E5)</i>	115
7.2.6 <i>Entrepreneur 6 (E6)</i>	116
7.2.7 <i>Entrepreneur 7 (E7)</i>	118
7.2.8 <i>Entrepreneur 8 (E8)</i>	119
7.2.9 <i>Entrepreneur 9 (E9)</i>	121
7.2.10 <i>Entrepreneur 10 (E10)</i>	122
7.3 Conclusions	123
7.3.1 <i>The characteristics of the Entrepreneur</i>	123
7.3.2 <i>The entrepreneurs and engagement</i>	124
7.3.3 <i>Entrepreneurial role, culture and relationship</i>	125

	Page no.
Chapter 8	
Research Findings: The Contribution in Developing Entrepreneurial Activity in the Academic Heartland	128
8.1 Introduction	128
8.2 Research outcomes	130
8.3 Conclusions	137
Chapter 9	
Analysis of Research Findings and Wider Implications	141
9.1 Introduction: findings and analysis	141
9.2 The Expanded Heartland	142
9.3 The Intrapreneurial University as a developing concept	144
9.4 Collective entrepreneurship	145
9.5 Implications for policy	146
9.6 Conclusion	147
Chapter 10	
Reflections, Professional Development and Conclusions	148
10.1 Introduction	148
10.2 Contribution to knowledge	148
10.3 Contribution to practice	149
10.4 Limitations of study/future research	150
10.5 Reflections and professional development	150
10.6 Conclusion	141
References	152

TABLES

	Page no.
Table 1. Manufacturing Industries/Creative Industries (Hartley, 2005)	60
Table 2. Policy Environment (Hunt, 2010)	64
Table 3. Entrepreneur Characteristics	104
Table 4. Sub-themes Listing	128

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The DBA has been a long journey and I am incredibly grateful to all those people around me who have supported, cajoled and encouraged me to complete this thesis, particularly in the final stages. At times it seemed out of reach; that it was the impossible dream, but at other times it so was so interesting and motivating that I couldn't engage enough. My colleagues on the DBA8 cohort were great fun and so interesting that they made the experience even better. How interesting it is to be part of the senior management of an institution and be a student at the same time. I think this combined experience is very useful in understanding just how our own undergraduates must feel at times in this changing world of higher education.

I am very thankful and indebted to my supervisor, Professor Rajani Naidoo, who has been a great inspiration to me throughout the whole DBA. What an amazing person, a cool but not cold approach to supervision suited me perfectly and I recognise the soft power of her advice and guidance that got me through to the end.

I am grateful to the institutions and colleagues who have supported me in this endeavour and I recognise the faith that they had in me through their support. I changed institutions half way through the DBA and, although I recognise that 'life happens', it was significant for me and I believe my career advancement has been in part because of the DBA.

I must thank Martin, Joe and Freddie. Their patience and humour has been fantastic and I am very lucky to have such a lovely family, and I hope this might inspire my boys too to continue to learn and enjoy what they do.

Finally, I dedicate this thesis to my father. Someone who went to the 'University of Life', but encouraged me to do more and make the most of the opportunities that come along. My interest in art and design and the practice I now have is because of him and I owe him a great deal.

Thank you all.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the entrepreneurial university concept from a Faculty of Art and Design perspective, with a particular focus on external entrepreneurs. The concept of the entrepreneurial university is described as one that actively seeks to innovate in how it goes about its business (Clark, 2008). The thesis aims to understand the role external entrepreneurs have on the academic heartland, as the Faculty of Art and Design. It considers the implications for what may be the implications for the future of the concept of the entrepreneurial university, and whether new insights can be developed that might be useful for more contemporary settings.

The primary research question is; how do external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland of a university? This research question aims to explore a phenomenon noticed by the author, who came into contact with entrepreneurs whilst she was working at a post-92 university that labelled itself as 'entrepreneurial'. One of the central views is that the external entrepreneurs themselves were playing a role, perhaps an unconscious one, in challenging the entrepreneurial concept. This study focuses on a group of ten entrepreneurs who worked with a Faculty of Art and Design over a three-year period.

The subject of the research is important because of the current focus on universities in a new and marketised setting and changing priorities of government policy and disruptions at national and local levels. As a consequence, it was a good time to observe the changes happening on a day to day basis through the research methodology of self-ethnography.

The findings suggest that the role the external entrepreneurs play has implications for the future. Firstly, it introduces other dimensions to a concept that is more intrapreneurial, in addition to entrepreneurial. Secondly, it proposes that some aspects of the academic heartland might need revision and that the notion of an expanded heartland, which could include external entrepreneurs, is more appropriate. Finally, the notion of collective entrepreneurship is positive as there can be shared attitudes to risk, and attributes of co-design would suit art and design academics, whilst enabling the university to remain comfortable within its own regulatory frameworks.

CHAPTER 1 - OVERVIEW OF STUDY

1.1 Introduction and scope

This thesis investigates the role external entrepreneurs play in a Faculty of Art and Design, and whether that role has implications for the concept of the entrepreneurial university. The thesis aims to add to the understanding of and offer further dimensions to, the concept of the entrepreneurial university. The model of the entrepreneurial university is one that is driving many institutions, but more particularly post-92 institutions, into a way of working that encourages diverse income streams, and close working between industry, government and the academic disciplines within the university. The research took place in a post-92 university, which has been anonymised to the moniker EntUni to protect the anonymity of informants, and others associated with the research.

The thesis will look at the entrepreneurial university concept from the perspective of the Faculty of Art and Design and the focus is on those who enter it from the outside. This is investigated through the analysis of ten individual external entrepreneurs who worked within the faculty through the single academic discipline of art and design, which is also referred to as the academic heartland (Clark, 2008). The thesis aims to understand the role these external entrepreneurs have on the academic heartland and what, if any, the implications may be for the future of the concept of the entrepreneurial university and if variations to, or a new model or insights, can be developed that are useful for more contemporary settings.

The primary research questions are based around the role the external entrepreneurs play, what their characteristics are, and why they enter and engage with the university. The subject of the research is important because of the current focus on universities in a new and marketised setting and changing priorities of government policy. Most of the literature on the concept of the entrepreneurial university focuses on a university as an institution that derives income through innovation and the internal structures and mechanisms to support the creation of a financial surplus. This thesis takes a different perspective, by focusing on those who enter the academic heartland from the outside for various reasons. Eminent authors who have written on this subject include Clark (2001; 2008), Etzkowitz (2008), Shattock (2009) and Carayannis and Campbell (2014), but there is little from the lens of the individual external contributor in that literature. The main point

of departure in this thesis is to look at the role and contribution of the external entrepreneurs within the academic heartland.

The thesis starts by explaining the entrepreneurial university concept, the use of terminology such as the academic heartland, the behaviours that describe the external entrepreneurs, and the characteristics of entrepreneurship as applied to the university setting. It also puts into context the norms as found within faculties of art and design and the economic setting of the creative industries. The focus of the study is at the faculty 'academic heartland' level, which sits within the broader literature, but the unique focus is on the externals rather than internal faculty members. It does not aim to look at student learning or curriculum improvements as these are well covered in the literature (Henderson, 2000; Miclea, 2004; NCEE, 2012).

1.2 Research context

The study is set during a time where major upheavals in policy direction and funding are affecting UK universities and at a time when global economic pressures are adding to the need to secure new rationales for existing as a university, with increasing competition for scarce resources and innovation in a new marketised setting. The literature review of policy was completed during the 2009-2011 period when the scene was set for further changes in UK higher education (HE) policy which continued to change and develop through successive governments. The changes in policy at national and local levels provided a good time to observe the changes happening on a day to day basis and their impact on the faculty at a local level through the research approach of self-ethnography and based on the work of Alvesson (2003).

Self-ethnography is described by Alvesson as a study in which the researcher has access to a cultural setting and then uses the experiences, knowledge and access to empirical material for research purposes (Alvesson, 2003, p. 174). This approach was chosen because self-ethnography enables an extremely familiar setting, in this case the Faculty of Art and Design, to be used as the basis for research in which something revealing happens. The observation of external entrepreneurs who themselves are risk takers, and not prone to what may be characterised as a more a conventional academic mind-set, enabled a wealth of empirical material to be generated that demonstrated what was really going on and enabled other considerations to the concept of the entrepreneurial university to be explored.

Alvesson, along with other excellent researchers (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007; Bleiklie, Enders & Lepori 2015) has successfully used self-ethnography as a research methodology for studies in Higher Education. They found this approach valuable, particularly where exploratory methods and a rich set of observations are used to discover new insights into behaviours and influences on organisations. This study continues in the same vein. Self-ethnography is a reasonable, if uncommon, choice as a method as it enabled some entrepreneurial characteristics to be used by the author, and also fitted the exploratory nature of the research questions. Whilst other more mainstream qualitative methodologies might have conformed more comfortably, they did not conform to the approach the author wished to take, whose background is in art and design, or fit with the entrepreneurs with whom she was coming into contact with. Self-ethnography allowed the author to, in a sense, mimic what entrepreneurs do, namely a constant scanning of the landscape, looking for innovations and opportunities to seize and exploit, but within the setting of her own institution.

Whilst this research concerns itself with universities in general, a particular focus is on the Faculty of Art and Design, which has a close and growing link to the creative industries sector. The creative industries sector has emerged as an important component of the knowledge economy in the UK (Howkins, 2002; Florida, 2005; Hartley, 2005). This means that the creative industries economic base has given refreshed impetus for academic disciplines that deal with these subjects, such as those found within faculties of art and design, the humanities and media subjects. The creative industries are now out-performing more traditional economic sectors such as engineering and manufacturing, although they are based on models that successive governments have found difficult to codify and measure (DCMS, 2013; NESTA, 2016). The creative industries are based on elusive structures and constantly reform themselves as their creative practice dictates. However, entrepreneurial universities that seek to maximise third stream incomes through research and knowledge transfer find it difficult to work with these industries because of the particular organisational attributes pertaining to this sector. Yet, there are significant opportunities for faculties of art and design where there is an acknowledged link to innovation and entrepreneurial practices that emerge from the pedagogies of the subject, and have now come into their own as the industry grows and government recognition is given to this sector as being economically important.

As a consequence of policies and strategies developed and drawing in part on the seminal study by Burton Clark, first published in 1998 (2008), many UK universities now see themselves as entrepreneurial and follow more or less the criteria that Clark

developed as being essential to be successful in this way. His model revolved mainly around finding new ways of working with industry and spinning out knowledge and finding new forms of funding so that the reliance on state funding could be reduced. Whilst in the 1960s a handful of universities such as Strathclyde and Warwick could claim this title, it is now so much part of the additional activities of universities that it is the norm for UK universities rather than the exception. However, the success of the knowledge transfer activities seems to be more prevalent in Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) subjects and not those in the arts or humanities subjects. Clark even referred to these subjects as the 'resisting laggards' (Clark, 2008) when it came to engagement with the entrepreneurial concept.

The background for this study is to look at the phenomenon of the rise of the entrepreneurial university through the lens of a Faculty of Art and Design, and to focus on the role that the external entrepreneurs have on the academic heartland. Faculties of Art and Design, and some remaining specialist art institutions, have a long track record of working with industry and much of their pedagogic underpinning relies on 'live projects' and 'learning through doing' as key to a student's development. Yet, although these concepts are very embedded, they do not seem to reach out to the concept of the entrepreneurial university in the same way as the STEM subjects have done. Added to this, art and design subjects through their history have been 'late to the party' in terms of formalising research, research degrees and other key academic tributes that are seen to be worthy of spinning out. The role that real life learning has had on faculties of art and design has meant that most faculties have very strong links with industry, which by their nature tend to mean that they are small or micro businesses, as is common in the creative industries sector. This, in turn, means strong links to entrepreneurs who are affiliated with creative subjects but not necessarily always from their own business sector.

Clark and others (Etzkowitz, 2008; Davies, 2009) have written a considerable number of publications about the concept of the entrepreneurial university. Clark describes five core features that he believes are necessary to have in place to be successful. These are: 1) a strengthened steering core; 2) an expanded developmental periphery; 3) a diversified funding base; 4) a stimulated academic heartland; and 5) an integrated entrepreneurial culture. It is the stimulated academic heartland that is appropriate to focus on in this study as Clark admonishes those in faculties for not reaching out to the external world as much as they should, to engage in entrepreneurial activity that can then be supported by the other four core themes as listed above. A perceived problem is that this is exactly

what the Faculty of Art and Design does and yet there seems to be either a pejorative view of the subject or a lack of trust or understanding from all sides to have reconciled a more positive view. That being said, several decades have passed which enables a reflection to take place on Clark's concept and, with the recent changes in the economic climate as described above, there is an opportunity to look further into the relationship between external entrepreneurs who work with the faculty and the concept itself.

1.3 Primary research questions

This research seeks to do two main things; firstly, to contribute to furthering understanding of the concept of the entrepreneurial university in the 21st Century and to advance thinking towards a new model appropriate to the variations of disciplines found within a university. Secondly, to address a gap in the literature between external entrepreneurs who enter the academic heartland and the entrepreneurial concept itself. As far as the author is aware, the relationship between the two has not yet been investigated in an in-depth manner. The section that follows explains the objectives of the research, the primary research questions and a summary of the methodology used.

The central research question aims to explore a phenomenon noticed by the author who encountered many external entrepreneurs whilst she was working at a post-92 university that labelled itself as entrepreneurial. One of the central tenets is that the external entrepreneurs themselves were playing a role, perhaps an unconscious one, in challenging the concept of the entrepreneurial university as laid down by Clark.

The author was interested in whether the external entrepreneurs were shifting the locus of academic authority from one owned by the faculty in terms of knowledge acquisition to one of a more collaborative approach to knowledge creation and exploitation, or were they just accessing the university for their own gains? The author was also interested in the extent to which they were unwittingly influencing the concept and understanding of the entrepreneurial university. The research aims to understand the relationship between the external entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurial activity whilst in the university, as seen through the work of a particular faculty. The problem identified is one that rests wholeheartedly within Clark's use of the academic heartland as the area most in need of persuasion in pursuing the concept of a successful entrepreneurial university.

The research problem is concerned with the role that is played by external entrepreneurs and therefore the primary research question is:

How do external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland of art and design within a university?

In order to answer this central question the sub-questions are:-

1. Who are the entrepreneurs and what are their characteristics? How do they enter or engage with the university? What attracts them and what are their motivations?
2. What entrepreneurial activities do they engage in when they are in the academic heartland of a Faculty of Art and Design?
3. What is the role of these actors in developing academic entrepreneurialism in the academic heartland and how do they further the entrepreneurial relationship?

1.4 Research methodology

This study focuses on an in-depth study of a group of ten entrepreneurs who worked with a Faculty of Art and Design over a three-year period. The faculty was situated in a modern post-92 university, which had fully embraced the concept and mission of an entrepreneurial university and was seen as successful in this role. The author noticed that the external entrepreneurs were entering directly into the heart of the faculty and were not utilising any of the organisational units that were designed to link the academic heartland with the administration of the university, such as Knowledge Transfer Offices (KTO's), and were in fact actively avoiding such offices. The art and design faculty was traditional in its pedagogic approach, following practices started by the Bauhaus schools, which utilised mastering technique and ideas generation through learning, by doing, alongside real world experience. The Faculty had a good reputation and was one of the biggest in the university, with consistently high applications, retention and achievement results. It regularly invited consultants, external projects, and external entrepreneurs to work with students on design briefs that had commercial or social potential. These 'live' projects as they are known were central to student learning and were often quoted as to why students were successful in gaining employment. However, the author was interested in exploring the shift in role that she was observing (from one of compliant offering of a project to be undertaken by students, to something more engaged and challenging). Or, on the other hand, whether the relationships with the entrepreneurs were altering a university model that has been in existence for many years and might now benefit or change future practice in a new marketised era of higher education.

As the author was directly involved with the entrepreneurs and their relationship with the Faculty of Art and Design, there was a very close sense of 'feel' as to what it was like to

be an entrepreneur and to be witness to their characteristics as typical of entrepreneurial behaviour. These were characteristics such as risk taking, being comfortable with uncertainty and seeking innovation, versus being caught up with, or at times conflicted with, the more formal side of the university's operations of order and formality and bureaucratic processes (Deem, 2007; Shattock, 2009; Whitchurch, 2012). In addition, the Faculty of Art and Design had embedded characteristics of creativity and innovation inherent in most of the courses and programmes and was serving the ever-growing creative industries sector. The mismatch between the formal notions of the entrepreneurial university and the practice in the Faculty of Art and Design was becoming evident, as was the need to find a research methodology that would enable the phenomenon to be explored.

The author was initially interested in traditional qualitative and quantitative methodologies such as questionnaires and interviews for the study; however, as the process for data gathering was being investigated, they did not seem to sit comfortably with notions of entrepreneurial behaviour or would not necessarily offer the insights that were being sought. Looking at the realities of the phenomenon through the single lens of the Faculty of Art and Design also seemed to offer opportunities for a new way of looking at the research problem. Therefore, the author embarked on the relatively less well known methodology of self-ethnography, and utilised the work of Alvesson (2003) in particular. Alongside this was the desire of the author to think and act through the research as creatively as possible by taking into account her professional background of design, which utilises observation and reflective practice as a routine set of methods. This combining of a professional intuition and practice with self-ethnography could be open to negative feedback, as it forms a method which could be described as risky (for its perception of the lack of rigour) or alternatively could be considered innovative in mixing new methods with an interdisciplinary approach. However, the method is closely linked to insider research and observation, which has long been utilised in research, as it brings significant benefits. These include greater access to cultural phenomena and respondents, an understanding of mutual concerns, and opportunities for understanding university practices. A further benefit is that it follows behaviours characteristic of entrepreneurs by being unconventional and for seeking to find the most innovative way of taking a new idea forward. Whilst it may not sit comfortably with business and management disciplines, it did resonate with Design Thinking which refers to a method that emphasises observation and fieldwork (Lockwood, 2010) as a process sometimes used within the creative industries sector.

The research method finally decided upon utilised self-ethnography espoused by Alvesson (Alvesson, 2003). This was supported by the theories of insider research (Brannick and Coghlan, 2007) and participant observation (Atkinson and Hammersley, 2007), and the use of reflective practice and design thinking in considering the coding and findings. To aid the validity of the findings the author decided also to observe and utilise other aspects of her work that would help to explain the central phenomenon through the use of the policy and national networks with which she was engaged. This use of multiple affiliations (Alvesson, 2003) was a way of avoiding the problem of 'staying native'. The use of the additional strategies for observation strengthened the research methodology and helped to avoid any particular researcher bias that might have emerged.

The observations were recorded in word documents after each encounter from which a rich set of data was created. Distance was created not only physically as the author moved geographically to another institution, but also in time as the observations took place over three years ago. This distance is important, as it helps to protect the individual entrepreneurs with anonymity alongside the pseudonym given to each as a way of ensuring that the guarantee of anonymity was preserved.

1.5 Contributions to Knowledge and Practice

Taken together, and in answer to the main research question, the analysis shows that external entrepreneurs are playing an important role in contributing to entrepreneurial activity in the academic heartland. This is a role that is down played or insufficiently acknowledged as having a place in the new modern university. Equally important is the focus on academic disciplines, and how they engage with the wider stakeholder group of their related industry.

The research findings also produce a number of wider insights, developed from the three sub questions concerning who the external entrepreneurs are and their particular characteristics; the activities they engage in when in the academic heartland and also the role they play in furthering the entrepreneurial relationship. The research suggests that the role of external entrepreneurs could have implications for the university of the future, perhaps in the possibility of a new model of the entrepreneurial university that manifests itself as an **intrapreneurial university**. Intrapreneurial behaviour is considered to be 'insider entrepreneurialism' where the challenges of working within a highly structured and bureaucratic organisation could lead to innovation and have

competitive advantage in a highly competitive environment. Universities are run by processes, policies and regulation and can be seen at times to be overly bureaucratic and deemed to be mature organisations with little appetite for risk taking. Potentially this could be overturned by intrapreneurial behaviour.

A further insight is that the academic heartland might be an outmoded concept, as more engagement with the external world through individuals might lead to advances in collaborative knowledge engagement and the term **expanded heartland** might better suit the newly engaged faculty. This fits with the Faculty of Art and Design and may well fit with others who take a translational approach to the curriculum where the academic/practitioner is key to developments.

In addition, the research suggests that academics can learn from the behaviours of an entrepreneur which proposes the notion of **collective entrepreneurship**. This is a positive finding as there can be shared attitudes to risk, and attributes of co-design and design thinking methodologies would suit the characteristics of art and design academics whilst also enabling the university to remain comfortable within its own regulatory frameworks. But, most importantly, collective entrepreneurship would allow for a different approach to knowledge generation.

The findings and insights from the research hope to contribute to relevant knowledge that can help practitioners to develop and to contribute to their profession and also, in addition to offer university managers new ways of working at a time of great change.

1.6 Summary of chapters

The next chapter, Chapter Two, focuses on the literature review of the concept of the entrepreneurial university, definitions of entrepreneurialism, the policy environment and its place within a global setting. The literature comments on the roles of leadership and innovation for higher education within this setting.

Chapter Three extends the literature review to enable the reader to understand the context of art and design higher education, the Creative Economy and the Creative Industries link to entrepreneurship. A key focus of this chapter is to understand art and design as a translational subject and one that might gain greater status if the discipline was understood in a new context of innovation and entrepreneurialism to support a growing economic agenda, which in turn may support a new meaning of entrepreneurial

university. This chapter also looks at Design Thinking as a management tool that has derived from the creative industries and to put into context another way of thinking, particularly about leadership and management other than those mentioned in the literature review, which stem from more traditional business and management sources.

Chapter Four focuses on the research methodology and research questions in depth and describes the research problem and how the Faculty of Art and Design might address the issues. The chapter looks at the research methodology and why self-ethnography was selected and the justification for its use. Other methods are analysed and dismissed as not being fit for purpose. The ethics section highlights concern around using self-ethnography as a methodology and justification for its use in this context.

Chapter Five discusses the research design, and its separation into four research design elements. The research design takes into account the methodology used and the final selection based on the use of self-ethnography as described by Alvesson and the research design follows his advice.

Chapter Six is the chapter, which contextualises the study and is in keeping with the methodological approach adopted to ensure that distance is created between the author and the research subjects by reviewing her roles in external and national contexts. This chapter looks at a national subject association, a week-long colloquium, a visiting professor scheme and a parliamentary commission.

Chapter Seven introduces the ten entrepreneurs who have been used in this study and the findings in relation to their contribution to entrepreneurial activity, their characteristics and engagement. This chapter starts to identify three areas of activity that are useful in coming to conclusions as to the role they play. It introduces the first findings which are identified as three areas: Pose, Progress and Perform.

Chapter Eight introduces the research findings chapters and discusses the research outcomes and the analysis of the findings using a template which was designed and adapted following the advice given by Alvesson (2003). The contribution to developing entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland is discussed using 37 different sub-categories which were identified and matched to the three areas above in the second of the research findings chapters (Chapter Seven).

Chapter Nine analyses the research findings and provides insights into the wider implications for the entrepreneurial university concept. This chapter articulates the three core findings of the **Intrapreneurial University** as a developing concept, the **Expanded Heartland**, and a focus on 'curators' as opposed to 'creators' of knowledge through **Collective Entrepreneurship**.

Chapter Ten is a reflective piece by the author that identifies the contributions to knowledge and also to practice. This chapter also looks at the implications for policy and the limitations of the study and makes the final concluding remarks.

CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This thesis aims to understand and explore the relationship and role between entrepreneurs who enter a university on an informal, or semi-formal basis, and that of a university that describes itself as being entrepreneurial. This review draws on the main literature on the thinking concerning the concept of an entrepreneurial university and then discusses the challenges to the concept. The author noticed particular relationship constructs between the concept of the entrepreneurial university and that of the entrepreneurs who entered a Faculty of Art and Design in a post-92 university.

This led to a series of questions regarding the entrepreneurs' role and how they themselves respond to the concept of the entrepreneurial university, and in particular how this is seen through the lens of one faculty, the Faculty of Art and Design. Further questions arose concerning a faculty approach to the notion of the entrepreneurial university concept and whether lessons could be learnt in contributing to a model that might be fit for the 21st Century. The literature review aims to establish the current thinking concerning the concept of the entrepreneurial university and art and design education within the context of the creative industries. It does not attempt to cover the whole literature concerning entrepreneurship per se, nor does it involve student teaching and learning approaches to entrepreneurship and enterprise. It does, however, provide, a critical overview of the concept of the entrepreneurial university through a focus on management and leadership and the running of a university with business methods in mind, and within the changing policy landscape of higher education in the UK.

Following seismic shifts in the economy and the higher education environment in England post-2009, the thesis aims to stimulate new thinking for the concept of the entrepreneurial university, i.e. one that may not have been suitable, desirable or necessary in the preceding 30 years. Most of the current literature focuses on internal cultures and a series of criteria to follow in order to be successful. The literature tends to look at business models from other organisations and focuses on the challenge that universities face in order to offer economic salvation through research and spin out activities to help reverse a decline in traditional industries. There is a strong focus on innovation and financial surplus, and on business cultures which challenge models of academic management and leadership. It aims to seek out the motivational factors for a wider disciplinary scope than the 'old' model due to the recent impacts from changes in

the economy and global issues. It also seeks to establish the particular role, if any, that higher education in art and design plays following the insights and findings of the research. The literature review will test the existing model to see if it is fit for purpose, and identify gaps in the literature that support the need for the research problem to be worth pursuing. It will also put into context the changes in higher education in the UK and government interventions in pursuit of competitive advantage for the economy through the use of a new type of entrepreneurial university.

The rise of the phenomenon of the entrepreneurial university developed in the late 20th century following an increase in the changing perceptions of the role of the university within both the state and the private sector. The university sector, particularly in the UK, became increasingly involved in a variety of mechanisms to find new sources of funding as a result of the systematic reduction of state funding, and also due to the need to respond to the rise in managerialism and in competing in an ever expanding global market for higher education. Within this context, key authors such as Clark (2008) and Shattock (2009) started to identify the traits and characteristics of those universities, which believed they had formed a 'new' type of institution and could call themselves 'entrepreneurial'.

These institutions developed new roles and income streams as a positive addition to the established activities of research and teaching as the main components of a university's mission. The pioneering institutions provided a role model for others to follow, particularly in generating third stream activities such as income generation from knowledge transfer, international students, spin out companies, quasi-private collaborations in science parks, and high cost income generating short courses. However, the significant changes in HE funding at the beginning of the 21st century have led to the favoured characteristics of the entrepreneurial university to be called into question. A critical approach to the literature and the growing need to identify the role of the entrepreneurial university, and how it might manifest itself in the future, forms the basis of this literature review.

Central to almost all of the current literature is the interchangeable use of the words 'innovation', 'enterprise' and 'entrepreneurial' within a university context, and also in the perception that the university is essential to the construct of problem solving, either in developing new economic wealth, or solving social and technological issues. Whilst this may seem obvious, it brings with it connotations for developing the entrepreneurial university and its implication for today's universities, and the role they play in economic regeneration. This literature review will look at innovation in light of the concept of the

entrepreneurial university, but will not delve in to the larger complex literature of innovation strategies. It is important, however, to touch upon the definitions of intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship and their link to innovation, risk and enterprise so that it can be seen in the context of developing entrepreneurial universities, not only in the current state of English higher education, but also in the context of education and economic policy.

Following the definitions and economic historical developments, which ensure a common understanding for the literature choice and critical review, the literature review develops into a contextual piece on the changing higher education environment, the concept of the entrepreneurial university as set out by key authors, and the roles and actions that the concept dictates. A significant look at the current policies and government intervention follows which aims to demonstrate why a new type of entrepreneurial university is emerging and what its characteristics might be. The need to find a wider disciplinary scope for a new entrepreneurial university is correlated by the concepts of design education, design thinking and design ethnography, linked by innovation and an overarching desire to find a new approach to the research problem, which will enable a newly formed concept for business facing entrepreneurial universities. This leads on to the next chapter that examines art and design higher education, the creative economy and its link to entrepreneurship.

2.2 Definitions, history and economics

This thesis is concerned, in part, with the concept of the entrepreneurial university, but this simplistic phrase does not do justice to the numerous interpretations and developments that have arisen over the years. The concept includes the business facing university in the external work that an institution does, through to enterprise education and working with entrepreneurs. The concept also includes having an entrepreneurial mind-set in the steering of universities, and this is further compounded by recent issues around the need for universities to ensure their graduates are employable and to provide support to them in their entrepreneurial developments. The activities, government steerage and private sector relationships create a complex environment in which to discuss the definitions.

The first difficulty lies in the word 'entrepreneurial' itself. The Oxford English dictionary (OED 1995) traces the origin of the word to the 18th century French '*entreprenour*' used to describe people who hired premises in which musical performances were given

against an expectation of box office income (Shattock, 2003, p. 147) and were therefore very much considered risk takers based on anticipating a need or service.

Notwithstanding this definition there is an issue around the confusion in the literature for higher education between being an entrepreneur, entrepreneurship education and being an entrepreneurial university, and the role all of these play in the development of economic theory surrounding entrepreneurship. However, it is important to discuss these as, although they all inform each other and have their own individual explanations, they are part of the larger debate on entrepreneurial universities, and the inter-relationship between research and enterprise, teaching and learning, subject disciplines and external social, political and economic environments. It is significant to the research question concerning the relationship between the entrepreneurs who enter a university that defines itself as entrepreneurial and the role they play.

The Oxford Dictionary also refers to an entrepreneur as someone who ‘undertakes an enterprise or business with the chances of profit or loss’ (OED, 1995). This is unhelpful as a generic definition for a term used by universities as it refers largely to individuals. Most definitions fall into historical and economic circumstantial definitions and seem to be appropriated to the particular moment in time, or rely on a variety of characteristics or traits which define an individual and then by extension an institution or company, or the political and economic era. More useful is the exact French translation of the verb ‘entreprendre’ which means ‘to do’ and can be divided into two parts: ‘*entre*’ meaning between, and ‘*preneur*’ meaning taker. Literally meaning a ‘between – taker’ or as we might say a ‘go-between’ (Filion, 2008). If we take the literal meaning then universities form a very useful go-between in terms of student, industry and faculty but this does not form a useful understanding of the relationship and characteristic traits of an entrepreneur, and how they engage with an organisation that is entitled entrepreneurial.

The first attempt at defining an entrepreneur is generally referenced by Richard Cantillon in 1725 (Long, 1983; Filion, 2008). He used the term to describe someone who we might now call a venture capitalist, someone looking for investment opportunities and who takes the risk in the hope of yielding a profit, or someone who is the intermediary – the ‘go-between’ (Filion, 2008). This early definition usefully describes the author’s initial concerns over the efficacy of the individual entrepreneurs who were entering the faculty as to what their real motive was. Was it to be the angel who entered the academy as a friend passing on knowledge, or as a venture vulture looking for early access to talent and ideas as are often seen to be generated within an art and design faculty? However,

Cantillon's definitions of the entrepreneur preceded Adam Smith's definitions of capitalism and the rise of the owner-manager in the *Wealth of Nations* (1776) (Hartman, 2011). The prevailing fundamental concepts of economic theory concerning the creation of new wealth and the distribution of wealth are central to the concept of entrepreneurship, but Smith's 'invisible hand' of the free market is important to note, as entrepreneurial behaviours would be led by self-interest (Hartman, 2011). In the 19th century the concept of the perfect free market meant there was no place for the entrepreneur who would allegedly disrupt the equilibrium, and was challenged by Marx through a socialist view of society that the state would triumph over the wealthy who benefit only themselves and not wider society interests. Marx therefore did not value the individual pursuit of the would-be entrepreneur at the expense of a controlled state system (Ebner, 2005). Nearly a century after Cantillon, Jean-Baptiste Say had the greatest impact on the study of entrepreneurship. In 1815, Say identified the element of innovation as being an important characteristic of people who could do new things, or in a different way. Say was able to make a clear distinction (Filion, 2008) between the role of the entrepreneur and the role of the capitalist. This distinction became important to the author as another area of concern about the entrepreneurs entering the faculty as to whether they were attempting to find the latest innovation from the design students, in other words being the design dragons under the guise of support and investment.

At the beginning of the 20th Century, Schumpeter (1934) known as the father of modern entrepreneurial thought, described those who were innovators, and sought creative activity and new business from innovation as being entrepreneurial (Cunningham, 1991). Schumpeter did not see the perfect market as being at equilibrium but as a chaotic force constantly interrupted by entrepreneurs entering the market with new innovations. Known as 'creative destruction' Schumpeter's ideas looked to new demand being created by entrepreneurs who created wealth and its ongoing distribution (Cunningham, 1991; Hartman, 2011). The link between innovation and entrepreneurship is established here by Schumpeter and from this point the two words are always closely related which is important to note when considering the new role of an entrepreneurial university, and why so much of the literature on entrepreneurial universities refers to innovation strategies. Schumpeter identified entrepreneurs as the people most needed to revitalise the economy during times of hardship and therefore makes the closest link between economy, entrepreneurialism and innovation (Filion, 2008).

Therefore, during times of economic hardship universities are called upon to develop research and innovation strategies so that an institutional manifestation of what it is to

be entrepreneurial is linked closely to the economy and socio-economic concerns (Ebner, 2005, p. 258) and this has been the case in recent times. As the literature starts to describe entrepreneurial universities and the rise of neo-managerialism (Deem, 2001) and business like behaviours, the university begins to find itself stuck in some ways between the theory of entrepreneurship and the theory of the firm (Ebner, 2005, p. 258). The theory of the firm looks to describe and explain behaviours, existence and relationships of a particular organisation and particularly the internal structures and the markets they serve. With a university there is a long history of its purpose and its changing relationships with the external world (Grant, 1996) and the internal structures and new markets they work in, both for teaching and for research. Utilising research as an economic profit-making activity led to some universities creating their own internal firms, through spin-outs from research or student business start-ups (Etzkowitz, 2008).

2.3 Defining the entrepreneur within entrepreneurship

Most of the definitions of entrepreneur refer to the characteristics of what individuals who are described as entrepreneurs actually do. These include those who are comfortable with uncertainty and risk, those who look for complementary management skills and those who seek out creative opportunities to innovate. Innovation is an important sub feature of entrepreneurship and becomes the conscious search for opportunity (Drucker, 1998). Other authors have developed aspects of entrepreneurial thought, including intrapreneurs (Pinochet, 1985) which Pinochet described as 'inside entrepreneurs' within a company environment, and is discussed later. Mintzberg linked entrepreneurial characteristics to change management (Mintzberg, 1973) to describe those who are willing to live with risk and uncertainty and are comfortable that ambiguity will lead to change within an organisation. This is problematic in highly controlled organisations, such as a university, where over time bureaucracy and regulations created both internally and externally have taken a key position in steering decisions (Barnett, 2000; Birnbaum, 2000; Bok, 2003). However, there is little in the literature, if indeed any, that provides answers to the research question regarding the role that external entrepreneurs play in a Faculty of Art and Design within an entrepreneurial university and therefore confirms why this study is important.

Drucker gives a simple explanation that 'entrepreneurs innovate' (Drucker, 1998) which disguises how profound this is because there is no mention of business, management, finance, or commercialisation in his definition. These are terms that are often used alongside a definition of entrepreneurship, especially when discussing entrepreneurship

and its place in universities, either as a teaching, research or a steering role. Instead Drucker's definition provides a metaphorical 'big tent', an intellectual framework with room for social, scientific, artistic and academic entrepreneurs (Thorp, 2010). The 'big tent' actually hosts a conversation and a way of thinking about an opportunity using a set of tools that are available to all, no matter what their agenda or values (Thorp, 2010, p6). This in itself is a more useful way of thinking about an organisation as being entrepreneurial rather than an individual, or enabling the culture of intrapreneurship.

Ducker's approach to innovation and entrepreneurship led to the understanding that it was the responsibility of every executive, or arguably in the case of university steering, the Vice Chancellor, to make a purposeful search for innovation within the company, or university, through four strands: Unexpected occurrences, Incongruities, Process needs, or Industry and market changes. In recent times the changes to higher education and ways of steering a university mean there is a need to search for changes by following the four strands above, particularly because of the way the market for higher education is changing. Drucker then considers the environment external to the company through three strands: demographic changes, changes in perception, and new knowledge creation (Drucker, 1985; Drucker, 1998). If a university is to consider itself entrepreneurial then developments in policy, demography and the challenge of what is considered new knowledge and where it is produced relies on every university to consider itself to be entrepreneurial.

However, this also conflicts with other more recent views that entrepreneurship is based on uncertainty and being able to cope with ambiguity in an uncertain world where society, technology and economics are moving at such a pace that a form of systematic innovation and entrepreneurship is no longer relevant to the contemporary world. The urgency became tangible when Michael Porter (quoted in Thorp) states 'that America urgently needs a coherent strategy based in large part upon our strengths in innovation, entrepreneurship and higher education' (Thorp, 2010, p. 1). More recently, Vince Cable has stated that 'there is an urgent need to raise UK skills levels to help drive productivity, growth and job creation' (Cable, 2011). Porter's call to arms for a coherent strategy, and the sense of urgency, is based on underlying economic theories of entrepreneurship, which further confuse where a university stands in either its mission or its activities. The role of a university to provide entrepreneurship education for the student body, and what and how it is taught, is not directly within the scope of this thesis but it has relevance to the purpose of a modern university.

The increased pressure for graduates to demonstrate personal entrepreneurial skills and organisational capabilities at a time when the nature of employment is changing dramatically has called for a greater emphasis on enterprise or entrepreneurship education. The nature and scope of what the curriculum content should be forms a wide debate but much of the content relies on business planning, engagement in enterprise learning, and how to generate own businesses or the value of self-employment (Miclea, 2004; Gibb, 2006; Etzkowitz, 2008; Hartman, 2011). The value of this type of education is copied and possibly misunderstood as to its effectiveness in a university setting and the role it plays in Porter's desire for a coherent strategy. However, the new employment landscape and future gazing sees the need for students to have strong emotional intelligence, to understand entrepreneurial values and to manage uncertainty in an ever changing work place, in an attempt to train people today for the work of tomorrow (Miclea, 2004; Witty, 2013).

The growing reliance on graduates to be entrepreneurial when they leave university is also highlighted as a need for employment success as an employee as well as an employer. The focus for some business students to study entrepreneurial content is more or less deliberately contributing to the development of students' willingness to take risks and shape their own futures, either by setting up young start-up companies or being active employees. Portfolio careers are seen to be the norm and therefore the focus on experiential learning and self-determination are key skills for graduates (Henderson, 2000; Miclea, 2004; National Council for Entrepreneur Education, 2012; Valsania et al, 2016).

Enterprise education is becoming more evident across the university sector and, although this does not make a university entrepreneurial per se, it is causing a change in the mind-set as to what this means to the academy and which disciplines have the closest fit. The obvious ones are the business schools as they change from having a business context that has dominated to date to an entrepreneurial paradigm. However, business schools are not necessarily the best places for this, as they are not good incubators of entrepreneurial aspirations and because they have up until now put emphasis on business growth strategies, business planning and management theory. They are regarded as weak at developing new pedagogies that stimulate entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviours, (Gibbons, 1998), in contrast to design subjects that are seen as strong in ideation and venture creation but possibly weak in business theory to support a new set up. This straightforward divide is an example of where a greater emphasis in understanding pedagogy for entrepreneurship is the subject of further research and not

within the scope of this study but symptomatic of the shift from a Science Technology Engineering and Maths (STEM) emphasis to a broader range of subjects.

The brief overview of definitions has attempted to contextualise the word and characteristics of entrepreneurship as both an individual and organisational aspiration and trait, but also the place it has in the wider economy and the challenge of appropriating the word to an organisation or a university. It has also clearly articulated how the 'go-between' of the original definition is probably the most suitable phrase to consider when applying entrepreneurship to today's universities. The close, if almost inseparable link, between innovation and entrepreneurship and the way in which this has become such an important economic imperative that its function in the curriculum is also important to discuss, and provides a context to see how the role of the external entrepreneur would operate in such an environment. The need to see these definitions in the light of a changing higher education climate follows. However, to contextualise how an entrepreneurial university needs to change and be fit for a new purpose in the 21st century, it is first necessary to look at the original concepts and foundations and the gradual acceptance of the word intrapreneurship alongside the word entrepreneurship.

2.4 Intrapreneurship

Gifford Pinchot was the first to identify a term for those who used entrepreneurship as a tool for creating innovation in established organisations and he named the phenomenon 'intrapreneuring' (Pinchot, 1985). The opportunity to investigate intrapreneurship in different types of organisations is useful but rests on considering similar attributes possessed by entrepreneurs alongside those who benefit from internal corporate schemes to encourage employee initiatives to be innovative. This interpretation is important in this thesis as the role of the author alongside the external stakeholders' role is seen as that of insider innovation. This is sometimes referred to as corporate entrepreneurship. The focus for intrapreneurship is on innovation within a company and from employees who were in tune with the mission of the organisation but looked to make new profits or processes as part of its ongoing development (Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005; Bojica and Fuentes, 2012).

Not a great deal has been written on intrapreneurship and the university context, and the rise in the literature in recent years has been largely concerning innovation in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and start-ups, and some authors have made correlations with small research centres, or niche courses in the context of academic intrapreneurship

(Roworth-Stokes, 2013). Intrapreneurship in companies such as 3M, Google and Apple all try to instil the opportunity for the encouragement of projects and provide structures and rewards to do this and therefore intrapreneurship is largely associated with growth (Valsania, Moriano and Molero, 2014). In various organisational environments, intrapreneurial behaviour is defined as voluntary behaviour aimed at the creation of opportunities, generation of new ideas and the creation of new products (Valsania, Moriano and Molero, 2014). Therefore, the idea that those within a university contribute to the concept of an entrepreneurial university has continued to grow beyond the original ideas as set down by Clark and others. The focus on external entrepreneurs entering the university provides an added dimension to the likelihood of some of their characteristics (such as risk taking, innovation and proactive behaviour) transferring to staff within the university.

2.5 The concept and establishment of the entrepreneurial university

This section looks at the development of the phenomenon of the entrepreneurial university. In the last thirty years there have been many factors that have challenged the status quo in higher education namely the reduction in public funding, pressures to carry out more applied research, the lifelong learning movement and globalisation (Davies, 2001). Because of these issues, more universities are being forced to become more entrepreneurial in style and substance, by becoming more aggressive in competition for financial resources, faculty and students (Breneman, 2005) and attempting to work in the age of super complexity (Barnett, 2000).

The economic and environmental pressures for universities to diversify and gain additional income from alternative sources saw the rise of the concept, of a 'new' kind of higher education institution named by Burton Clark as the entrepreneurial university (Clark, 2004; Clark, 2008). Originally the Humboldtian model of a university refers to two missions - knowledge transfer and knowledge acquisition (e.g. teaching and research), but more recently the entrepreneurial university is also concerned with a third mission, to connect and engage with society and commercial activity to develop the economic well-being of the region and nation. The inter-relationship of the three missions has become so critical that rarely are they ever seen to be viewed independently by any modern university.

The creation of the modern research university was itself an entrepreneurial act. Humboldt founded the University of Berlin in 1809 as an institution of change. It was

created to seize academic and scientific leadership from the French and to capture the innovative energy that resulted from the enormous changes precipitated by the French revolution (Thorp, 2010, pp. 3-4). Other universities emerged from entrepreneurial or philanthropic acts, such as Cornell University, which was set up to emphasise the teaching of practical subjects (Etzkowitz, 2008;Thorp, 2010). Likewise, the entrepreneurial spirit of local textile businesses formed the early days of the anonymised EntUni University. Throughout the 19th century foundations for universities were laid to ensure there was a drive for the betterment of mankind and support for great scholars, as there is again today (Thorp, 2010).

the remarkable culture created centuries ago to produce innovation by gathering in one place great minds from across the disciplines is again expected to provide the next big ideas that will transform society (Thorp 2010.p.5).

The function of the modern university is controversial as there is not a coherent agreed set of responsibilities to which universities adhere, despite league tables trying to give a sense of differentiation (Marginson, 2007). The rise of marketisation is seen as being linked to a successful economy and therefore when placed into a higher education setting, it has led to a worldwide variety of different types of institutions and ways of learning (Naidoo, 2000).

This thesis only looks at England, but even within this small country, there are different models that have emerged over a long history. The traditional purpose of research and teaching has been under strain for some time, as marketisation, globalisation and new public managerialism and the constraints of public funding have produced state led directives for university steering, which have challenged traditional university missions (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Barnett, 2000; Naidoo, 2000; Breneman, 2005; Deem, 2007; Clark, 2008). The political and economic changes have increased pressures for universities to change as Barnett points out:

the university, as such, is finding a new habitus, a new location in society, a new ordering of perceived value, and a new register of meaning and understanding across its now enlarged audience (Barnett, 2000, p. 13).

These changes have included commercially led research activities, consultancy research projects, technology and knowledge transfer, recruitment of international students, franchising of courses, and commercialisation of resources alongside

continuing professional practice (Davies, 2001). In all their various guises, these activities referred to as third stream or third mission summarize the focus in nearly all universities as being entrepreneurial, but in reality form a range of alternative income streams to substitute for any reduction in state funding. Nevertheless, the concept has to be taken beyond alternative income streams. The profit motive when introduced into the academy known as 'academic capitalism' was driven by market forces and competition (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, p.9).

The definition of the entrepreneurial university has also changed, as the phrase became more widespread and dominates much of the discussion on the purpose of the university and the development of activities that move them further away from their reliance on the state (Shattock, 2003). Shattock points out that although many universities have elements of third stream activities they are not particularly entrepreneurial in their management styles, and fall awkwardly between theories of entrepreneurship and theories of the firm (Grant, 1996). In some cases, institutions responding to the needs of new public managerialism (Deem, 2001; 2007) fail to take risks often associated with entrepreneurial activity and likewise the university as a long-standing type of institution has models of structures and behaviours that restrict the necessary traits of entrepreneurship or intrapreneurship. The theories of knowledge production and transfer as generating new innovations and entrepreneurial actions will be discussed later in the section as it is important to consider how this fits within the entrepreneurial concept.

Notwithstanding the problems associated with the terminology and the general understanding of the phrase, the work of Burton Clark (2008) first published in 1998, is pivotal in understanding the concept. He gave reasons why transforming a university culture into an entrepreneurial one was desirable and identified five components necessary to make the changes to be successful. The five areas are:

1. *A strengthened steering core* – meaning that traditionally universities had a weak ability to steer (lead) themselves and needed greater management capacity to be successful in this respect, as more senior academics became senior managers.
2. *An expanded developmental periphery* – meaning the development of non-academic departments to reach out and support external connections to link in with academic departments. These departments are often called technology transfer offices, knowledge transfer offices (KTOs) or outreach, or enterprise offices.

3. *A diversified funding base* – this focuses on the need to find alternative funding and income streams from non-public funds, such as income from commercial research or spin out activity.
4. *A stimulated academic heartland* – Clark saw a need for departments and faculties to become entrepreneurial to ensure a change in culture, and saw this as a sticking point in being successful. This area therefore becomes the focus of this study.
5. *An integrated entrepreneurial culture* – meaning to develop a work culture that embraces change and the characteristics of innovation and development.

(Clark, 2008, p. 5)

These five elements provide a rational starting place to interrogate the literature that surrounds the concept up until 2006-7. The economic crash of 2008-9 encouraged, in part, the development of a new HE White Paper, 'Putting Students in the Heart of the System' (2010). This left the literature fairly wide open, and hence there is a need to define the gap from late 2009 onwards by using different sources and materials. However, it is important to thoroughly analyse Clark's work first in detail as outlined below.

1. *A strengthened steering core*

The pressure on many universities, especially the Post-92 institutions, to include additional forms of income generation and to include statements of entrepreneurship in their mission and strategy, whilst at the same time competing for scarce resources, led to changes in roles and structures, especially in recruiting a group of externally facing staff (Becher, 2001). This added to the changes in the complexity of university steering and the chance to revisit the purpose of the university (Robinson, 2002). The strengthened steering core was an expression by Clark to avoid characterising types of leadership, and to enable the creation of flatter structures with good administrative support. This steering often manifested itself in the setting up of offices for research and enterprise in support of this activity and were seen to be at their best when well linked into academic units, and at their worst when seen as a separate silo. The research and enterprise elements are often clumsily categorised as blue skies research or close to market enterprise (Crossick, 2006). Becher further clarifies the issues in steering:

an increasing emphasis in government policy and rhetoric on the vocational functions of HE in terms of both of its role in supplying qualified students for the professions, industry and commerce and in terms of its research function. This has meant a de-emphasising of other roles, those concerned with the general

development of an individual's mind and capabilities, contributing culturally to the community of enhancing knowledge and understanding for their own sake rather than utilitarian ends (Becher, 2001).

However, one of the issues with the strengthened steering core is that of separate groups of people taking on external roles that may no longer be sustainable financially in the current economic crisis. This may become an inhibition to the future success of an entrepreneurial university if it relies only on this core group of people. It also prevents the whole university community from taking on the role of risk and innovation, which more recent literature identifies as being central to the entrepreneurial organisation (Pinochet, 1985). As Drucker pointed out, the steering has to be cognisant of the external issues such as demographics, external policy and the need to support the growth of new knowledge.

2. A diversified funding base

The strengthened steering core incorporated into universities started to make more use of strategic planning and management tools (Birnbaum, 2000) as a method of control and accountability in return for public funding. This in itself led to some attempts to find sources of funding outside of the accountability of public funding and the pressures coming from reductions in state funding. This led to pressures from government for universities to develop applied commercial research income, gain funding from the lifelong learning movement, and contribute to local and economic development and globalisation (Davies, 2001). The continued pressure on HEIs to mould an entrepreneurial society through government interventions such as de-regulation, privatisation, marketisation and technology was a global approach (Barnett, 2000; Gibb 2006). Clark's ideal of a diversified funding base included funds from philanthropists, private sector and specific government contracts, but for some the pursuit of making money only reinforced a lack of purpose in the academy in comparison to earlier and more traditional times (Bok, 2003).

The utilisation of applied research from subjects such as engineering and science formed the most obvious candidates to increase the scale of research, develop commercial applications and form partnerships with external and normally hi-tech companies. Other subjects which tried using government funding initiatives, such as the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF), found it harder to do so and as a result the main exponents of the diversified funding base tended to remain within scientific subjects. It was harder for those in the Humanities or the Creative Arts to make financial gain, despite having good

external networks. Either the system for support was wrong or it just did not match the full disciplinary scope of a 'regular' university (Crossick, 2006). The entrepreneurial university also seemed to favour those subjects that would promote economic growth only, rather than those that have a non-monetary value to society and the intrinsic benefits of learning, which seemed to lose favour with the public and the state (Wolf, 2002).

3. Expanded development periphery

Clark refers to the expanded range of people who now work in a university; employees who have roles in research and enterprise offices to support interdisciplinary activity tend to fall into two camps - those in administrative functions and those in academic units (Whitchurch and Gordon, 2012). This was an acknowledgement that the range of external links to different departments cannot be maintained or the possibilities of interdisciplinary work cannot be brokered without new offices to support them. The idea that departments alone cannot meet the new agendas required of them is not new and continues to be an issue universities are faced with today (Clark, 2008). The most senior of the expanded periphery roles tend to be at Pro Vice Chancellor (PVC) level for research and enterprise to oversee the strategy and implementation of routes to alternative finance streams.

The marketing of educational services and new product development is seen as a basic move from research to an entrepreneurial function (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). There are plenty of examples in the literature where this is successful for engineering/science faculties who can work on applied research projects and bring in additional funding. But the challenge remains as to what constitutes both new knowledge and applied research in the creative subjects (Crossick, 2006) and whether this can have the same impact. Whilst it might not have been true or seen to be appropriate in the era of Clark's definition, there is a new environment in universities now which forces the need for new approaches to subject disciplines to combine to focus on solving 'wicked' problems (Conklin, 2005) that can only be overcome by multidisciplinary teams with problem solving at its heart.

4. A stimulated academic heartland

This is one of the most interesting areas of Clark's characteristics in that he believes that academics should reach out to the external world and change the belief of the academic heartland (Clark, 2004). In 2008 he clarified his stance:

Universities consist of widely divergent fields in their traditional departments; enterprising action typically spreads unevenly in the old heartland. Science and technology departments commonly become entrepreneurial first and most fully. Social science departments aside from economics and business find the shift more difficult and lag behind. Humanities departments have good reason to be resisting laggards; new money does not readily flow their way either from government or non-governmental patrons. Deliberate effort on their part to go out and raise funds by offering new services may seem particularly out of place. (Clark, 2008, p.88)

This quotation is worthwhile seeing in full as it describes a pejorative view of academic tribes (Becher, 2001), and seems to reinforce that only certain subjects are worthy of exploitation in entrepreneurial terms, and does not consider how a greater scope of interdisciplinary endeavour may combine to be more useful to the current economic and social ills. Conversely, Deem also identified this problem from more traditional and longstanding university departments that there has been a loss of autonomy over their work. They have moved from being a community of scholars to workplaces with rules and regulations set by largely external forces such as government priorities (Deem, 2001). With vocational courses, there is a natural or inherent need to work externally and form localised pockets of inspiration and initiatives (Davies, 2001). Whereas, Gibb describes the need for the other disciplines to become the 'opportunity seeking core' and engage in the ownership of the entrepreneurial paradigm across the university and eventually become instruments for change in organisation and culture (Gibb, 2006).

5. An integrated entrepreneurial culture

Clark espouses that the university entrepreneurial culture develops over time either through direct leadership or from the ground up (Clark, 2004), and transformation may be slow because of the entrenched nature of the tribes within disciplines (Becher, 2001), with strong cultures and practices that are slow to change. However, with the passing of time it is difficult to see how, because of the rise in thinking and funding for entrepreneurial activity, that this is still so ingrained in some academics. The literature suggests that the barriers lie in organisational structures and traditions (Shattock, 2003) and this can extend into or be resisted by the student body. However, much Clark promoted an integrated culture, the successful entrepreneurial universities tended to be based around STEM subjects' ability to commercialise their research activities. However, since the economic crash of 2008, the need for economic survival rests in all parts of the

university within a broader cultural sphere of subjects working together for competitive advantage.

Both Davies and Clark include references to the characteristics needed for entrepreneurial cultures within university settings. In particular the institutional strategic need to organise policy, to have open and quick decision making, open communication, transparency and the collective ability to admit weaknesses and readiness to be accountable academically and financially. The recognition that failure or success in one area may have negative or positive consequences for everyone else means the need to take risks and experiment with new things is uncertain in everyone's minds but it does have clear links with the concept of a learning organisation (Davies 2001). Davies points out that the nature and rate of entrepreneurial activity (for example research and development or knowledge transfer with industry) can impact on the organisational lifestyle and culture of university. If the institutional strategy for this type of work is not clearly understood or has an explicit reference in its mission (Davies, 2001) then it is less likely to be successful. This thinking is at odds with the risk-taking characteristics of entrepreneurs and this is in part the reason for this study.

2.6 Modes 1, 2 and 3 knowledge production

In understanding the role of the external entrepreneur in a university, it is useful to understand the context that they would operate in and the rationale for a university to become entrepreneurial. The literature suggests that the need is developed through an encouragement of a move from 'mode 1' knowledge which was characterised as being basic and disciplinary based, through to 'mode 2' which was trans-disciplinary and validated through utilitarian criteria (Gibbons, 1998). For the majority of universities, the focus of a university mission shifted to the economy and the intervention from the state to encourage greater competitive advantage through mode 2 research (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). This alleged distinction of knowledge production, which is popular in most texts as being the norm for hybridised research and involving industry and government, is criticised by Fuller who calls universities 'dumb organisations' who have too much human capital and not enough good 'structural capital' (Fuller, 2009).

He contrasts this with business (that some universities try to emulate following business processes) and the buzz words of knowledge capital, modes 1 and 2 with that of the 'smart organisation' which makes the most of ill-trained staff through the alchemy of good

management. Fuller states that university deans and heads struggle to keep up with the activities of their over educated staff, and enterprise activity would be no different. If McDonalds is more than the sum of its parts then a university appears to be much less so (Fuller, 2009, p. 15) and, as a consequence, the role of the entrepreneurial university may be under question.

Throughout the 20th century, universities have systematically developed structures that allowed them to add the function of generating new knowledge to their previous functions of preserving knowledge and transmitting it (Gibbons, 1998). Notwithstanding this, the classifications of mode 1 and mode 2 by Gibbons relate to the steering that has generally been adopted alongside the knowledge modes. Mode 1 is about the problems that are set and solved in a context governed by the academic interests of the academic community and is developed within and by a hierarchical structure which tries to preserve itself. Mode 2 is knowledge produced in an applied context, and in contrast is non-hierarchical (Gibbons, 1998, pp. 5-6). Both of these established modes lie in the context of university knowledge production and exchange.

Carayannis and Campbell (Carayannis and Campbell, 2012; 2014) expanded the concept of modes 1 and 2 knowledge production into a mode 3. This incorporated the value of knowledge production from clusters and networks and called it a Mode 3 Innovation Ecosystem, and further developed the ideas of Etzkowitz's triple helix concept into the quadruple helix. Carayannis and Campbell then extended this further into considering the role of the arts and artistic research and arts based innovation (Carayannis and Campbell, 2014) into a five-helix model. They suggested a new reference point for debate, which fits with the author's thesis on the value of the arts and design in considering a new model for a university. Carayannis and Campbell state:

Art and arts can also be understood (and re-invented) as a manifestation of knowledge, knowledge production and knowledge creation. Furthermore, knowledge production and knowledge creation extend to knowledge application and knowledge use (Carayannis and Campbell, 2014).

The proposals for a new mode 3 knowledge allowed for local research with a global reach to be considered which support the concepts of the anchor institution discussed later in this chapter. Other more recent applications of how a university might connect with the external world is presented as the 'engaged university' (Watson, 2011; 2014)

where cooperation and knowledge advancement is made with the not-for-profit sector, voluntary sector and the social enterprise movement.

Whilst mode 3 and the engaged university are interesting developments of the original concepts of mode 1 and 2 and the entrepreneurial university, the author suggests that they are still rooted in working with external organisations whereas she is proposing considering a new mode where is it based on individual externals as opposed to clusters or organisations. This might be thought of as the individual as opposed to 'the public' (Leydesdorff and Etzkowitz, 2003). The author proposes that an extension to the modes could be thought of as knowledge produced by non-academics (those external to the university such as external entrepreneurs) and fed back into the university. For example, 'spinning in' rather than spinning out, with the advantage that the university community could find alternative applications, beyond the applied partnership research, and a link back to the research problem of how entrepreneurs are actually engaging with the entrepreneurial university concept.

Much of the literature (Clark, 2008; Davies, 2001; Etzkowitz, 2008) has suggested that the entrepreneurial university has several choices through income generation as the financial contribution from the state reduces. Yet the literature on the actual person, the entrepreneur, reveals a much riskier, innovative character who it would seem could imbue the university with a new type of knowledge. Such entrepreneurs would come with tacit and experiential knowledge, and certainly be more in accordance with other subject disciplines such as the creative arts and humanities and would therefore engage these subjects in a way not previously suggested. This would stop 'information feudalism' (Fuller, 2009) and encourage greater co-production of entrepreneurial activity. Non-academic entrepreneurs in residence are becoming more common in universities, possibly as a way of engaging in the characteristics identified and avoiding the risk of damage to academic reputation. It could be argued that mode 3 would become the 'non-knowledge' in a very precise sense surrounding risk and innovation, but would not necessarily be overcome by more or better knowledge (Beck, 1992) and in this example universities would become the 'holding institution' for knowledge (Shattock, 2009). It is potentially within this context and debate within the literature review and the concept of the entrepreneurial university that external entrepreneurs have a role to play, but not without first understanding the challenges to the concept itself.

2.7 The concept challenged

Returning to the established literature on the entrepreneurial university, Etzkowitz refers to the interaction amongst the university, industry and government, which he refers to as the triple helix (Etzkowitz, 2008) and key to innovation and growth in a knowledge based society. Universities and governments act as entrepreneurs demonstrating that entrepreneurship is no longer just for businesses. Unlike Drucker and other earlier authors, Etzkowitz believes in the collective approach to entrepreneurship particularly when applied to the university setting. 'Collective entrepreneurship' is typical of knowledge-based firms that require both technical and business expertise that is unlikely to reside in one person, nor are they likely to resolve some of the world's biggest challenges alone (Etzkowitz, 2008;Thorp, 2010).

Etzkowitz is similar to Clark, Davies and Shattock, in that in his view the fundamental linkages for an entrepreneurial university lie around the hybrid between university and industry for applied research, funded through multiple funding sources. Etzkowitz sees an evolution from research through to the internal offices, as described by Clark as the technology offices, and through to start up incubator schemes. Much of the rhetoric of the entrepreneurial university lies in the ability to spin out new business start-ups from which in return, funding is given back to the university. If this is not the case, as is often stated, then it demonstrates that this particular activity does not generate the alternative income hoped for and so not fit for purpose. Just as Clark had five functions, Etzkowitz also has five norms (Etzkowitz, 2008), which sum up his proposals for a triple helix relationship:

1. Capitalisation (on knowledge created for economic advancement as well as academic contributions)
2. Interdependence (interactions with industry and government)
3. Independence (the entrepreneurial university as an independent organisation - not true for publicly funded universities)
4. Hybridisation (hybrid organisational formats)
5. Reflexivity (constant review of the universities relationships with industry and government and their relationships)

These authors take a static stance around a certain set of relationships or through steering and external relations to achieve the entrepreneurial university but they rarely look at the scope provided by the discipline range within a university. Whilst all the norms and functions are relevant and can be developed, they are no longer fit for purpose because changes in the role and production of knowledge have changed exponentially.

The discussion over modes 1 and 2 and a developing concept of mode 3 does not take into account that universities are no longer the sole producers of knowledge (Gibbons, 1998). The fact that globalisation means that, for each actor, the bulk of knowledge to which access is required will have been produced elsewhere (Gibbons, 1998), means that a new type of knowledge worker is required. People, in employment (self or otherwise) will need to be expert at configuring knowledge relevant to a wide range of contexts, or making money out of thin air (Leadbeater, 2000). These new types of worker are referred to as 'problem identifiers, problem solvers, and problem brokers' (Gibbons, 1998), although they are the small minority who have the 'permission to think' (Lauder, 2012). The number of business spin outs from a university do not save the local economy and produce employment for a wider workforce without this opportunity. This forms an interesting point, in that the role of the university to find new opportunities and to innovate possibly only supports a few rather than supporting a larger group of employees, and therefore creates the myth that the entrepreneurial university can provide for economic salvation and competitive advantage. However national wealth creation as a policy may not be succeeding if judged by the number of jobs required and is often referred to as the jobless recovery (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997).

The issues relating to the third mission are highlighted by some authors who are concerned that the early origins of the research and teaching are now so lost that the university can only be defined as a 'patent office', and the rise of science parks and on-line courses make them the 'diploma mills'. Although these pull in different directions, they share the same concept as regards who can pay at the point of delivery (Fuller, 2009, p. 16). The changes in university funding in the UK since 2012 fail to acknowledge that the cost of delivery is the biggest expenditure and, whilst incomes get tighter, this leads to an excessive restructuring by both governments and institutions looking for alternative income streams as a way to boost income. Fuller proposes three assumptions that are in contrast to the work of Clark, Davies and Etzkowitz and provides an alternative view as to the 'fitness for purpose' of the old model of the entrepreneurial university:

- 1. The university is a trader who is both the producer and the consumer, and yet the two roles are distinguished in any financial transaction between the university and client/student.*
- 2. No trader will want a surplus of goods, let alone accumulate as many goods as possible. Normally unused goods either rot or become stolen. The accumulation of goods, i.e. knowledge, in a university setting is central to all university missions.*

3. *The cyclical structure of each trader's needs ideally correspond to the village markets. Only current desires are met, if they are not needed they do not take place. In contrast the idea of termination is so foreign to academic inquiry that attempts to arrest or even channel its conduct have tended to be treated as repressive* (Fuller, 2009, p. 19).

In summary, Fuller argues that knowledge is both produced and consumed and both have different financial consequences depending on whom is doing the producing and consuming. However, the continual production of knowledge that is central to so many university missions might not be sustainable in the end, but the idea that a university may consider reducing or terminating knowledge production is unthinkable. However, if the university is to become a new type of entrepreneurial university, it has to consider the current context of knowledge production and where and how it is produced and for what purpose, and its relationships with people such as individual entrepreneurs who enter the academy, bearing in mind that the university is no longer the sole producer. Whilst Fuller makes convincing arguments for an economic model of knowledge production it cannot be wholly seen as the same as the economic model for physical goods.

The role universities play in the production of knowledge is further compounded by the growth of the risk society (Beck, 2007). New knowledge such as human genetics and nano-technologies are being created at such a speed that their development is overwhelming public imagination, largely fuelled by the popular press (Beck, 1992). Risk becomes the 'mediating issue' in terms of the division of labour between science, politics and economics and in advanced countries must ultimately be re-negotiated, and, as such, we live in a world of manufactured insecurity. This contrasts to the interdisciplinary need to solve research problems together and to control of the final outcomes if they are considered to be too risky. Beck refers to '*knowledge and non-knowing, truth and falsehood, good and evil*'. In a way the purpose of an old university was to find and question the truth. However, the single undivided truth has fractured into hundreds of relative truths resulting in a greater understanding, closeness, and dismay over risk (Beck, 2007).

In concluding that the 'old' version of the entrepreneurial university is no longer fit for purpose, it is possible to point to several key factors from the literature. The perceived lack of success in regional universities in gaining the same form of entrepreneurial status (Benneworth, 2005) is under scrutiny as questions surrounding the type of industry focus and who to exchange knowledge with, deepens the need for greater discipline diversity.

As more universities developed third stream missions as a useful method of generating income and tried to serve different needs in the locality or nationally, they have also become more competitive. Seemingly rather than this being the panacea for a successful university (Clark, 2003), the concept for third stream income has become a very crowded and competitive place to be, and therefore in need of greater diversification is needed (Kennie, 2012). Thus the emphasis for the ownership of the entrepreneurial paradigm across the whole institution (Gibb, 2006) began to gain momentum, and the rise of devolution and the localised agenda gave rise to 'anchor institutions' in meeting this need.

The focus on universities to adopt the status of an entrepreneurial university, and in particular to focus on third stream activities (Witty, 2013) has been to provide an anchor role through their activities in research and services for businesses and the local economy (Smallbone et al, 2015). The term 'anchor institution' was adopted to provide a geographic region to have a more sustainable and positive impact in a localised setting from large organisations rooted in their locality (Cantor et al, 2013). Anchor institutions as a concept was developed in the 1960's but has come to prominence more recently following the economic downturn and the particular impact it had on local economic provision. Anchor institutions tend to be large (hospitals, colleges etc.) and not-for-profit organisations. Another key feature is that they have strong ties to a geographic area and therefore are unlikely to move (Mosari, 2015).

Where universities take on this role they tend to include a provision for the delivery of management and leadership development support to SMEs in the area and attempt to break down the barriers perceived between the university and the local community (Cantor, 2013; Smallbone, 2015). Similarly, to this project the author was interested in the perception of a one-way flow of intellectual capital and the idea that the anchor institution would create a 'community of experts' (Cantor et al, 2013). This idea is picked up later with regard to the agora concept and the notions of collective entrepreneurship as described in the findings chapter. However, anchor institutions tend to be more concerned with and rooted in place (Birch et al, 2013) whereas this study intends to look at the connections that are made through people.

The new knowledge producers, the risk society and the role of the modern university all combine to question the role of the 'old' model of the entrepreneurial university. The 'old' model can be seen as outdated and no longer fit for purpose, one that was purely technology or science driven that had an advantage to spin out, with little reference to

other growth economic areas and relevant subject disciplines. 'Mode 3' is a concept suggested by the author, and others (Carayannis and Campbell, 2012; 2014) that could be developed further as a modern twist to the two core modes of research and could support the challenges set down by Fuller and Beck, to not only question the myth of the old, but purport to the shock of the new. This would include considering the external individual entrepreneur as well as considering aspects of public cluster or networks and third sector organisations (Carayannis and Campbell, 2012, 2014; Watson 2011, 2014, Witty, 2013).The changes and themes of the future are discussed in the next section about the changing policy context which leads to a different environment and operating era than the one in which Clark and others were working. It is important to consider the literature at the time of writing to see if the new environment aids and develops support for the next generation of entrepreneurial university and the role that externals might play in the next iteration of the concept.

2.8 The changing environment and policy context

This section aims to introduce the recent (at the time of writing, acknowledging more recent changes have not been included) contextual environment that builds on the need for a new concept for the entrepreneurial university. Although this study is focused on the UK, there is a need to analyse the global competition in light of the changing environment that affects all universities because of competition for student mobility, technology and global changes to higher education. We have seen how important innovation is to the definition of the entrepreneurial university. The realisation of knowledge production in the university context is global and multifaceted. This seems at times to conflict with the growth of accountability and management structures to provide an easy demonstration of university success through proxies such as metrics, which are seen to be at odds with the risk approach needed for universities to be truly entrepreneurial. Since 2009, there have been policy changes that attempt to encourage changes in higher education and also competitive advantage through enterprise and entrepreneurship, which are probably the most compelling reasons for a new type of entrepreneurial university. The new environment is tied together by different approaches and rationales for using innovation as a key lynch pin.

2.8.1 Globalisation

The challenge of disrupting the status quo of the university is set within a global context as more aggressive competition becomes a feature of all higher education. The role and

purpose of the university becomes extended and falls into areas such as the advancement of knowledge and research, and its role within the corporate sector and society as a whole (Neave, 1991; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Naidoo, 2003). Seemingly, the world is becoming smaller and faster and with technology, new opportunities for access to higher education become easier for those with advanced technological infrastructure but this development is further alienating for those without any internet infrastructure (Castells, 1996). For education, this puts greater pressure on the need to compete in a worldwide market and for the entrepreneurial university to use the global market place as a trading ground for recruitment and knowledge advancement as part of the additional income streams. These things alone became shorthand for being an entrepreneurial university, as it exploited the academic capital and financial incentives, doing so, without considering the tensions this brought to the long-standing notions of academic pursuit and purpose.

In 2006 US Education secretary Margaret Spellings commissioned a report that stated:

Higher education has become, in what the business world would be called a mature enterprise, increasingly risk adverse, at times self-satisfied, and unduly expensive. History is littered with examples of industries that at their peril failed to respond or even notices changes in the world around them, from railroads to steel manufacturers. Without serious self-examination and reform, institutions of higher education risk falling into the same trap, seeing their market share substantially reduced and their services increasingly characterised by obsolescence (Christensen C.M, 2011, pp 3-4).

This foreboding statement further emphasises themes already picked up around the monolithic nature of higher education and worrying concerns on risk aversion. Seen in a global, local and national context, higher education does not escape this scrutiny. In part, this is dictated by external steering and a reduction in external state funding. Actors in HEIs find themselves increasingly at odds with trying to navigate the constantly shifting policy context. A major concern amongst governments in the western world is the need to shift to vocational forms of higher education and a focus on employability to ensure a good supply of well qualified graduates. This has also meant a 'de-emphasising' of other roles particularly the development of the individual mind and understanding for its own sake rather than utilitarian ends (Becher, 2001, p. 7). As a result, student learning beyond the curriculum becomes increasingly 'off stage' as students become consumers over protected whilst in education and are not being taught to be free thinkers (Christensen,

2011). Whilst academic staff find themselves 'overextended, under focused, overstressed and underfunded' (Becher, 2001) and, therefore, academics and universities tend not be entrepreneurial and any form of disruptive innovation becomes outside of the scope of the university.

Universities have always been campus based, teaching and research focused and therefore fallen into a trap of questioning how enterprising they can be. Technology has changed some of this with the growth of on-line courses that have been disruptive to the traditional campus student environment, enabling a diverse set of student needs to be met. However, unlike other types of disruptive innovation and entrepreneurship, we only see additional entry into the market and not exiting in the way that other traditional companies are pushed out (Christensen, 2011). If the model of on-line courses and technology is the extent of global innovation in universities then it is possible that universities will comprise just a small core of faculty and a much larger periphery of 'experts' of various kinds such as Clark promoted. Moreover, universities will become a new kind of holding institution in the field of knowledge production.

2.8.2 Innovation

As senator Spellings pointed out (Christensen, 2011) the sense of innovation in established businesses is rare and universities are falling into the group of mature businesses unable to innovate. New ideas that are found in universities (such as the intrapreneurial notion) tend to either be modified to fit existing structures (as in the expanded operating core) or dismissed completely through lack of possible integration into existing bureaucratic systems, while innovation itself is seen as an extra to the roles of teaching and research (Etzkowitz, 2008; Christensen, 2011). Senator Birch Bayh was quick to acknowledge this, in that numerous innovative breakthroughs were going to waste because of red tape and were acting as knowledge filters rather than supporting innovation. This resulted in the Bayh-Dole act of 1980 designed to penetrate knowledge filters by providing financial incentives to American universities to commercialise (Audretsch, 2007).

Whereas in the commercial world innovation is key to continued success and has been used as a way of exploiting the development of the knowledge production base, through research and development programmes or corporate entrepreneurship which has meant that firms have become active participants in new knowledge and enabled a changed relationship with universities (Gibbons, 1998). Whilst there is an acknowledgement that

innovation is more likely to happen in a turbulent environment (Bason, 2010), this does not seem to be happening quickly enough in response to the massive changes within universities, despite their readiness to take up the challenges. The lack of employee driven innovation, or intrapreneurship within the university sector, is further highlighted as being an issue for a new model of the entrepreneurial university, particularly in the range and breadth of disciplines that are now engaging in entrepreneurial activity.

Innovation is considered to be nearly always driven by someone, not an institution or organisation and there is always a champion who takes leadership of a product/idea. Consequently, if innovation is so closely connected with entrepreneurship then it cannot be solely linked to just one discipline in a university; it has to be seen as an attitude or a way of thinking for the whole organisation, just as the early authors on entrepreneurship identified. This reinforces the need for a university to have entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial cultures built into the organisation so that individuals within can increase innovation. Another role the university can take is to translate the innovation into reality, either alone or with partners:

'..the most important point about innovation and academia is that maximum impact occurs in response to a problem. Problem based innovation in research universities can focus resources from a variety of disciplines on the challenges we face and, in doing so, create new knowledge and economic growth (Thorp, 2010,p.3).

The stages of public sector innovation roughly follow the same trajectory as that within the university sector, as the two are closely linked through state financial support. From the 1970s onwards, management fads such as new public management and networked governance (Birnbaum, 2000) attempted to show value and accountability for public funds, which meant that institutions could not be described as finely tuned innovation machines as in the private sector (examples such as Google and Apple), but as more accountable and bureaucratised. The professionalization and identity of administrators (Whitchurch and Gordon, 2012) in universities meant that the imposition of hierarchy and bureaucracy became even greater. With the rise of the entrepreneurial university, as the need to establish a greater steering core and a developed periphery gave rise to a completely new range of administrative structures and services to be adhered to by academics, despite the announcements and rhetoric about innovation and enterprise within these sectors (Bason, 2010).

To Bason, the administrative elements become a barrier to a successful innovation culture within higher education. At its worse, risk taking as a desired attribute was actively discouraged in favour of following agreed rules and regulations. When it comes to development initiatives, public sector organisations seem to spend 80% of their time on understanding the past and managing the present and only 20% of their time on systematically exploring future directions (Bason, 2010, pp. 16-19). Exploring the future was a key skill identified by Drucker for any chief executive to be successful and Bason develops these thoughts further with his 4 'Cs' suitable for developing a public-sector innovation eco-system that might be more appropriate in today's university sector than the characteristics outlined by Clark or Davies.

Bason's four Cs are Consciousness (or for this read 'awareness'), Capacity (or read 'structure'), Co-creation (or read joint 'processes') and Courage (or read 'leadership'). If these are taken in an entrepreneurial university context, they would link to the idea of being very aware of consumer (student) attributes of the organisation (university) of the needs and desires of the consumer base, in this case students and stakeholders. This implies that having a greater understanding of people and an awareness of them as a group, but supported by traditional bureaucratic systems, such as statistical analysis, is important for innovation. The structure of the organisation needs to enable innovation, intrapreneurship and appropriate risk based on the observation of the identified need. Co-creation is about joint or collaborative development of the processes and outcomes needed for change to make a difference, and courage is about a new type of leadership, one who is not risk adverse and is more in tune with entrepreneurial characteristics. The four 'Cs start to identify a new way of thinking which in itself is beginning to question the old model of the entrepreneurial university, as it gives much more awareness to the consumer and traits of observation to design structures, and in particular seeks a different type of leadership rather than the 'steering core' as developed by Clark.

2.8.3 Leadership

If new leadership paradigms are being developed, then this could give rise to a new type of entrepreneurial university where a new style leader promotes and uses a complex set of relationships and makes connections for different purposes. These associations mean that more people are having a say in innovation as science and technology invade the lives of those outside of the academy with less expert authority being used to comment through the media, politicians and lawyers, who are winning the right for a say in the decisions of new knowledge and innovation (Beck, 1992; 2007). This is further putting

the role of the university at risk and emphasising a greater need for understanding 'non-academic' 'mode 3' type knowledge (Carayannis and Campbell, 2012, 2014) and a form of leadership in support of innovation practices, rather than the perception of innovation being filtered through bureaucracy. Current thinking advocates that a relationship between shared leadership and collective leadership has a positive association with innovation (Hoch, 2013).

Innovative leadership behaviour is, seemingly, increasingly important for universities and other organisations to survive. The recent literature is concerned with a form of transformational leadership as opposed to transactional leadership and is argued to be more effective in developing innovative behaviour in the workforce. A connection to the mission and psychological empowerment of staff is seen to be important in this regard (Pieterse et al, 2010). The concept of the entrepreneurial university, to empower those within it to take more intrapreneurial action, is discussed by Valsania, Moriano and Molero (2014; 2016) as needing 'authentic leadership'. Authentic leadership can be defined as a leader's behaviour that achieves performance beyond expectations, which is sustainable and maintained over time. Valsania et al describe components of authentic leadership as; self-awareness, balanced processing, internalised moral perspective and relational transparency (Valsania, Moriano, and Molero, 2014).

Potentially the leadership of innovation in universities becomes easier for those who actually like making money, who enjoy the cut and thrust that often goes with it, and are naturally competitive. For these types of institutional leaders, personal benchmarks are more than mechanisms of measurement and accountability and more about 'keeping score', which means constantly looking to see what others are doing and trying to surpass them. They take an entrepreneurial approach to problem solving and are results orientated but believe in measuring impact and holding individuals to account (Thorp, 2010). Perhaps a new key skill for leaders of an entrepreneurial university of the future will be the ability for decision making in uncertain times, taking risks and looking for funding opportunities beyond the state. The benefit of authentic leadership is that it enables a type of leadership that supports innovation and intrapreneurial behaviour in an organisation. The type of processes and environments that foster the sharing of knowledge amongst members (Valsania, Moriano, and Molero, 2016) could be useful in allowing innovation to happen amongst academic groups.

The type of leader described by Drucker showed someone looking for new opportunities and who recognised market shifts. Clark recognised the need for effective steering for

the university to become entrepreneurial. However, in more recent times, the policy context and changing environment mean the skills and attributes that relate to those of the entrepreneur become even more acute. Rewards and recognitions would need to change if the culture of the institution is to gain momentum for being enterprising. Unlike Clark who positioned a 'hero' leader for academic enterprise leadership often outside of the main discipline units, the new leader would favour the skills of a more creative, collaborative and relationship builder in the form of 'servant' leadership to adopt a greater culture and philosophy of entrepreneurship across the university (Blanchard, 2008; Powell, 2012).

Blanchard refers to different types of leaderships models that have mutual respect and enable innovative behaviours in staff. With reference to the changing culture of a university, he saw leadership as a process of influence (Blanchard and Hodges, 2008). In this respect cultures become more important than structures (Thorp, 2010), and enables creativity, innovation and excellence to prevail. The strict rules and regulations built up over years for managing a university are called into question as hierarchical structures and rigid attention to the rules are considered a barrier to innovation and do not foster the right intrapreneurial or entrepreneurial culture. The new kind of university leader will empower people and give them the space to innovate but how this is done in the context of control is difficult and again highlights the need for a new type of entrepreneurial university. Some attempts at providing a high performance culture and accountability measures have been introduced in universities through the use of key performance indicators and balanced scorecards (Norton, 2001; Kaplan, 2006; Hunt, 2009). This performance culture tries to create a form of opportunity (Blanchard and Hodges, 2008; Thorp, 2010) that is then appropriate to innovation and entrepreneurship. Although, other leadership theories encourage a different approach, such as servant leadership which Blanchard described as:

Servant leadership is all about making your goals clear and then rolling your sleeves up and doing whatever it takes to help win. In that situation, they don't work for you, you work for them (Blanchard and Hodges, 2008).

However, the same sorts of barriers exist in universities as in private companies, regardless of the strategic tools used. As we have noted, universities are not the most entrepreneurial of institutions themselves (Davies, 2001) and do not tend to use the theories often developed within the institution for their own use. Nevertheless, a greater encouragement of self-efficacy for academics based on Ajzen's theories (Ajzen,

1991; Kirby, 2006) shows that those individuals will activate their entrepreneurial potential if they believe they have the ability and the right environment to achieve such an objective.

2.9 Translational disciplines

In attempting to encourage the innovation capabilities of a university, with the necessary accountability requirements, the answer could be in a greater acknowledgement of the use of the 'translational disciplines' (Thorp, 2010). Translational disciplines are professions such as engineers and designers, and those whose skills are often also associated with enterprise have a natural fit with innovation, but do not necessarily fit the 'widget' model of the entrepreneurial university (Crossick, 2006). Innovation strategies have shown that there is rarely one solution to the grand challenges in society and by definition, this means that the silo discipline culture is unlikely to result in the type of interdisciplinary problem solving that is needed. This dilemma requires a knowledge broker to find new approaches to the status quo (Thorp, 2010). Likewise, a purely technocentric view of innovation, as the only form of new ideas and knowledge, is less sustainable than it was thirty years ago when it was the cornerstone of the entrepreneurial university. New ideas that tackle the big issues of health, poverty, education need an integrated approach into all aspects of business and society (Brown, 2009).

2.10 UK policy context

This section considers the need for a new type of entrepreneurial university within the policy framework introduced since a coalition government came to power in 2010. The period between 2010 and 2012 will be used to document the extent of new policy mechanisms and rhetoric likely to encourage a new type of entrepreneurial university, even though this might not have been a conscious policy decision. The policy context is geared to reducing the national economic deficit, and to growing out of recession through new jobs, new businesses, entrepreneurial developments for innovation and employment, and the contributions that a university can make.

Three key policy documents are referred to: the new higher education white paper, '*Putting Students at the Heart of the System*' (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011). *Innovation and Research Strategy for Growth* (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011), and *A Review of Business-University Collaboration*

(Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2012). *Students at the Heart of the System* (2011) is the Higher Education White Paper for England (it does not extend to the four nations of the UK) and although this is potentially problematic, the theme of this thesis concentrates mainly on the UK, the focus is on an art and design faculty within an English University.

The White Paper has been at the centre of the controversial reforms for higher education, with the aim of providing a sustainable and fair funding base for higher education. However, it forms a carefully worded document that looks to bring into sharp focus the issues surrounding the developing changes in global higher education, and those issues already mentioned such as an increase in student choice and marketisation, better prepared students for employment and a diverse and responsive sector. It also includes recommendations for improved social mobility and fit for purpose regulatory frameworks. The author notes that more recent changes to a proposed Higher Education Bill (2016) demonstrate many of these ideas being translated into law.

The White Paper recommends a review of business–university collaborations, known as the Wilson Report, to promote better teaching, research and innovation and enterprise, so as to make the UK the best place in the world for university-industry collaboration (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011). However, within this is also the caveat of expecting value for money and different business models with a change in university funding. There is also a continued expectation that universities will deliver high level research, and utilise the ‘national asset’ to warn off growing international competition. This White Paper reflects many of the current concerns surrounding higher education implementation and steering. It does give some recognition to the need for universities to develop a different stance towards industry collaboration, by commissioning the Wilson Report to explore the role of knowledge creation, business, investment and skills education and training, and public sector innovation.

The report supports the theoretical texts of Etzkowitz (2008), and Bason (2010) and further highlights the changed role of universities as noted by Barnett, (2000) and Shattock, (2003; 2009) and the need to prepare students for employment. Employment, enterprise, and entrepreneurship all fall in to the same confused categories as outlined above. The White Paper proposes a quality assurance review to ensure these things are not only built into the teaching base, but also that sets out the skills and knowledge, and attitudes students should be able to acquire through enterprise education. This alone could warrant a new type of entrepreneurial university as it becomes a subtle but

powerful message for university steering and purpose set against the scene of global competition:

Around the world, the very best universities are building deeper links with business, both to maximise innovation and promote growth, and to ensure students come out of universities equipped to excel in the workforce (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011).

The *Innovation and Research Strategy for Growth* (2011) document aims to reinforce the messages in the *Students at the Heart of the System* paper but also demonstrates a continued divide between teaching and research, with an attempt to define the third mission through referencing an approach to collaboration with industry. It gives a very clear commitment to maintain the UK's science and research base and to encourage commercialisation of innovation and research so that it remains competitive on the world stage. It also commits to continuing investments such as in SME engagement, and supportive schemes such as innovation vouchers, based on the understanding that Government intervention can be an important driver of innovation (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011). Whilst these interventions might not be disputed, they contrast with the ideas described by Bason (2010) who, whilst working with Mindlab (a cross government innovation unit in Denmark), attempts to change the top down mind-set of governments. From one where thinking is a sort of overlaid support and hoping that it will work, to one of a consumer up viewpoint where ideas are tested using a more ethnographic methodology.

The *Innovation and growth strategy* refers to the removal of red tape, and comments on the effectiveness of other countries in developing more agile innovation strategies, but once again, innovation is put at the heart of the growth agenda, as an essential component of economic competitiveness and higher living standards. This suggests a problem between the state wishing to control higher education funding and accountability on the one hand and allowing a largely unregulated market for innovation on the other hand. It refers to the importance of private sector innovation as central to developments and the role the government can have with entrepreneurs, finance, innovators and universities. A key area for intervention is in proof of concept of new products and commercialisation. This is an area that fits either into the role that the new entrepreneurial university can play or the 'mode 3' knowledge that might be seen as 'non-academic'.

The investment from government will come in the form of grants, loans, and direct funding to a broad range of innovation areas, such as branding, training and design as well as business processes. This is a breakthrough in government policy and supports the need for a wider discipline scope to be acceptable within an entrepreneurial university framework, and also acknowledges that the most successful and innovative countries share common characteristics in that they generate long term and risky investments for new ideas from both the public and private domains. Whilst this is promising to read, it seems to be compromised by some of the attempts at 'centralised de-centralisation' (Shattock, 2003). The higher education White Paper introduces a 'fit for purpose regulatory framework' and not a 'dynamic entrepreneurial culture that tolerates failure', such as that found in the US innovation eco system and Silicon Valley (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011).

The *Innovation and growth strategy* reinforces the need to find solutions to global societal problems through interdisciplinary collaboration that involves both blue skies and applied research. The creative industries together comprise an economic sector that is one of the fastest growing sectors in the UK, and an area that has a 'distinctive international reputation'. This again highlights the need for a greater disciplinary scope for the new entrepreneurial university, and, as the document states, the creative subjects bring together the key elements of the strategy. Particularly good is the recognition of the nature of interdisciplinary innovation between subjects and the crucial importance of design as a translational subject. Design plays a particular role in the transformation of companies and for leading on the innovation process itself, the commercialisation of science and the delivery of public services (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2012).

The recognition of the creative industries, and a wider discipline/interdisciplinary scope is an acknowledgement of the importance that design plays in innovation and competitive advantage strategies that gives credibility to the need to involve these subjects in the heart of any new entrepreneurial university concept. The strategy rightly points out that:

there are parts of the economy where design awareness remains low, including amongst SMEs, scientists seeking to commercialise ideas and the public sector. This lack of awareness and use of design is compounded by the fact that the UK design sector, whilst boasting a worldwide reputation for creativity and innovation, is complex to navigate (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011).

In attempting to avoid an unfortunate set of unintentional consequences between various government policies, the BIS document is at pains to introduce incentives for foreign entrepreneurs to enter the country on an Entrepreneurs Visa in recognition of the contribution they can make to growth. The promise being that if successful (judged by a turnover of £5m or creation of 10 jobs) they can apply for accelerated indefinite leave to remain (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2011) . This confirms Simon's stance that knowledge lies in an individual's brain, you either have it or you 'buy it in' (Simon, 1996) to gain some form of competitive advantage.

Design Thinking is discussed later in this section, but is mentioned briefly here as it is important to innovation and the growth strategy, as a way of acknowledging the importance of user centred and consumer centred approaches. It also brings together different perspectives that support interdisciplinary research and innovation in the public sector. This theme is continued in a document that attempts to bridge both the *Research and Innovation for Growth* strategy and the *Students at the Heart of the System* White Paper. The *Review of Business – University Collaborations (2012)* also known as the *Wilson Review*, demonstrates the problem of very diverse higher education landscapes with many different types of engagements in industry and business. The Wilson review summarises activity that was also identified by Clark and Davies as belonging to the entrepreneurial university:

.... the highly diverse domains of activity ... for example, the education of highly skilled graduates, applied research in advanced technologies, bespoke collaborative degree programmes, 'science park' developments, enterprise education, support for entrepreneurs, industry-sector foundation degrees, higher-level apprenticeships, collaborative research, in-company upskilling of employees. Many domains have a second dimension defined by business sector, for example, the creative industries, agriculture, communications, bio-pharma, engineering (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2012).

The Wilson review builds on the endorsements of the Lambert Review (2003) to encourage greater business-university collaborations. Much of the 'crowded space of the business facing university' (Kennie, 2012) is as a result of government led funding initiatives such as Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) to change the culture of collaborations. Wilson develops this theme stating that if the recommendations of the UK business university collaboration are fulfilled, it will show that universities are at the heart of the economy, as they generate wealth and prosperity. Innovation is again encouraged

in the Wilson review by 'boundary scanning' to facilitate collaborative and interdisciplinary work on the challenge areas.

All the policies endorse the need for innovation, but the barriers to success largely fall into the same categories of issues that affect higher education, mainly concerning the perceived benefits of marketisation. As in the White Paper, the issue around 'quality' is hard to measure, despite the introduction of information, and the long standing branding issue relating to prestige. Other barriers include accreditation and the closed market, which is again addressed in the White Paper, to allow new comers into the market, but, as mentioned before, there is rarely any note about the exiting organisations that fail because of this. The only real disruption is the prevalence of on-line learning (Christensen, 2011). These contradictory factors make it difficult to become entrepreneurial as in Clark's concept.

2.11 Conclusion

In conclusion, there appears to be a lack of intrapreneurship in the academy, despite opportunities to develop this and possibly, because it is seen as being too commercially biased. This leads into the research questions as to whether external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activities of the university and if they could help inform adaptations to the concept. Innovation is an important factor as a trait of entrepreneurship. It is important that the grand research challenges that affect all countries are considered in a broader discipline base. The translational disciplines and interdisciplinary research are seen as important factors in this respect. For a new concept, or further dimensions of an entrepreneurial university to succeed, they have to adopt some of the characteristics of entrepreneurship and be comfortable with risk and uncertainty; traits that most leaders would want to avoid to ensure smooth steerage. It is possible to think of a new type of organisation with leadership changes that support the academy, as well as ensuring performance indicators are met. The policy documentation largely follows the issues raised in the recent literature and there is a nod towards the value of creativity and design subjects in helping to achieve more than the sum of the parts of a university. The challenges presented in the literature reveal gaps that suggest more insights into the role that externals play, and is also important to investigate further the role that universities can adopt.

CHAPTER 3 - ART AND DESIGN HIGHER EDUCATION, AND THE CREATIVE ECONOMY.

3.1 Introduction

One of the key discussions in the earlier section of the literature review is that design, as a translational subject in higher education, may play a significant part in a new model of an entrepreneurial university. It is important to understand this in the context of one subject discipline, which can be seen as the academic heartland. The research focuses on the role that external entrepreneurs play within a Faculty of Art and Design and whether that role has implications for the concept of the entrepreneurial university. Therefore, it is important in this chapter to consider Art and Design higher education. The previous chapter discussed the entrepreneurial mind-set within a university and a new context for external engagement. It looked at how those with entrepreneurial experience and characteristics are beginning to become fully engaged within a university, as a method of bridging a previously unsuccessful gap in third mission activity.

A university is no longer the sole producer of knowledge, so the link to new knowledge produced outside of the academy, by 'non academics', becomes an attractive collaboration and important partnership. This was identified by the author as something that might be known in this study as 'mode 3' knowledge, or knowledge in application and context developed by non- academics. Universities of the future might contain a small nucleus of teaching staff and a much larger periphery of experts of various kinds who are linked to universities in diverse ways. As Gibbons states, the university may become a holding institution in the field of knowledge production (Gibbons, 1998).

It would be interesting to know if there is any data surrounding the economic and financial gain claimed through third mission activity that is borne out in economic returns of university data. However, this is beyond the scope of this research. One of the key factors of third mission activity was business spin outs, in particular in the STEM subjects. This was never going to be the case for arts and humanities subjects, which found it difficult to capitalise on the 'widget' model (Crossick, 2006). A suggested fourth mission of 'non-economic value' is similar to the problem that the creative industries have faced in the lack of understanding of the value and status of the sector and how it is difficult to pinpoint its exact contribution beyond a financial viewpoint.

These thoughts are similar to the problems associated with the creative industries, design education, creative entrepreneurship and design thinking in general. The understanding of design and tacit knowledge in relation to experiential knowledge in connection with the entrepreneurial university context is interesting to explore. If the concept of the entrepreneurial university model is no longer fit for purpose, and with variable forms of success then the almost universal acceptance of third mission strategies becomes problematic. The reliance on tacit knowledge shared by external entrepreneurs and the experiential learning experience of students and researchers in translational subjects such as design becomes a potent argument for inclusion in understanding a new model. To understand this argument there is a need to understand how art and design education, design and innovation, the creative industries and the creative economy would drive a new entrepreneurial university model from within the academy position.

3.2 Art and design higher education

In 1837 the Select Committee on Arts and Manufacture debated art and design education soon after the National Schools of Design were formed, largely because of perceived economic necessity to provide competitive advantage against global industrial competition (Bell, 1963). The history of the development of the national art schools and their economic imperatives has been largely uncontested until recently. When Romans reviewed the development of the Design Schools he reflected on the establishment of a morality around consumption and in particular taste, and what constituted good or bad taste, and for whom the new schools were intended for (Romans, 2005). Romans suggests that they were designed for the middle classes by the middle classes and were part of the Victorian discourse on social class. This point is important in that the rise of the design education system from this point sits uncomfortably with that of the history of the university from the same period. This gives a context either for or against art and design as a subject in university provision when it comes to the entrepreneurial university of the 21st Century.

The rise of the 'artisan' during the Victorian period suggested that those in these occupations had some characteristics that seemed to detach them from other social classes (Romans, 2005). This is not dissimilar to the notion of the creative class today (Florida, 2005). Similarly, it gave rise to the potential of social mobility through working class attendees at the design schools, including women, but they were more likely to be

of the middle class, and similar to the number of first generation students entering university through creative subjects during the last decade.

The Design Schools became one of the oldest publicly funded types of education and fit with the notion of sponsored public arts that grew out of the modern philosophy of civic humanism (Hartley, 2005). The notions of class were distinct in the UK from about the 1700s where those in the privileged classes might collect and appreciate the fine arts but would not contribute to their manufacture as a servile occupation unless this was dedicated to public good rather than private means (Hartley, 2005). A similar distinction is still prevalent today between a perceived academic and intellectual quality in the arts versus a vocational quality. However, this is less overt in the distinction of an art and design education in a university as following an intellectual pursuit, whereas in a further education college it is more vocational, or artisan. This straightforward perception of class, value and purpose of art and design has perhaps lingered, throughout the modern history of the subject.

The words design, designing and designers, often correspond to the rise in mechanisation and mass production and become fully embedded as words in the 19th century at the same time as the start of the national design schools. Such was the importance of the schools and the rise of the 'profession' that most towns and cities would boast an art or design school. Before the 19th century, the word design can be traced back to the 16th century and used to describe the production of artefacts, and the growth in the role of drawing, for representational reasons (Corte-Real, 2010). During the 19th century the word 'design' also began to be used in literature and gave rise to its use of meaning as intention, purpose, enterprise or pre-empting an event (Corte-Real, 2010).

This literature definition became more important as the history of design moves into the 20th century Ideas around design emerged to define it as a premeditated action to avoid risk and to make improvements, for example named design functions such as service design, transport design, and design for health, became prevalent. In trying to understand the value and status of design in higher education through heritage and history, it immediately becomes problematic, and not unlike the etymology of entrepreneurship and its current usage. If design education and entrepreneurship relied on the consumption of goods to some extent, then the two forming a unique relationship for an entrepreneurial university model would make sense, regardless of other issues relating to innovation, environmental concerns and sustainability.

One of the issues within recent design education has been the perceived lack of 'academic-ness' in design research. Therefore, its place in the academy has always been problematic in relation to ways in which it fits in with the role and purpose of a university. The early definitions as described by Corte-Real show that design 'as a word' comes from an etymology that describes a significant intellectual process behind the development of different types of knowledge, and not, as previously normally referred to, as a non-reflexive and poorly intellectualised arts and crafts tradition (Corte-Real, 2010). The understanding of the joint skills of academic pursuit mixed with the practical manifestation of ideas forms the basis of design education and is therefore suitable to the intersection of research and practice in the form of innovation and entrepreneurship relevant to today's society.

By the 1970s, most of the design schools had either closed or merged into larger higher education institutions or polytechnics. Depending on the mission of the institution, design research was a limited exercise and has only become more ambitious as the polytechnics became universities when the binary divide was abolished in 1992. The reinvention of the modern university in the 19th century had not included design education. Therefore, design did not become part of a university model that included research and teaching, but it always included and developed a relationship with industry. Research degrees were also a late comer in design education, where the emphasis on practice ruled to the extent that undergraduate degree status has only been offered since the 1960s and was, until recently, seen as the route to practice rather than to academic post-graduate study as with other disciplines (Bird, 2000). This is further emphasised in the case of doctoral study in design, as this is a very recent development in design education.

However, more recent interest in developing career patterns and the future employment landscape means that the role of design pedagogy is being adopted by other disciplines, as transferable skills, managing self-employment, portfolio careers and project based work are becoming the norm, and learning becomes 'just in time', outcome orientated, continuing, self-motivated and self-monitored' (Hartley, 2005). Universities are looking to embed different attributes that are learnt beyond the traditional classroom into their teaching. For design education, disruption (Christensen, 2011) in practice is already evident. Alternatives such as on-line courses, vocational evening classes, self-taught guides, and courses in further education have been part of the landscape of higher education in art and design for some time; it does not appear to be the same for other

disciplines that are also vocationally certificated, such as medicine and architecture, for example. The designers and entrepreneurs of tomorrow may not have a university education, but may well be part of the knowledge generation that acts as a support to the academic system.

The pedagogies of design rely heavily on the philosophy of creative endeavour through tacit (Polanyi, 1962) and factual knowledge. Tacit knowledge is not easily transmitted and it is only through practice and as captured within a network or a community of practice that it is enhanced. The 'learning by doing' model introduced by the Bauhaus schools is typical of this approach and has been a longstanding method since then. The 'Design Process' introduced by art educators such as Hamilton, Pasmore and Hudson (Yeomans, 1988) since the 1960s developed the processes of design education that remains largely in place in the UK today. In the same way as apprenticeships learnt through the master in the ancient guilds by observation (see section on design thinking), imitation and practice still form the fundamentals of design education.

These attributes of design education are fast becoming new best practice in other subjects. Similarly, learning is becoming more distributed and challenges the traditional studio practice. Those developing creativity and innovation are finding that the learning environment can become anything from the family kitchen, as well as the classroom, cafe and workplace. It is in this context that the rise of the creative industries, stemming from design education, makes most sense, as an area of economic development. Creativity can have significant social and economic impact (Hartley, 2005). The impact based on tacit knowledge, factual knowledge and the link between know how and know who, as described in the original definition of entrepreneur as the 'go-between' is important to note.

The creative attributes that design education can bring, amongst others include the sense of *originality, and adventure on the importance of 'seeing things differently' pushing boundaries, making connections and working in ways which were wild crazy or unorthodox. It's about lateral thinking, distance from the origin, pushing all ideas, good and bad, with a belief in producing something of interest and desire* (Jackson, 2006, p.111). This sentiment fits wholly with the concept of an entrepreneur who takes risks, looks for opportunities and acts as a negotiator.

The features of creativity outlined by Jackson demonstrate a close link to entrepreneurial skills which can then be attributed to a range of professions and disciplines. These attributes include:

Being imaginative, generating new ideas, thinking out of the boxes we normally inhabit, looking beyond the obvious, seeing the world in different ways so that it can be explored and understood better;

Being original embodies the quality of newness, inventing and producing new things or adapting things that someone else has invented, doing things no one else has done before, the idea of significance, exploring, experimenting and taking risks;

Skills in critical thinking and critical synthesis – the ability to process and analyse data/situations/ideas/contexts and to see the world differently as a result;

Communication – often through story telling that helps people see the world you have created, or helps you see the worlds of others (Jackson, 2006).

These features of creativity and entrepreneurship are important when addressing the themes of innovation, creativity (in its widest sense) and business. Design is a highly entrepreneurial profession and it is also a maturing academic discipline (Julier, 2000). The twin issues of innovation in academia and the desire to create the maximum response to a problem, and create the new knowledge for economic growth (Thorp, 2010) demonstrate that universities that have design departments are well placed to face these problems and create the missing link to entrepreneurialism. If, as previously noted, universities will increasingly be ranked in terms of their connectivity (Gibbons, 1998) then their link to the networked entrepreneur and the designer's ability to foster these relationships becomes important. Thus, the enduring link of co-creation between students, industry and external non-academics, is a system that is clearly understood by designers, but not always design academics or other academics.

3.3 The creative industries and the creative economy

The concepts of the creative economy and the knowledge economy have been recognized as part of a new global economic make up (Seltzer & Bentley, 1999; Howkins, 2002; Florida, 2005; Hartley, 2005; Anheier, 2008). The knowledge society or 'the thin air economy' (Leadbeater, 2000) is criticised as having always been part of society's drive for organisation and advancement, as is the fact that you can acquire or possess knowledge and also intellectual property (Fuller, 2009). Intellectual property drives much

of design practice through the power to create new things and therefore to possess the intellectual property of the new knowledge economy and creative economy. If intellectual property is the regulatory arm of innovation, ideas and creativity, it has strong links with entrepreneurship and the feasibility of coming from a university, where people interested in ideas and knowledge, not infrastructures, have always resided.

The creative economy and the creative industries became worthy of public investment from a government perspective once it became clear that the demise of the service and manufacturing industries were no longer forming the cornerstone of the economy. Whilst politicians could see merits in areas of creativity and culture, such as the media and entertainment industry and at times through design for competitive advantage, these became far harder to count and audit than the traditional industries which had acceptable methods of calculation to enable investment from the public purse (Crossick, 2006). The creative and cultural industries are by their nature volatile and elusive, never remaining in one form for long. They are irritatingly quick at adapting to new scenarios but have a strong antipathy to scale, in a way often found in more technological industries. Keeping small and agile is seen as a better strategy than growth and organisation. Whilst being good at income generating was not good at providing growth and employment opportunities, these industries consequently became part of 'the jobless recovery' (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2009). If the rhetoric of public support for the creative industries was challenging, so too was how this filtrated into higher education and faculties of art and design.

The creative industries subjects became popular courses and provided a route for first generation students to go to university. These subjects were also difficult in providing the traditional notions of teaching and research in the academy. On the one hand, they provided a life line (frequently) for university admissions targets but, on the other, they provided a very industry and vocational experience without much research, led teaching supporting the undergraduate provision. However, the links to industry gave rise to a ready supply of graduates in business start-ups, funding enterprise programmes and many of the attributes needed for the original model of the entrepreneurial university. Based on Hartley, the chart below in Table 1 shows how the creative industries differed from the manufacturing industries and the rise of new concerns around value, status and economic benefits.

Manufacturing Industries	Creative Industries
Large scale enterprise	Often micro businesses, at best SME
Industrially organised	Organised around the project/production, not the factory or office
Led by entrepreneurs	Consumer led, and individual artists
Production key to added value	Creative industries tend to harvest value from the consumption end of the value chain
Work in a defined sector of the economy	Increasingly dispersed into other services/sectors. e.g. finance, health, education, government etc.

Table 1. Manufacturing Industries/Creative Industries (Hartley, 2005)

The creative industries are barely recognised as a coherent subject group because they were fragmented and varied in scale, purpose, organisation, and dispersed within different sectors of the economy. As a result, they do not provide an easy evidence base for governments to look for information and do not follow a traditional business organisation or a conventional image of industry (Hartley, 2005). Similarly, the creative economy was not a natural place to look for educational policy on entrepreneurship, and yet these industries clearly provided some early indication of future trends for employability, particularly around entrepreneurship, as this was often seen as the cause and agent of economic success.

The creative industries therefore arose out of the UK's cultural and creative heritage, its arts schools and the public good. These subjects were not a direct product of industry per se and there is some regional variation. The term creative industry picks up the idea of consumer and market driven economics, with a turn of phrase that implies an industrial or manufacturing heritage rather than of culture. Creative and cultural epistemologies gave the creative industries term a distinction of value and status, not unlike the artisans of earlier centuries. The creative industries demonstrated a very diverse spectrum

(Seltzer & Bentley, 1999; Howkins, 2002; Florida, 2005; Hartley, 2005) of activity from a teenager designing apps in their bedroom, on the one hand, to the large corporate of Time Warner/Disney on the other. Both of these examples are seen to be at the cutting edge of new ideas and creative technologies, but also contradictory to the 'arts subsidy' end of public provision for funded and subsidized creative activity.

Governments were keen to support those in cutting edge innovative industries in an attempt to reduce the problematic subsidy end whose activities were often controversial or questioned as to a worthy spend of public funds. The dilemma between high end creative enterprise but low growth of employment opportunities and large scale public funding of the creative industries was problematic when it translated into higher education, as there was no measurable way of telling which undergraduates would fall into which camp at the point of enrolment.

Whilst the creative industries sector could be described as elusive, volatile, and competitive with a large number of small scale, micro businesses where one tended to be reliant on another (Leadbeater, 2000; Florida, 2005) but in a disorganised way, they became difficult to penetrate as a cluster. However, the creative industries still became the mantra of many government policies because there was recognition that the creative industries could provide jobs and improve Gross Domestic Product. There was a sense in the 1990s that creativity could move from the spending departments of government (e.g. the arts and education) to the wealth generating ones of public investment, entrepreneurship and taxation (Hartley, 2005). A former Labour government in the UK established a new department specifically for Creative Media and Sport (DCMS), which set about defining the creative industries, and ensured its focused support to the economy. However supportive this may have been for the creative industries, DCMS did not provide the lifeline for creative subjects in higher education or entrepreneurship, as these areas tend to fall between the gaps of the Department for Education, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and DCMS. DCMS has provided one of the most often quoted and useful definitions of the creative industries as:

The creative industries are those industries that are based on individual creativity, skill and talent. They are also those that have the potential to create wealth, and jobs through developing intellectual property (DCMS, 2005).

Meanwhile BIS states that building a:

dynamic and competitive UK economy by creating the conditions for business success, promoting innovation, enterprise and science and giving everyone the skills and opportunities to succeed. To achieve this, we will foster world class universities and promote an open global economy (BIS: 2010).

The knowledge worker (Drucker, 1998) quickly morphed into the creative worker (Florida, 2005) who produced creative capital and a cache of ideas that would turn into valuable products and services. Creative employees pioneered new technology applications, created new products from other technologies and generally provided power to economic growth. Often quoted statistics demonstrate that the creative industries are a success story for Britain:

The creative industries together combine a gross added value (GVA) of 6.4% to the UK economy in 2006, and grew by an average of 4% per annum between 1997 and 2006 which compares to an average of 3% for the whole economy over this period. In 2007, total revenue across the creative industries amounted to some £67.5bn (TSB Creative Industries Strategy 2009-10).

The creative industries became embedded in the structures of many universities, with some faculties being renamed as the faculty of creative and cultural industries. The focus for institutions to diversify income streams became a natural place for the third mission engagement with the creative industries, and the knowledge economy, in an attempt to support the rhetoric about increasingly global concerns for universities to be part of the economic recovery (Hunt, 2010). Art and design higher education in the UK holds a unique position in global creative education and has arguably helped the UK capitalise on the rise of the creative industries as a major economic force (Crossick, 2006). This has potential for a new type of entrepreneurial university structure. There is a tendency for the art and design subject area to think of the discipline as being inherently entrepreneurial, and that it has been engaged with industry since its early educational inception (Clews, 2009). However, the reluctance to fully participate as an academic in the 'dirty commercialism' of the concept of entrepreneurialism is as true for academics in art and design as well as other subjects (Deem, 2001; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2009).

Design students, however, are encouraged to deal with speculative and divergent ideas and to negotiate uncertainties and ambiguities (Jackson, 2006). Design students rely on their knowledge base as a way of moving across boundaries, making connections and enabling entrepreneurial thinking. Living with uncertainty, and being able to cope with

ambiguity are identifiable new traits for the modern employability landscape, alongside entrepreneurial thinking, as discussed in the previous section. Many of the current trends in skills agendas are at odds with the concept of learning as an unpredictable process similar to that of the creative process in art and design. The idea of categorising knowledge into disciplines is being challenged and regarded as potentially outmoded for this century (Hunt, 2010). Increased interdisciplinary skills and collaboration between disciplines are being called for, with design becoming the potential ‘boundary spanner’ (NESTA, 2014).

The creative industries gave the art and design sector a status that it had not previously had, but it has probably ‘missed the boat’ in terms of any significant rise in status at university level compared with other disciplines such as STEM subjects. A way in which this status could be repositioned is through a new model of an entrepreneurial university. As James Dyson states, there should be no distinction between a ‘hands’ person and a ‘brains’ person (Dyson, 2010).

The policy environment, listed below in Table 2, depicts over the last few years for the creative industries is a useful overview as to their importance in policy making and their perceived economic value.

1997	Creative industries task force created to increase awareness of economic importance of creative industries
2001	Digital television project – joint industry and government initiative for digital switchover
2005	Creative Economy Programme established
2007	Staying Ahead report published (Wil Hutton)
2008	Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy (cross government strategy for creative industries)
2009	Digital Britain
2009	Creative Industries 2009 – 12 (TSB)
2010	New Industry New Jobs :One Year on (HM Government)

2010	EC Green Paper unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries
2010	Coalition Government formed

Table 2. Policy Environment (Hunt, 2010)

All of these documents and similar ones offer recurrent and interlocking themes of the global economy, the digital and technological economy, collaboration, partnerships and linkages, new business models, education skills and training, and the social dimension (Hunt, 2010).

3.4 Design thinking

Some of the literature supporting entrepreneurship or intrapreneurship concerned itself with new leadership traits with authors such as Bason (2010) calling for more consumer awareness, whilst also enabling a ‘safer’ methodology for innovation and risk taking within a bureaucratic structure. The literature also calls for a review of how a substantially regulated business can find gaps in which academics can innovate. This section on design thinking is to provide information that links traits from design education with a new management and design process, which could potentially support Thorp’s (Thorp, 2010) view on providing a culture for innovation rather than a structure for innovation. For the author, this section is the ‘boundary spanner’ bringing selected design processes into the narrative of art and design education with higher education management literature and links to the research methodology chapter:

design thinking is essentially a human centred innovation process that emphasises observation, collaboration, fast learning, visualisation of ideas, rapid concept prototyping, and concurrent business analysis, which ultimately influences innovation and business strategy (Lockwood, 2010, p. xi).

This section tries to tie the concepts of the modern entrepreneurial university together with the history and purpose of design higher education. It offers a potential model for investigating the new concept of a 21st century university but that is beyond the scope of this research. The aim here is to identify traits and characteristics that design thinking can bring to a methodology that investigates how an entrepreneurial university can develop. It brings both academic and non-academic knowledge, as seen through the eyes of external entrepreneurs, to the fore. Design thinking authors agree on key themes

(Borja de Mozota, 2003; Brown, 2009; Lockwood, 2010) that characterise design thinking, as identified by Lockwood below in italics (Lockwood, 2010, pp. xi-xii). It is useful to complement these traits with those of entrepreneurial thinking in the context of an entrepreneurial university. The author makes a brief comment relevant on this referring to each trait.

1. *Deep understanding of the consumer based on fieldwork (observe, ethnographic methods)*

In the case of the entrepreneurial university investigating whom the consumer is, beyond the normal student/academic relationship to that of the non-academic industry partnerships. To understand the entrepreneurial university using design thinking, the consumer would need careful identification before the analysis from the fieldwork and observations for the study could begin.

2. *Collaboration, users and multidisciplinary terms – helps with radical innovation rather than incremental innovation*

This could be used in the new model of the entrepreneurial university through the concept of interdisciplinarity in solving the grand challenges and working across the boundaries of academic/non-academic linkages and intrapreneurship.

3. *Accelerate learning through visualisation and hands on experimentation and quick prototypes – experimentation in a quick way to grasp the potential- how to do this in the research context*

In this area, the entrepreneurial university would make use of the creative faculties for exploration of design services to those internal and external to the university.

4. *Include some form of visualisation in concept*

To do this with the entrepreneurial university concept is to make it far more tangible as to the research applications from a university to industry and vice versa.

5. *Integrate business analysis into the process rather than add on later*

This is essential. As the processes of managerialism dominate in HE, there is little to support an 'intuition' model only, but plenty to support a mixed culture of design thinking with rigorous business analysis.

'Nobody wants to run a business based on intuition, feeling, and inspiration, but an over reliance on the rational and analytical can be just as dangerous. The integrated approach at the core of the design process suggests a 'third way' (Brown, 2009, p. 4).

This quote suggests to the author that there is potential for the university to act as agent, educator and collaborator for developing skills in enterprise, entrepreneurship and as the anchor institution working with external entrepreneurs who understand the economic context in which the university operates.

Design thinking in this context is seen as an innovation model for business transformation and could be part of the new entrepreneurial university paradigm. If, as previously noted, the new university sector is causing everything to be challenged and the status quo is no longer relevant, now is the time for 'out of the box' thinking and new methods of problem solving to be developed. One of the problems is how to create the new entrepreneurial university to help solve economic and social problems. Design thinking embraces the experiences of customers (or students and learners, staff and external entrepreneurs), and what they care about. Bringing design thinking into university to create a new model of innovation for interdisciplinary collaboration could create the new management model needed for the 21st century University. As Lockwood states:

the management model that got us into the 21st century is underpowered to move us forward, we've been getting better and better at a management model that is wronger and wronger (Lockwood, 2010).

This raises the question of whether the design minded organisation would work for a university as a whole, bearing in mind the challenges of academic tribes, mature organisations and being weary of yet another 'next best thing' in management?

3.5. The EntUni's current faculty of art and design

In this section, the author describes the Faculty of Art and Design that she was leading. The mission of the faculty was to 'foster the next generation of creative practitioners' and to ensure their contribution to society through cultural, social and economic wellbeing. The faculty mission is well placed for the role the faculty plays with the external entrepreneurs.

The faculty continues with the traditional 'design processes' and 'learning by doing' approach in terms of pedagogy supported by a mixture of academics and technicians. It provides a dynamic and interactive learning community, largely through a series of workshop spaces and open studios where talent is encouraged towards a student's own personal professional intent. The technical support is often crucial to the delivery of a successful art and design curriculum. The numbers of technical staff out-number academic staff in the faculty as they provide a lot of the skills and training in techniques. The philosophy for the faculty was one where 'technique is freedom' and a mastery of technique in whichever discipline would allow innovation and ideation to follow. Courses tended to stem from the historical background of the town, with strengths in constructed and printed textiles, fine art, photography, and product design. The academic base was 'loyal' with some ingrained practices that were popular with students but did not fit the direction of the university, particularly the expectation for them to gain higher research degrees themselves. The culture and collaboration with external stakeholders was high and highly regarded, and in particular, the faculty had one of the biggest numbers of students going on year-long work placements. As is typical in many art schools, the 'creative cycle of employment' is strong, with successful alumni coming back to look for new talent to support their businesses.

Staff activities were demonstrated largely through their own professional practice as artists, designers, photographers or architects and this formed the base for a developing research culture. Students were attracted by the staff who were practitioners and not just theorists and benefited at times from being co-collaborators on large scale art or design projects. Staff were well networked themselves and used their own 'little black book' to bring live projects and external opportunities into the curriculum.

The author's work included working with external entrepreneurs, and in delivering the university mission to be entrepreneurial. Most of the externals would 'get it' in terms of what was happening in the faculty, and could see students in action in studio set ups, as opposed to a more traditional set of lecture theatres and more academically led subjects. Students were recruited on the basis of portfolio interviews and their ability to develop nascent talent; they were expected to be fully committed to the studio set up for learning and the open culture of sharing ideas and working towards employment. Students engaged with external visitors and understood this practice as part of the curriculum offer and learning contract. Many students benefitted not just in learning terms but in gaining short term design contracts or work placement opportunities.

The overview of the faculty was traditional in approaches to teaching and most problems were to do with the lack of innovation in teaching practice as class sizes grew, but the externality of the delivery was very evident. The faculty had its early beginnings as a 19th century design school to support the textile industry and went through various iterations before being part of a post-92 university, and is a good example of a gradual and long history of cultural reinforcement as to its purpose in contrast to an aspiring entrepreneurial university.

3.6 Conclusion

The aim of this section has been to introduce the discipline of art and design into the literature and understanding in the context of the research. The external entrepreneurs are those who have accessed the Faculty of Art and Design at EntUni and to whom we refer in this project. A brief overview of history and current thinking aim to give a context to the next section on methodology. The overview demonstrates the possibilities for an entrepreneurial approach to other subject disciplines beyond STEM and one that has benefits as a translational discipline. In this context it is possible to see design as a potential game changer in the nature of the entrepreneurial university. The attributes of design, around the global challenges, and impact through the use of design in the new employment landscape, innovation strategies and competitive advantage for companies can lead to the development of academic enterprise through design. Design's advantage to the academy is that it is now about thinking as well as about doing. How the external entrepreneurs who work within a Faculty of Art and Design are creating an impact and are playing a role is explored further in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4 - RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction and research question

This study aims to deepen the understanding of the role of entrepreneurs who avail themselves of the talent and resources found typically within a Faculty of Art and Design located within an entrepreneurial university. The author noticed that the relationship, whilst positive in terms of student learning, was potentially at odds with the concept of the entrepreneurial university itself. As such, the author was witnessing a phenomenon whereby the university was largely adhering to the standard theories of the conceptual implementation of the entrepreneurial university (Clark, 2008; Etzkowitz, 2008) and yet the entrepreneurs themselves seemed to be oblivious of such a concept or their potential role within it. It is this gap, that evolved from the literature review of the entrepreneurial university at faculty level, combined with an observation that there seemed to be little empirical research to support this hypothesis. This therefore forms the basis of the study that the author intends to address.

This study does not attempt to investigate the value of the relationship of the student and the entrepreneur which is documented in the literature as largely having a positive impact in terms of aspiration and inspiration. Nor indeed does it investigate the relationship between a vice chancellor and the philanthropic intentions of some notable entrepreneurs. This study aims to look at instead the concept of the entrepreneurial university through the eyes of one faculty, as Clark would describe it, as the 'academic heartland' (Clark, 2008). The faculty encouraged entrepreneurs as regular attendees, who were engaged in everyday activity within the faculty, but they did not have the standard 'business school' approach to engagement with entrepreneurial learning. Clark saw those in faculties of humanities and arts as 'resisting laggards' (Clark, 2000). This study aims to question this view, which in the eyes of the author was a pejorative view that did not do service to a discipline that is largely misunderstood within the university sector, as the literature notes. The Faculty of Art and Design was one where the author had access and knowledge within the sector and one where the differences were first noticed. The aim is to understand the impact of entrepreneurs on the entrepreneurial concept at local faculty level, with the potential opportunity to advance the thinking towards a model of entrepreneurial universities for the future.

The primary research question asks **how external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity with the academic heartland of the university**. This question is looked at through the lens of a Faculty of Art and Design. Central to the research problem is the *role* played by external entrepreneurs when they enter the academic heartland to make their contributions, and, as a consequence of this, the author has identified three sub-questions that need to be investigated in order to achieve the research aims.

The first of the sub-questions is; **who are the entrepreneurs and what are their characteristics? How do they enter or engage with the university? What attracts them and what are their motivations?** This question is trying to understand who they are and how they engage with the university. It is important to know this, as this will indicate the reasons for their engagement and in turn illustrate what attracts them, and why they wish to come into the faculty. This will begin to identify the roles and contributions that they make and can be described and discussed. The literature describes entrepreneurs as people who are happy with risk and uncertainty. The question arises as to whether they continue with these characteristics when they come into the academy or whether they act differently, or whether their engagement is a risk in itself.

The second sub-question is; **what entrepreneurial activities do they engage in when they are in the academic heartland?** This question is looking at what it is that the entrepreneurs offer and then do when they come into the faculty and whether they contribute to an entrepreneurial mind set or not, or whether they are stifled by institutional bureaucracy and administration that is unfamiliar and prohibitive to their contributions. Is Clark's expanded developmental periphery such as knowledge transfer offices actually working for the entrepreneurs or the faculty if they enter it directly?

The third sub-question is; **what is the role of these actors in developing academic entrepreneurship in the academic heartland and how do they further the entrepreneurial relationship?** This question aims to look at their contribution through the role they play once in the faculty. Is it one they assume or are they assigned to a part that they carry out either because they think it is required of them or because they carry on with their natural behaviour and beliefs? In doing so are there any inhibiting factors that might obstruct or cause problems with their engagement and relationship? In the literature, Clark identified that an integrated entrepreneurial culture was necessary as a cultural requisite to enable a faculty to become entrepreneurial itself.

These questions are interesting as they form the basis of enquiry that has not been covered in the literature. Therefore, this study will contribute further to the understanding of the role of the entrepreneur in an entrepreneurial university. At first, the questions were formulated from the perspective of the faculty looking out to the externals but, after further reading, these were revised, as the real interest lay in the perception of the contributions of the externals that came into the faculty. Equally the interest lies in what the drivers are for an entrepreneurial university to support the concept at faculty level and whether the academic heartland depends purely on the need to engage more with '*enterprising action*' (Clark, 2000) to make a shift to have more entrepreneurial activity. The research questions also emerged from the Faculty of Art and Design's pedagogic context in that their role was being welcomed, but not necessarily understood, when that faculty was within a university dedicated to the entrepreneurial concept and described as such in its mission statements.

4.2 The research issue and problem

The literature review debated the rise of the concept of the entrepreneurial university through the late 20th century as a result of changes to funding from the state and a rise in managerialism (Deem, 2001; Clark, 2000, 2004, 2008; Shattock, 2003, 2009). The work of key authors such as Clark and Etzkowitz who set out the characteristics of those universities that would define themselves as entrepreneurial. Pioneering universities provided a role model for others to follow and it soon became a norm to describe an institution as entrepreneurial, in particular where different income streams were being derived and when new relationships between industry, the government and a university (Etzkowitz, 2008) were being formed. While these institutional role models were business orientated, this research project looks to the individual external entrepreneurs to see if their role within a university can also be motivating for others to follow.

Clark gave five points of practice that he considered would form the basis of any successful university wishing to engage in such entrepreneurial practice. These were in (1) core steering, (2) a developed periphery, (3) alternative funding streams (such as international student recruitment and knowledge transfer) (4) a sense of place in the academic heartland and (5) a fully integrated approach. However, this study challenges this notion and gives rise to the research question because of the complications relating, in part, to definitions and concepts ranging from being entrepreneurial as an individual and as an organisation and the inevitable link with innovation. Particular dissent about

the role of the university and entrepreneurial outlooks were discussed by Beck (Beck, 1992, 2007) and Fuller (Fuller, 2009) who queried where knowledge is being formed and the risks that were being taken as a result, and indeed whether the desired effects of an improved economy and employment were as successful as claimed (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2009). Whilst relationships between organisations and individuals were being discussed as part of the entrepreneurial university concept it became apparent that the local interpretation in the 'academic heartland' was not as clearly understood or integrated as was perceived necessary by Clark, and so this became the research arena for the author.

Alongside the literature on the entrepreneurial university concept there was the perception of an emerging panic by all western nations in wanting to make policy that would ensure that universities not only became financially independent of the state, but that they would also play a larger and faster role in reversing the economic downfall. Thus, a keen sense of universities taking an active role in innovation, and start-ups became more apparent. Within the Faculty of Art and Design innovation is seen, quite often although not uniquely so, as inherent in the practice of artists and designers. Likewise, the rise of the creative industries as a growing economic sector put faculties of art and design into a stronger position within university hierarchies than they had had for a long time. The link between the two areas became evident although still the focus for most policy development was within STEM subjects rather than arts subjects. The policy review in the literature chapter focuses on the advancing implementation by the state of ensuring an entrepreneurial mind-set for HEIs to the extent that it became a crowded space of business facing universities (Kennie, 2012). As a result not much attention was given at the faculty level, and hence the need for this research.

One of the key issues in the research is that art and design (alongside engineering and technology) are seen as being important translational subjects for entrepreneurial universities particularly in the impact and social/public interpretation of STEM subjects. The design section of the literature review emphasises how the link to the academy by 'non – academic' entrepreneurs became an attractive proposition in trying to link industry and the university sectors together for collaboration. Whilst theoretically this might be so, in practice the author was witnessing something different. A great deal of engagement by entrepreneurs was happening but not in the way the literature suggests that would capitalise on scientific research, as in the 'widget' model (Crossick, 2006) that would in turn create spin outs companies and benefit for the universities. However, the history of art and design education in the UK suggests that a greater understanding and financial

gain should be possible but somehow, from the engagement of the entrepreneurs coming in the faculty, the concept of the entrepreneurial university and the growth of the creative industries, there seemed to be a mismatch that was worthy of further investigation.

The problem identified by the author is that something was out of kilter between the advancement of the creative industries as being an economic force, the development of innovation within the entrepreneurial university characteristics, and the engagement and contribution of external entrepreneurs themselves at local faculty level. The research problem was therefore identified as needing further investigation and the role that entrepreneurs were playing as individual actors in the faculty and the wider university became of interest. The problem was framed by the theories of the entrepreneurial university as set out by Clark (Clark, 2000, 2008) as the main protagonist in development of the theory, although others (Davies, 2001, 2010; Etzkowitz, 2008; Shattock, 2003, 2009) made significant contributions. The literature gave rise to the question of what exactly do external entrepreneurs contribute and are they aware of the impact they have or otherwise on the concept of the entrepreneurial university? The primary and sub research questions were outlined at the beginning of this chapter with the objective of contributing to the understanding as to the purpose of the entrepreneurial university as seen through the lens of one Faculty of Art and Design.

4.3 The faculty of art and design in answering the research question

The broad area of research is the entrepreneurial university and the relationship with external entrepreneurs coming into the university. This is a highly complex situation and one that is prevalent with concerns surrounding many issues, for example, confidentiality and secrecy of the entrepreneurs themselves, intellectual property rights, non-disclosure agreements, and shifting attitudes to financial gain within and externally to the academy. The research problem led on the one hand to a straight-forward qualitative approach via case studies and interviews with entrepreneurs, but then on the other hand this could adversely skew the data needed to really try and understand what the relationships were and to gain some meaning for future analysis and interpretation. Choosing just one Faculty of Art and Design approach enabled a single lens to be taken but should not be seen as one where the same approach can be replicated in other faculties.

The reason for selecting the Faculty of Art and Design is that the author was the Dean of Faculty and a senior manager of the university. This gave the author access to both

the day to day operations of the faculty, as well as a role in setting the strategic direction of the university. The author was also a national player in various organisations. For purposes of confidentiality, the university will be referred to as EntUni, throughout, to provide anonymity to those drawn into the research data. EntUni was an outstanding post-1992 entrepreneurial university, having been awarded prizes and accolades for being designated as such. EntUni had set up a major incubation and enterprise centre, which was supported by well-known large industry companies, and it supported the development of spin outs through the commercialisation of research and access to finance and markets. This in itself echoes the expanded development periphery and the strengthened steering core that Clark mentions as pivotal to success. It also enabled a research base to be accessed through academic staff and high end resources. The author had access to the strategic plan and the involvement of teaching and learning and research strategies in support of the entrepreneurial stature and was regularly involved in the work of the faculty and the incubation centre.

Through observation and experience, the author was able to note the research problem as being not only specific to the Faculty of Art and Design, but one that drew attention to the work with external partners. Following a long pedagogic tradition of working externally for the benefit of students' 'real world learning' and this would quite often be of a different nature to that of another faculty. The research lent itself very specifically to the nature of the faculty. A wider exploration of the research problem might not be possible in other faculties unless the research was undertaken by those in the relevant faculty. The character of art and design education is inherently innovative, as noted in the literature, and enabled the author to question this within the context of an entrepreneurial university rather than the well-established field of creative learning and student enterprise.

The research problem developed into a several areas of enquiry (as stated above in the research questions). It became apparent for reasons to do with the entrepreneurs themselves that an unstructured and qualitative research methodology would enable the questions to be explored in a way that led to the entrepreneurial spirit itself to be employed. The methodology emerged after investigating different ways of engaging in qualitative research and a form of ethnography was chosen. Whilst ethnographies are well established in this domain, the role of the self-ethnographer is only recently being used by authors who find this approach valuable. The next section discusses the research choices, reasons for selection and justification, as well as the limitations and final reason for choosing to adopt a self-ethnography study.

4.4 Research methodology, selection and justification

The author's approach to the research was to be an active participant, because the author was a key player participating in invitations to and from external entrepreneurs who wanted to help faculty students. Thus, she became aware of their own priorities for engagement. It seemed clear from their initial engagement that the external entrepreneurs were declaring that they were not going to be part of the academy, nor would they engage in activity that was seen to be traditional in research terms in any way – for example being interviewed, filling in questionnaires, or doing surveys. Instead the author witnessed a fascination by them for the faculty that brought into question the areas of engagement that entrepreneurs were willing to be involved in such as student projects with direct engagement for the project rather than to be seen as a research object themselves. This concern led to the need to find a research method that would look to answer the research questions but not frighten the entrepreneurs into not participating in the Faculty or the study.

It should be noted that the research took place during one of the sharpest recessions in recent history and the regularity of entrepreneurs entering the faculty might not have been so dominant in a time where business was more buoyant. It was a time where new young talent, with potentially cheap ideas to implement, was a key motivator for many of those who came into the faculty.

The author was involved as an active participant observer utilising similar characteristics as the entrepreneurs with whom she was coming into contact with, and therefore she looked for opportunities to reflect on that engagement whilst at the same time using some design training traits for the investigation. The literature section that discusses Design Thinking as a way of working combined ethnographic observation with testing visualisation methods. This meant that the self-ethnography methodology became a natural choice. In this study, the author was involved in studying her own immediate context as a resource for research and analysis in answering the research questions. Similarly, designers go through an iterative process of thinking, making, doing, redesigning, rethinking and remaking until a problem is solved and the aesthetic is determined. Whereas, before this research study began, being part of something, rethinking, changing and being very close to the issue at hand had never been a problem for the author; however, now it seemed as if it might become the problem, unless an appropriate methodology could be found. The context in which the author worked had

valued relationships between colleagues internally and externally, and so the study was undertaken not as a remote stranger but as a valued member of that team and this had to be considered carefully in the process.

The following sections describe the process of consideration of different research methods and the eventual evolution of the research design and methodology.

4.5 Reflective practice and qualitative methodologies

A description was given above whereby a designer would use a method of reflection to arrive at a point of decision and this is a useful starting point to situate the research problem whilst using attributes familiar to the author. However locating the research purely within this realm would not facilitate answers to the research questions as they arose in the literature, partly because the focus is much more on an understanding of the relationship between an individual entrepreneur and a corporate entrepreneurial status.

4.5.1 *The reflective practitioner*

The reflective practitioner (Schön, 1983) utilises the exploration of professional knowledge to understand the relationship between academic knowledge, in the author's case that of the role of the external entrepreneurs entering an entrepreneurial university at faculty level, and the competences found in professional practice. In the author's case the role of being a manager/dean in a university that worked specifically with individual entrepreneurs). Taking the exploration beyond Schön the idea of the author's knowledge being central to the debate between policy and practice and an understanding through a case study of a faculty and its contribution to a new model of entrepreneurship was useful only inasmuch as a reflective piece that demanded a cycle of review of practice to improve professional actions. As Schön states, professionals '*have a claim to the most extraordinary knowledge in matters of great social importance*' (Schön, 1983, p. 4) and, in the case of the entrepreneurial university, as demonstrated in the literature review, this is seen as a matter of economic salvation and a new role for universities to play.

To demonstrate a professional claim, Schön was ahead of the time of the development of the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF). However during the development of the concept of the entrepreneurial university, professionalization in higher education became more apparent, (Whitchurch and Gordon, 2012) for example

with the development of the Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy, as a way of matching other professions, such as architects, doctors, lawyers etc. For Schön and for many professions, the knowledge attained is mismatched 'to the changing characteristics of practice' and as such are complicated and suffer from uncertainty (Schön, 1983, p. 14). This could be true for the mismatch between the entrepreneurial university concept and the roles that higher education professionals played within it. As previously mentioned in the literature review, super-complexity (Barnett, 2000) and new public management (Deem, 2001) are causing a change in the view of the academy and how professionals act. Understanding how the author as actor would act when '*practitioners are frequently embroiled in conflicts of values, goals, purposes and interests*' (Schön, 1983) led to further investigation of method so as to find one that would align itself appropriately to the research questions. As Schön stated:

If it is true that professional practice has at least as much to do with finding the problem as with solving the problem found, it is also true that problem setting is a recognised professional activity (Schön, 1983).

4.5.2 Qualitative frameworks

The research is located in a qualitative framework, and a case study method was at first deemed appropriate to answer the question, but the design of questionnaires, surveys and interviews would not fit the nature of the actors in question, mainly because of their very entrepreneurial nature and natural affinity with risk and less with process. Deciding to do a case study as a research method (Yin, 2009) tries to understand the wealth of information found in the phenomena and the breadth of the real life context that is experienced on the ground. Although most of the research questions that are drawn out fall into the 'how' and 'who' categories and thus extrapolate a series of phenomena worthy of further investigation and become explanatory, other research questions fell into the 'what' category, with the aim being to explore what is happening in the organisational situation (Yin, 2009). The research methodology, therefore, had to enable both to be answered.

The case study method was rejected early on in the quest for a more appropriate methodology for those reasons stated above, but did lead to the notion of considering the 'case method' of teaching being expanded into the research methodology as what was happening, in part, was the access to real world experiences being utilised. However, this was also rejected as being too prescriptive and whilst beneficial perhaps

to teachers and students, did not necessarily communicate the concepts or analytical aspects (Bok in Schön 1983, p.29) of the research questions. Equally, it would not contribute to the understanding of the relationship between the role of the external entrepreneur and the Art and Design Faculty. The case study and a version of the case teaching method suggested an approach that might lead to an overriding consensus rather than drawing on the individual entrepreneurs in action through observation to provide evidence for developing the concept of the entrepreneurial university. Although there is plenty of evidence to support case study research as an appropriate method and supportive rigour in its methodology (Yin, 2009) it was not deemed appropriate for this study for the reasons given above.

The author was conscious of the need to embrace the professional aspect of her role as a senior manager, as alongside that of being a researcher. The challenge was to find a solution through an appropriate research methodology, and to understand how to respond to both the professional role and that of an active participant researcher. To understand this, the author focused on Schön's assertion as to how the split between research and practice emerged. He pointed out that:

the professions are to give their practical problems to the university and the university, as the unique source of research, is to give back to the professions the new scientific knowledge which it will be their business to apply and test... This led to a division of labour which reflected the hierarchy of knowledge and a ladder of status, those who created new theory were considered to be of higher status than those who apply it, and the schools of higher learning were to be superior to the lower...This led to the familiar split between research and practice (Schön, 1983).

This quotation from Schön suggests that within the context of design education in a higher education setting, from its early historical practice base to its final integration into the university sector it was always at odds with the research versus practice split. This split, however, remained quite consistent until the development of the university crisis and the need to support the economy through a new 'habitus' (Barnett, 2005), where the role of the university through entrepreneurship became urgent in the minds of policy makers. This change enabled a different way of thinking between research and practice, and in turn how practitioners in higher education could think of research in their own territory.

The practice of entrepreneurship from those who were actually doing it (the external entrepreneurs) became obvious when seeing them in action in the Faculty of Art and Design, as a practitioner and in a studio setting, compared with those who tried to theorise it and characterise organisational settings outside of this environment. Following Schön and earlier practice, the author was able to articulate the problem from the setting that she was personally observing from a situation that was puzzling, uncertain and troubling (Schön, 1983, p. 40), and it was initially not making sense in the way that the literature for research methodologies was providing as appropriate methods. For the author, the challenge lay in considering design processes where the question would be 'what is the real problem to be solved', rather than finding a research question to match the research methodology. As Schön states, the problem that is hard to define, then becomes hard to be resolved through applied research and then becomes the victim of conflicting paradigms of professional practice as to how to resolve (Schön, 1983, p. 41). Consequently, the search for an appropriate research methodology continued.

Schön suggests that the search for a new model of epistemology of practice is implicit in the artistic and intuitive processes, which some practitioners bring to situations of uncertainty and instability (Schön, 1983, p. 49). This in turn enabled the author to go back to the role of design education and the practices involved to help inform the Faculty of Art and Design in understanding the contribution of external entrepreneurs to an entrepreneurial university, and the role that the practitioner as senior manager would play through using their own tacit knowledge:

The reflective practitioner reflects on the phenomena before him, and on the prior understandings which have been implicit in his behaviour and carries out an experiment which serves to generate both a new understanding of the phenomena and a change in the situation (Schön, 1983, p. 68).

In undertaking this exercise of reflection, the author noted that an experimental approach to the research might indeed generate the understanding of the relationships/roles sought and provide opportunities for advancement of the concept under question, and lead to greater clarity in defining the problem.

However, the reflective practitioner approach was discarded as a method to use for this research as it relies largely on retained knowledge and experience and, although that is a consideration, it does not enable any analysis to come from the circumstances of the participant observations of the external entrepreneurs who were involved in the study.

The reflective practitioner approach also would not suit the research because it is not in the context of organisational benefit; as this study intends, it is more to do with individual self-improvement rather than organisational or policy improvement (Reynolds, 1998). Reynolds argued to enhance Schön's work with more critical reflection that questions assumptions of organisational context, and therefore has learning for all the professionals within that organisation, rather than just the individual and the relationship with a 'client' (Reynolds, 1998).

The research into different methodologies was not only leading to reframing of the problem by the author, as in design thinking terms, but was also leading to an observation methodology again familiar to the author. Ethnographic research methods have a long history and are methods that could be repeatable should another time and situation be similar (e.g. another dean of another subject area with external contributors) but would also be appropriately challenging and defensible as a method. Other qualitative methodologies are acknowledged but it is not felt to be necessary to give detail about all of them. However, the use of interviewing techniques is one that is often thought of as having impact in research terms and was considered an appropriate method to gain answers from the external entrepreneurs. Nevertheless, as noted earlier, it was not part of their natural character to get involved with interview scenarios. Also, as Alvesson (2003) notes, interviews are part of a control mechanism that can control behaviours and therefore the answers to questions tend to provide a fixed and less emergent set of data. Therefore, interviews were also ruled out as being appropriate or innovative enough for this study, whereas ethnography is considered in greater detail in the next section.

4.5.3 Ethnography

Ethnography enables a prolonged period to collect, observe and contextualise the lived realities in the field setting (Yin, 2009). Simply put, there are three areas of ethnographic practice, derived from anthropological models, where a study of a group of people in the field is undertaken and their trust is gained. More recently, versions of auto ethnography have emerged. This is largely the study of the self in an autobiographical context and is in contrast to self-ethnography, as defined by Alvesson,(2003) where the researcher studies their own group as an established participant and understands the context from within, as opposed to without or externally (Eriksson, 2010). The method of self-ethnography seemed to be appropriate to both the concerns of the author to be innovative and entrepreneurial in practice and to the nature of the enquiry.

The author undertook the study over a period of three years from 2011 to 2013, with the focus purely being on collecting data from the entrepreneurs and in assessing the 'lived realities' of other people in one's own setting (Alvesson, 2003). Another similar approach might have been a narrative methodology, where the story of the events as they unfolded through entrepreneurial activity at the university would have allowed a narrative to reveal itself but not necessarily allowed the individual personal phenomena to be drawn out. Because ethnography studies an intact cultural group (Creswell, 2009, p. 13) over a period of time, the author was able to witness and observe the setting where entrepreneurs would come into the faculty and was also able to observe the implementation of the entrepreneurial characteristics upon the EntUni. The process is unstructured, which was helpful in providing a flexible approach as to when the entrepreneurs would enter the faculty. It was clear that the 'backyard' (Creswell, 2009, p. 177) research, which involved the author's own organisation and very directly the faculty, meant that there were potential difficult issues to overcome with regard to ethics and confidentiality. However, further review of self-ethnography as a method indicated that other excellent researchers in the field of Higher Education such as Bleklie, Enders and Alvesson were using this approach effectively.

Self-ethnography, as described by Alvesson, became the preferred method for this study. The author uses his methodology as a guide for the research design as a way of studying the 'lived realities' in the settings where the author is an active and also authentic participant of the context under study, in other words the Faculty of Art and Design, working with the external entrepreneurs. Alvesson clarifies his viewpoint in the subtle differentiation between the role of being not a 'participant observer' but an 'observing participant' (Alvesson, 2003). This subtle but important distinction is crucial to the research design of this thesis. In the case of this study, the author's (as Dean of Faculty) participation came first and the research perspective became the secondary function.

4.5.4 Self-ethnography

Insider research means research by members of organisations in and on their own organisation. Self-ethnography is similar in definition to insider research (Brannick and Coghlan, 2007). Brannick and Coghlan define insider research as being more formal and thought out than the more incidental description as described by Alvesson (Alvesson, 2003; Brannick and Coghlan, 2007) for self-ethnography.

Alvesson describes self-ethnography as:

a study and a text in which the researcher – author describes a cultural setting to which s/he has a 'natural access', is an active participant, more or less on equal terms with other participants. The researcher then works and or lives in the setting and then uses the experiences, knowledge and access to empirical material for research purposes (Alvesson, 2003, p. 174).

As mentioned earlier, to undertake a more traditional form of qualitative research via questionnaires would be highly problematic in the author's setting and could disrupt a layer of trust, and as such, would skew the data.

Self-ethnography and insider research are often seen as problematic, arguably as insufficiently rigorous intellectually, and having too much of an emotive or personal stake in the setting. However, the tacit knowledge and awareness gained as professionals in a university setting is becoming more common place and seen as a mix of professional reflections on professional experiences (Schön, 1983). Most organisations provide a rich setting for research, but this may seem more compromised by the nature of the researcher being a member of an academic community rather than any other professional community that they might research as an outsider.

Brannick and Coghlan aim to react against the negative views of insider research by affirming its theoretical academic value within research traditions (Brannick and Coghlan, 2007, p. 61). The debate around practice and theory informs and seeks to legitimise the research surrounding the entrepreneurial university. *'Researchers who undertake a research project in and on their own organisation do so as complete members (noting a form of ethnography as having three distinct fields, peripheral member, active member and complete member)'* (Brannick and Coghlan, 2007). Insider research has its own dynamics that distinguish it from an external researcher approach and is an approach that the author followed with regard to the entrepreneurs and the university setting. *'The researchers are already immersed in the organisation and have built up knowledge of the organisation from being an actor in the processes being studied'* (Brannick and Coghlan, 2007). For some researchers this is known as 'from nearness to distance and back', but it does raise concerns about blind spots and the ability to move knowledge from the specific to knowledge of theoretical interest (Bleiklie et al, 2015). In assessing the appropriateness and the methodology, the following pros and cons fall into place (Alvesson, 2003; Bleiklie et al, 2015). The positives are the availability of the information

required and ability to build up direct knowledge of the subjects and hence a richer set of observations can be made, at a time that is available and ready for the practitioner researcher, and over an extensive period. They enable a comparison of case studies from within one source and enable the exploratory research questions to take a more natural form than more structured methods (Bleiklie et al, 2015).

However, conversely, Alvesson rightly points out that this method also brings risk and complaints of ethical irregularity and being too close to the subjects to warrant a rigorous research method that is capable of replication. These criticisms have been addressed in this study in several ways. The first and most practical is that the research data were collected several years ago when the author was employed at EntUni but she has since moved to another post at another university, so distance both geographically and time wise has taken place. This helps with separation and avoids any distrust for the author in moving amongst the research environment. In addition, the data names and institution have also been changed for anonymity and protection. The accounts of each entrepreneur have been written up using as much reflexivity as possible and using a defined set of 'points of observation' (Bleiklie et al, 2015) following best practice indicated in the literature review. The points of observation and the referencing in the design of the research were purposely positioned to take account of the main theorist for the entrepreneurial concept (Clark, 2000, 2004, 2008) and to ensure that the focus is on matters of theoretical interest.

The chosen methodology, of self-ethnography, was in part informed by the experience of being a designer and becoming an academic manager and the transition that goes between professional practice and the university. The author also wanted to follow the entrepreneurial spirit of the entrepreneurs, not to follow the rules blindly but to be innovative in finding a way of explaining a situation and interpretation of the relationship value between the entrepreneurs and the university and their contribution to the academic heartland. The research design followed the concept of the entrepreneurial university as suggested by Clark and concentrated on one facet of his theory: the academic heartland. To engage in the academic heartland, the author as Dean of the Faculty of Art and Design was able to participate and observe the entrepreneurs and the environment around them. The author made notes based on a rich set of observations following the engagement with entrepreneurs, which formed the basis of the data to analyse. All the research was therefore undertaken in situ in the Faculty of Art and Design.

4.5.5. Research methodologies in other disciplines

In undertaking the research, the author was conscious of her natural discipline as a designer and the constraints she was feeling over utilising too strict a methodology based in the social sciences. Practice-based research is controversial in the art and design setting but is more understood than perhaps in other disciplines. It does, however still follow a systematic enquiry to answer a particular question through practice. In the sentiment of Herbert Read (Read, 1963) practice-based research is seen as '*for practice*', in which the research itself is subservient to the practice aims of the artist/designer, or '*through practice*' where the practice serves as a research purpose, and '*into practice*' such as observing the working practices of others (Frayling, 1993).

4.6 Ethics

Using participant observation and reflection as a research method is to gain insight into an organisation and its setting. Self-ethnography enabled the author to access the immediate environment and, as discussed above, is beginning to be a recognisable source for research into higher education. However, using *semi-covert* research is perhaps controversial, particularly where the subject is not seen to be dangerous (as in crime research) or particularly sensitive (as in health research) so it is necessary to defend the approach and this is done in several ways. Firstly, by looking at the literature on covert participant research; secondly, by looking at the consequences for both the researched and the researcher, and finally by understanding this in the context of observation through design thinking and reflective practice. The key issue was to ensure confidentiality but at the same time to utilise an approach appropriate to creative and entrepreneurial practice that would add value to the research findings.

In some cases, covert participant observation raises questions of a moral and ethical nature for both the researched and the researcher. It is helpful to draw on the literature of covert participant observation and place it in context with the research undertaken here. The process of participant observation is noted as being useful to experience the environment and cultural setting of a particular phenomenon first hand, with the researcher actively involved in the situation being studied (Atkinson and Hammersley, 2007). In the case of this research, the active involvement of the author with the faculty and those entering it as entrepreneurs is the research problem. Through this process, the author is able to observe and experience the work of the entrepreneurs and to make notes on the particular context and meanings that emerge.

The covert nature of participant observation has been used in other disciplines such as organisational behaviour for human resource studies, or for crime and criminology, related areas where the sensitivities are such that the overt method might cause some distress or mistrust (Oliver and Eales, 2008). However, there is concern expressed in the literature with regard to this approach to data collection (Oliver and Eales, 2008). The issue with the prolonged exposure to the people being researched is one concern (Atkinson and Hammersley, 2007) as it focuses on real life and not through other environments that might have been specifically designed by researchers or follow accepted methodologies. However, the closeness to the subject is one of the benefits of participant observation (Alvesson, 2003) but also causes a problem if the subject is unaware of the observation taking place.

Oliver and Eales were concerned in their case studies that the fall out of being found out is worse for the researchers themselves than those being researched (Oliver and Eales, 2008) and it was difficult to separate the researcher from the researched in the way that others have described as problematic between subjectivity and objectivity (Alvesson, 2003; Bleiklie et al, 2015). To avoid this situation the key issues for the author were to recognise the impact of her views and ensure distance occurred in the note making (Coffey, 1999), and also the appropriateness of the research method to the research being undertaken. The research being undertaken was at a time of recession and the focus on universities to find solutions to costs and to be more entrepreneurial, and hence the 'search was on', which led to this study being undertaken. The vice chancellor of EntUni was aware of the project the author was undertaking and supported the research and collecting the data in this way.

The ten entrepreneurs were all aware of the research the author was undertaking in relation to their relationship with the faculty and the activities they did, but they were not aware of the wider parameters of the study, as this would have changed behaviours as discussed earlier on in the chapter. Whilst this is a relatively new area of research it is increasingly being used by Education Doctorate students (Trowler, 2014). Those interested in higher education demonstrate the benefits where there are implications for policy, or specific groups, where shining a light on a particular issue adds to the organisational understanding. Trowler, Alvesson and others use this method effectively and when it is appropriate to do so. In answering the research question concerning the contribution of external entrepreneurs to the academic heartland this method is seen to be appropriate as its contribution is adding to the understanding of a phenomenon, the

entrepreneurial university, rather than a particular isolated and attributed individual or cause.

However, just as the work of the entrepreneurial university is setting a new context that is disruptive and innovative in sensing the new habitus of higher education (Barnett, 2000), so is the process of understanding a new method of research that is disrupting research in the social sciences. It is becoming an informed choice of research style rather than an enforced one of traditional and acceptable methodologies (Calvey, 2008) and this is important to the author and the approach. Calvey notes the use of documentaries and the public appetite for such methods in exposing the 'truth' in the public domain and yet this is being hampered in the academic domain by false understandings of 'consenting to what'. Whilst sensitive subjects need appropriate protection, those such as the author's area of study is not a sensitive area in need of protection but in attempt to add to the 'wider process of disruptive thinking in sociology and the social sciences, where one's normal status and privilege in the setting is removed' (Calvey, 2008).

This led the author to use a series of practices that were considered appropriate, as utilised by Alvesson and Bleiklie, Enders, et al (Bleiklie et al 2015), and enabled a coding process to be developed that would reflect the process of objectivity to theorise rather than a subjective description of the observations. This led to originality in the research design, as set out in the coding design below. As mentioned, the authorisation to use the institution for research purposes had been approved at the beginning by the vice chancellor and names and institution have been changed to give both the university and the entrepreneur's anonymity.

4.7 Conclusion

The author considered traditional methods of qualitative research but dismissed them because of needing to find and develop a methodology that would do justice to a series of factors. The first being the need to reflect the author's own background in design education and second to find a method that would reflect the subject matter of entrepreneurship. Being confident with newness, risk and innovation was an important feature and led to the use of self-ethnography as the chosen methodology.

The rationale for selecting self-ethnography lies in the many benefits it brings and the fit with the research focus of the study. The positive aspect is the rich source of data that was readily available and could be followed over a period of time. The main negative

aspect was the issue of its repeatability. However, small scale in-depth studies which focus on subjective understandings, processes and interactions between individuals and the environment are generally not expected to be replicable in the scientific sense (Alvesson & Gabriel, 2013; Atkinson & Hammersley, 2007; Brannick & Coghlan, 2007; Creswell, 2009; Oliver and Eales, 2008; Yin, 2009). The author concluded that as geographic distance had emerged following a change in institution and with a period of lapsed time it was possible to overcome any challenges from being an insider researcher. The use of self-ethnography and insider research is seen as a useful tool for many organisations, and in particular for higher education by many researchers (Alvesson, 2003; Trowler, 2014; Bleiklie, Enders & Lepori, 2015). Another reason for choosing this methodology was to explore the research questions in a way that would investigate and lead to a greater understanding and contribution to knowledge about the entrepreneurial university concept, and to suggest ways of developing contributions to practice in the higher education setting.

CHAPTER 5 - RESEARCH DESIGN

5.1 Introduction

The author chose to use self-ethnography methodology as a research method, which would investigate the primary research question of how external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland of a university. The research design was set out in four parts to reflect both the literature and the research methodology. Collecting and analysing the data led to the development of the research design, through an iterative process such as that seen in design thinking and in coding and analysing text, which is discussed below. Using one of Clark's (2008) five principles of the entrepreneurial university, the Stimulated Academic Heartland, as the focus for the research study gave an important boundary to the study. The other key aspect of the research design was the work and direction of Alvesson (2003) in the use of self-ethnography methodology, which enabled the data to be cut in different ways and utilised his five recommendations to improve and facilitate the revelations that would emerge from the data.

5.2 Research design: element 1

The Stimulated Academic Heartland is the title of the section in Clark's book, but is abbreviated in this study to the academic heartland, which is used as the starting point for the research design and was developed so that it would reflect the core elements of how external entrepreneurs interacted with the faculty and the entrepreneurial university. The focus was about the core academic discipline/unit/faculty that was traditionally centred on research and teaching and was able to continue without hindrance to the newer departments relating to the strengthened steering core, outreach offices, and other alternative income streams. The academic heartland is where most academic work is done, and where most attempts to become entrepreneurial fail (Clark, 2008). Therefore, it seemed logical to look closely at this section and link it to the author's faculty to find the relationship and contributions under question. The author was interested in who the entrepreneurs were, and what characterised them, their engagement with and their motivations for working with the faculty.

The first section of the research was to categorise the data according to characteristics that relate to the entrepreneurs who make up the study. This includes personal information, such as approximate age and gender. However, it also includes information

such as the business sector they are in and their engagement with the faculty. This section relates closely to the first research sub- question of who they are and their characteristics. These categories emerged from the field notes taken at time of observation and are important, as they form the basis of the discussion and findings on who they are.

5.3 Research design: element 2

The second design phase was to categorise the data and the ten entrepreneurs according to the three sub questions, and drawing on the first research design element, to try and understand who the entrepreneurs are and their particular characteristics were. Also to understand why the entrepreneurs enter and engage with the university and what attracts and motivates. The author reflected on these attributes with a view to understand their role and how they might be furthering the entrepreneurial relationship with the university.

To enable research findings to emerge from the design elements one and two, the author developed coding structures, plus a methodology and mechanics for the practice of coding to take place, from the data. The record of the entrepreneurs observed provided the raw data which was collected through a process of note taking and initial thoughts made at or just after the time of encounter. Each encounter was recorded and kept electronically in word documents. For the final analysis, ten entrepreneurs, records were used for the coding. It is worth noting here that the value of the data is a rich source of text based information and its empirical worth is based on the fact that material is found in the author's own environment, as discussed earlier in the methodology chapter.

Following the literature for coding data for qualitative research, a plan was devised that followed a typical linear and hierarchal approach (Cresswell, 2009; Salanda, 2009). This process became very iterative as it went from the general to the more specific and each stage was reconsidered. The mechanics of the coding was completely manual and solo. There were no joint collaborators to the research, which meant that the coding and the initial notes could be completely understood by the author alone. As the notes were made at the time of the encounter, manual coding seemed to be the most useful and although time consuming it seemed the better route than electronic coding. Electronic coding may have enabled some further distance to be created to counter the negatives associated with self-ethnography, but manual coding was more in keeping with the research design method and enabled the initial codes to be created following a general

sense and essence of what was happening. This initial 'sense' was an important first step in defining the pre-codes (Cresswell, 2009).

The whole collection of notes by the author was read from cover to cover (over 150 pages of script once transcribed into one document). Initial decisions were made not to include several entrepreneurs where the information was not as coherent or considered useful. A final selection of ten entrepreneurs was used. Other notes that had been made at the time included observations based on encounters with entrepreneurs from Australia and Chicago. It was decided to leave these out and concentrate on the UK ones, as the concept of the entrepreneurial university and the faculty under consideration was in England and utilising international references might have distorted the findings.

5.4 Research design: element 3

After design elements one and two were completed this development led to ensuring that the theoretical framework of self-ethnography as devised by Alvesson was followed to address the primary research question. The question of how external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity of the academic heartland, and how self-ethnography would help with understanding and analysis of the data was implemented. To do this, the author focused on advice given by Alvesson to look at and cut the data in different ways to avoid the problem of being too close to the research environment, as an insider researcher. The author used Alvesson's five recommendations to improve and facilitate the revelations that would emerge from the data. These five recommendations are discussed in turn and each one is followed by a single word or phrase that the author adapted from the recommendation to aid the analysis.

1. Alvesson's first recommendation is to develop a sense of self irony and to that extent the author decided to use the word **Surprises** to see if the data would expose any new meanings that were not expected or that would not fit into any other category. As a design method this fits with the expectation of the author to find aspects of the research that were not planned or initiated in any other method, in a way that the literature on design thinking envisages, or as a reflective practitioner would do in finding a problem alongside solving one.

2. Alvesson's second recommendation is to challenge the data, and the author did this by utilising Fullers' (2009) critical assessment of universities, as described in the literature, through the debate about the **Knowledge Base**, whether it is exchanged,

shared, or developed outside of the academy, and how external entrepreneurs would contribute to this knowledge base or not.

3. The third recommendation from Alvesson suggests using an interpretative repertoire not based on one's own theme of research but another associated theme. In this case, the author chose the theme of the **Teaching and Learning** relationship, as this is not part of the study but naturally part of the university mission and the literature is closely connected between teaching and learning and entrepreneurial activity.

4. The fourth recommendation by Alvesson was to work through the data with a notion of reflexivity inspired by another viewpoint. The viewpoint taken was to think of this using reflective practice as described by Schön and through the viewpoint of design thinking, and to concentrate purely on the **entrepreneurial university** concept in this theme.

5. The final recommendation was to work with the material through the routine nature of the self, in other words the author and her personal position as a dean in a large faculty, with access to both the research base but with other attributes relating to her position with national organisations, and her **relationship** with the entrepreneurs.

Thus, the five focused themes for the research design element 3 emerged as: -

- **Surprises** – embracing the position of irony by the author, as this study does not focus on learning and teaching of entrepreneurship at all, but was often an amusing aspect of the work with entrepreneurs and students.
- **Knowledge Based** – how knowledge is shared and exchanged or developed, and utilising Fuller's criticisms of the current university status.
- **Learning and Teaching** relationship – the question of whether this is understood or not by the entrepreneurs was interesting and whether it would change the perception of the study, as this is not a focus of the research.
- **Entrepreneurial university concept** – looking at the main themes by adopting a changing repertoire.
- **Relationship** – of entrepreneurs to the university concept, through the role of the author's professional and personal capacity.

These five themes were used to interrogate the data and revealed an additional 37 different themes from the data and formed the basis of the research analysis which is discussed in the following research findings chapters.

5.5 Research design: element 4

The final research design element was to embrace the notion of distance to establish a wider context from which to draw findings and to ensure the findings from the ten entrepreneurial observations were considered more fully. The author has chosen to do this by investigating other areas in which she worked and to establish an external context that was distinct from the EntUni view of entrepreneurial activity and its relationships with universities more broadly. This is in keeping with the methodological approach adopted to ensure distance is created between the author and the research subjects by reviewing her role in external and national contexts.

In answering, the primary research question of entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland the author chose to research a national subject association that was closely linked to the art and design discipline, a weeklong entrepreneurial colloquium held at a research-intensive university, a review of a visiting professor scheme for entrepreneurs and a parliamentary commission.

5.6 Conclusion

The final selection for a research methodology was self-ethnography, as utilised by Alvesson, and the author adapted his recommendations for the use of this study. This methodology led to a design and analysis structure that was deemed the best choice to uncover the contributions of external entrepreneurs, and point to areas of development within the academic heartland and entrepreneurial university. Four research design elements were discussed that worked from the initial hypothesis of Clark's academic heartland to the recommendations of Alvesson in disclosing the emerging themes and categories from the raw data, and the role played by ensuring distance is created by exploring the wider context from the author's engagement in like minded but external organisations.

The data collection concentrated on ten external entrepreneurs from one faculty of EntUni and four external organisations that the author was involved in. The selection of data enabled the main research question and the sub-questions to be answered effectively. The process of working through the data and developing themes in accordance with other researchers using the same methodology gave strength to the research design.

The following three chapters reveal the data from the research design and methodology and lead to the final analysis. The next chapter contextualises the study and is an attempt to present findings that keep with the methodological approach adopted but ensure distance is created from the EntUni under consideration. The following chapters focus on the external entrepreneurs who entered EntUni and their engagement and activity with the Faculty of Art and Design, and then the thirty seven themes that emerged from the analysis using the 5 recommendations, following Alvesson's approach.

CHAPTER 6 –POLICY AND NETWORKS AS DISTANCE

6.1 Introduction

In the process of achieving understanding of how external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland, using self-ethnography as the method, the literature suggests distance is created. The author has done this by using her external networks. This also helps with the wider contextualisation of the study. The author is engaged with other networks and affiliations and these links are included here as a way of securing a position of detachment from being too close to the research through an active participant observation stance. The challenge for self-ethnography is that it can be criticised for being overly connected to the researcher's personal stance or bias. One way of avoiding this is through creating knowledge via different interpretations by having other affiliations and not just through the one discipline. In this study, the author was directly involved as dean of faculty but was also a key player in the university's development of a new enterprise facility that embraced all the areas of an entrepreneurial university. Also, and maybe more importantly, the author was involved in the development of policy areas and networks outside of the institution and could use this as a way of informing and revealing what was happening internally.

The author describes the affiliation to other groups through four main events to 'micro anchor' the research accounts (Trowler, 2014). All of the groups have been disguised and are anonymous to ensure and protect the other actors involved. The four distinct groups have been chosen for their difference but also inter-relationship with the research questions. The first is a national association that the author was chair of during the three years of the research period. The second is a report on a week-long colloquium held at a top research intensive university in the UK, but involved a European group interested in developing the entrepreneurial university model further. The third was the development of an application for a visiting entrepreneurial professorial scheme with another faculty and therefore outside of the author's main discipline area. The fourth is a description of events that are based on the author's engagement with a national parliamentary policy department.

All of these reports aim to add meaning through the descriptions to the focus of this study and in particular, reveal new and deeper meaning and understanding of the research question. The reflection of these events is crucial in aiding this understanding and is part of the consistent and persistent challenge to find out what is going on at grass

roots/discipline level in art and design and whether the external environment was influencing the roles and relationships between the academic heartland and the external entrepreneurs. The four external networks are discussed below.

6.2 National subject association

The national subject association has been in existence for over thirty years and the author was its chair during the research period and at a time when there were huge changes in the policy landscape and funding for the arts and humanities seemed to suffer at the hands of the perceived importance of STEM subjects. The paradox for the subject of art and design was that it makes a significant contribution to the national economy through the developing creative industries and yet, when viewed through the lens of policy changes to the higher education sector and subject superiority, it does not come out well in comparison. During the author's chairmanship, several aspects emerged that demonstrated an alternative view of how the subject could and should be viewed based on the membership's collective approaches to the subject. These neatly divided into those who believed in the sanctity of the subject and skills based in almost a historical fashion and those who perceived it as a translational subject that ought to be holding its own amongst the STEM subjects. The membership of nearly 80 people was largely equally split between the two emerging themes. The author had a tough task in that membership was falling due to cut backs in university departments and this was a diverse community from those in specialist colleges to those in Russell group universities and all in between.

The real benefit of chairmanship was a unique and easily accessible link to those in senior positions in the higher education sector, the art and design community and to senior ministers in Parliament. This also involved chairing three national conferences, development of a leadership programme, a longitudinal research project on employment and careers and invitations to speak at overseas conferences. However, two of the conferences form the basis of this report as they were concerned in one form or another with what was happening to the so called entrepreneurial university as seen through the eyes of sector colleagues from the perspective of their own institutions.

The first conference aimed to examine the role of HEIs as brokers of benefit between businesses and local economies and to consider the role of industry representatives to HEIs with regard to what was in it for them in terms of impact and funding. This conference took place in a major north of England city that had successfully regenerated

through culture and the creative industries. Central to this had been the part played by the local university Faculty of Art and Design. It was through the university's role as 'anchor' that they were able to bring together many different organisations to establish a creative economy and the concept of a city of learning and creating. Notes made at the time suggested that 'the competitive need was to strengthen advocacy of art and design subjects and the extent to which entrepreneurship as a creative model could be adapted as a trailblazer for other disciplines to follow'. The conference also recommended an 'embedded curriculum model for developing entrepreneurial awareness that is directly linked to creative practice and to develop entrepreneurial mind-sets and behaviours rather than just skills'.

The second conference aimed to look at the art and design sector from those who operate outside of it and encouraged external non-art and design academics to state their case from the outside looking in. This was hard for those inside of the sector to hear. It was not the usual soft appreciation of each other that takes place at conferences and very much typical of the creative sector to find an edge to challenge preconceptions. A focused discussion in the author's notes identified a debate that challenged those who saw their role only as within the academy to 'be part of a collaborative practice, actively participated in by both producers and consumers and that learning environments must reflect the growing convergence of cross disciplinary teams'. Similar notes were made regarding a call for design educators 'to empower students with thinking that inspires them to change the world, why then can't universities do the same and inspire greater entrepreneurial activity'?

6.3 Colloquium

A week long intensive colloquium was held at a one of the UK's premier research universities. This aimed to look at the impact of the entrepreneurial university on the higher education sector across Europe. The colloquium was hosted by a foundation based in Europe and consisted mainly of a group of European entrepreneurial professors. The author had to apply to be part of the group and was successful in the application to join the other selected delegates. The aim of attending was to challenge some of the preconceptions around the concept of the entrepreneurial university as one which had been prevalent for over twenty years but one where the foundation felt there was still scope for development and enhancement to newer and smaller European universities. During the week, the author made notes on a daily and almost hourly basis,

as the content was seen to be important. Several themes emerged from the week as described below.

1) The spin out phenomenon was considered a major factor of success for an entrepreneurial university and important to develop alternative income streams, but there was uncertainty as to whether this was actually happening or was just a myth. Whilst arguing for infrastructure support to create these opportunities, the return on investment was not being realised fast enough to warrant any return on investment. It was noted that the emphasis on spin out was a fallacy but still the content of the colloquium focused on the strategic supervision of university start-ups and spin outs.

2) The role of the future university was considered, with a view to learning by doing the classic art and design pedagogy, appropriated to the needs of a modern business university and the need to 'decriminalise entrepreneurship' as a dirty word, meaning business, instead seeing it as a positive attribute. The notes suggest a veiled threat by academics that the university capacity for institutional policies regarding entrepreneurship is infinite but the reality is only possible at the micro level of the faculty or departments.

3) Commercial decision making is beyond that of the university and should not be seen as part of its work, but the spirit is there in the mission. The mission of an entrepreneurial university should be not for itself but for its students and other clients and wider communities. This gives it a different meaning to that which is often expressed. Innovation, however, is key and it might be that the innovative university is the next trend for universities to adopt.

4) Vicarious learning has a place in the entrepreneurial university as it allows the development of practice through the eyes of another. On the other hand, would self-efficacy be better to develop in students? Rather than hearing successful stories of others, students could be encouraged to produce their own success through the development of self-confidence. The experiences of others could help in providing role models; there was, however, a problem in providing female role models of the external entrepreneurs and this in turn produces a gender issue.

6.4 Visiting professor scheme

The author was invited to be part of a scheme to invite visiting professors of innovation to work within the institution and within two different faculties from her own university. The proposal aimed to bring the best of innovative industry thinking into the university to motivate the next generation of employees for UK knowledge based industries. A network of exchange was proposed that would enable a legacy of learning to be gained and followed throughout the university as a whole. The scheme was to host two visiting professors, both of whom were part of the group of ten entrepreneurs known to the author, to combine and give unique opportunities for cross discipline working whilst sharing innovative features such as links to the enterprise centre and support for new ideas to be commercialised. The scheme was based on an exchange mechanism where all participants in the scheme would be able to gain maximum return for the maximum input they put in.

The wide paradigm shift in changing models of education was noted in the scheme as being important to offer support for innovation and creativity across all disciplines and to offer a blueprint for future practice. The work planned for the scheme involved several innovative features for delivery between the different faculties, all of which would be led by the visiting professor of innovation; these included:

1. Interdisciplinary problem led design challenges.
2. Masterclasses and workshops with mixed groups of students.
3. The development of a system for students to share skills bases for collaborative projects based on a 'crowd funding methodology' but for skills.
4. Funding for advancing good ideas to proof of concept stage.
5. Development of modules linking different disciplines together but with creative thinking underpinning it.
6. Creating a knowledge base that was external to the academic colleagues.

The visiting professor scheme aimed at bringing two entrepreneurs into the university on a funded basis to bring innovation practice into the curriculum. The scheme was useful in setting precedence for the faculty that it could have leadership in this area whilst not directly taking part and supporting other faculties. There was some confusion initially as to its purpose amongst academic staff but it was welcomed by students through the open sharing of skills and ideas. It resulted in a more connected community during the time the entrepreneurs were in the university and became more than just a visiting professor scheme or an entrepreneur in residence scheme, as it provided more cross disciplinary working.

The relationship between faculties that developed as a result of this scheme can be described as being very close and very distant at the same time. The author's notes suggest that the strength of the underlying discipline such as maths or physics, when applied to a specific problem, was hard to move away from in comparison to an ill-defined problem that was more readily accepted by the art and design discipline. What became clear is the apparent dispute in thinking around problem solving from an approach, which looks to have a million ideas for a single problem, which are then refined, rejected, reviewed and developed, to an approach where the problem has all the constraints already articulated. The disparate thinking within the different faculties reinforced the challenges held within the framework of the academic heartland.

6.5 Parliamentary commission

The author was invited to be a founder member of a commission set up by her local MP to engage with the design industry and to set up a series of enquiries into the role design plays in the larger economy. There was a sense that good design costs money but that poor design costs more through ill-conceived products and artefacts and a misplaced sense of value. The commission was set up to challenge existing thoughts following a major cull of quangos that saw many reset themselves as 'enterprising charities'. The first inquiry, following the methodology set out by government, was based on design education and involved many of the country's leading design experts. The inquiry focused on design education from primary school to university and was spurred on by the cuts in education and the creative sector that still remain. The author challenged the oft told story of employers not happy with the learning that takes place in universities with a report based on whether employers were visiting universities to reassure themselves or otherwise that the curriculum has currency and how they would provide entrepreneurial and innovation-led education.

The author's notes identify a great sense of loss at the diminution of design education in schools and the lack of support at higher education levels. One comment recorded by the author said: 'some professors are in despair at the deskilling of the design industry that they see unfolding; one said that we are handing competitive advantage to the Far East on a plate'. In another comment, a fellow commissioner noted that 'design courses have their funding cut and will set back this country significantly which is sheer madness'. The inquiry into design education was also critical of the higher education policy of the time that relied on metrics to define success of a university. In particular, employability

rates for design students were often regarded as weak as they are 'slow to burn' but do not acknowledge the fact that most designers will hold a higher degree and are often in solo freelance careers or with small micro businesses and as such do not feature in the scheme of large employment opportunities.

The inquiry was published and is in the public domain but its impact was probably marginal when other disciplines such as teaching and health subjects were also subjected to the same cuts. However, the author recorded a list of applications that design education can bring to the notion of the well-rounded individual and these include: problem solving, systems thinking, virtuoso skills in a particular technique or craft skill, verbal and visual communication skills, drawing, CAD, ideas generation and development, resourcefulness, etc. These skills are seen to be pertinent skills needed by all the next generation and could be developed further for all disciplines, not just those in creative subjects.

6.6 Conclusion

This chapter acts as important buffer between the observations and analysis of the ten external entrepreneurs and the author's own activities that ensure distance is created in the analysis of the research. This is to avoid being accused of being too close to the research data. The main findings from this chapter emerge around the themes of collaborative practice, coming either from the National Association conference where externals themselves were calling for greater collaboration, or from the Visiting Professor scheme that urged for greater collaboration through the leadership of the external entrepreneurs.

Within the colloquium, it was confirmed that the entrepreneurial university concept had some real challenges but also opportunities that enabled more learning by doing and vicarious learning that saw entrepreneurship as positive. Finally, the Parliamentary commission endorsed the assertion that new knowledge and currency could be found from entrepreneurial relationships. One of the most revealing aspects of this analysis was that vicarious learning, or learning through the eyes of another was seen as positive and reinforces the self-ethnography methodology as being appropriate for this study.

The activities described above enabled a thought process to be utilised from an external point of view rather than succumbing to just an insider researcher viewpoint. This was to create distance and to follow best practice to avoid becoming 'native' as the literature

advises. This position of detachment was used to create a more objective mind-set when reviewing the data and is referred to in the findings chapters that follow. The next chapter introduces the external entrepreneurs and concentrates on the research sub-questions relating to their characteristics, motivation and activities.

CHAPTER 7 - THE ENTREPRENEURS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY WITHIN THE ACADEMIC HEARTLAND OF THE UNIVERSITY

7. 1 Introduction

In answering the primary research question regarding the contribution of the external entrepreneurs to the entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland, it is necessary to explore the sub questions first to enable greater insights into the characteristics and motivations of the external entrepreneurs. The sub questions focused on three main areas. Firstly, who are the entrepreneurs, their characteristics and what attracts them to the university? Secondly, with what entrepreneurial activities do they engage within the academic heartland and, finally, what is the role of these actors in developing the academic entrepreneurship in the academic heartland and how do they further this entrepreneurial relationship. Thus, this chapter introduces the ten external entrepreneurs within the context of the sub-questions to present the first set of insights into the research findings.

The external entrepreneurs all had different backgrounds and approached the Faculty of Art and Design through their own initial 'cold call' contact. Although some of the entrepreneurs knew each other and no doubt this facilitated the first contacts, for others this was not so. The entrepreneurs have been anonymised by referring to them simply by number, E1, E2 etc. This allows for protection of identity. Some references to business interests have been obscured so as to avoid their identification through that method. All entrepreneurs accessed the Faculty of Art and Design at EntUni during 2011-2013 and are introduced in this chapter, as a means of identifying who they are, their characteristics, motivations, and engagement with the faculty. These questions were deemed important in order to understand the role of the external entrepreneur coming into the academic heartland, which would in turn contribute to understanding and answer the main research question. The characteristics of the entrepreneurs were chosen as the starting point to review the data.

The Entrepreneurs' basic characteristics are shown in the chart below in Table 3. This illustrates the core information of who they are and how their basic attributes fit together. As the entrepreneurs were, in effect, all self-selecting, there was no opportunity to ensure a gender mix, but this in itself demonstrates that those who declare themselves entrepreneurs are probably representative of the gender bias, as all are male. The

column, which shows age, was based on observation and an approximation made, or became obvious during the observations; however, most of them fall into an age 50-year-old category, with one younger exception and three who are over 60.

	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5
Age approx.	45-55	45-55	55-60	60+	35-45
Gender	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male
University education	Yes	Yes	Unknown	No	Yes
Business sector	Engineering Health	Investment Education	Lifestyle	Health Lifestyle	Retail Lifestyle
Known to another E	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nationality	British	British	British	British	British
	E6	E7	E8	E9	E10
Age approx.	60+	45-55	60+	30-35	45-55
Gender	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male
University education	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Business sector	Creative Cultural	Engineering Investment	Creative Cultural	Lifestyle Retail	Creative Cultural
Known to another E	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Nationality	British	European	British	British	European

Table 3. Entrepreneur Characteristics

The popular assertion that claims that entrepreneurs are self-made millionaires from an early age and not university graduates is not borne out by this table. Out of the ten only two and possibly three did not go to university; this shows a high proportion of graduate level entrepreneurs. Perhaps not surprisingly, given the faculty discipline, the business sectors vary but tend towards lifestyle, creative and cultural and retail sectors, with two in investment and two in engineering. It is interesting to note that six of the entrepreneurs knew of each other and possibly, although it was not information that was sought or observed, had recommended each other to contact the faculty. What this does show is

the network of entrepreneurs in the locality; four were not known to the others. Only two were from outside of the UK and not unsurprisingly had contacts with those in the region.

In really understanding who the entrepreneurs are, the data that was collected after each observation was interrogated to find areas of relevance to the research questions. Each of the ten entrepreneurs is discussed in turn below, in relation to the three sub questions deriving from the literature on the academic heartland (Clark, 2008), and divided into three sections for ease of reading.

1. *Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations (relates to sub-question 1)*
2. *Engagement and activities (relates to sub-question 2)*
3. *Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland (relates to sub-question 3)*

7.2 The Ten Entrepreneurs

7.2.1 Entrepreneur 1 (E1)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

E1 is a tall thin white man who was always immaculately dressed, if a little lacking in style. He had a pleasant personality, but with an underlying arrogance that became more prominent once, he became more comfortable with the faculty and in particular with students. He is clearly very intelligent with a great deal of self-belief and determination who was not prepared to accept anything as a problem and demonstrated typical entrepreneurial self-belief. Characteristically, he presented himself as a hard-nosed business type and where problems were presented, he saw them as a challenge to be solved quickly and effectively. This attitude was acknowledged early on in the relationship, as he became more serious and not generous in his knowledge, understanding or capacity to engage with students or staff, but very clear on his business needs. He was happy to experiment with ideas to support his activity, engage in different ways, and saw experimentation as part of his approach to risk.

E1 showed a great deal of empathy for the local area and the support he was given on his way up as a businessman. The author noted that she always felt uneasy in his company, partly his height and partly his manner, which was not conducive to feeling comfortable. Because of this, she suggests that this might also demonstrate a more

volatile character, who might be very difficult to work for, but he managed to suppress this during his visits to the University. He can easily be described as a serial entrepreneur who was interested in pursuing the relationship but not through the periphery offices.

E1 was very self-assured and knew exactly what he wanted when he came into the Faculty. He had little consideration for the academic year and the learning environment which he was entering and, as a consequence, he soon lost interest in the nitty gritty detail and handed the project over to a marketing manager.

2. Engagement and activities

E1 approached the author (as Faculty Dean) directly following a recommendation from the Vice Chancellor who had met E1 on a number of occasions. E1 was interested in developing a fashion brand based on the heritage of a company he had recently acquired. His previous business interests had been in health care and engineering and as he is a highly skilled businessman who had received various honours for his business ingenuity, he seemed to believe that this would carry through into the fashion industry. His background in business was something he demonstrated when he proclaimed *'I'm from business which is more 'about' the work, now I'm interested in a business that is more 'for' the work, so more about lifestyle, rather than cash'*. His motivation for entering the faculty was partly born from the need to find talent to help his projects and partly from the fact that he wanted to follow suit from others, such as Ferrari, Porsche, Barbour, Hunter etc. who had retail lines based on associated clothing lines from heritage collections. Following a personal hobby, he brought a small-scale engineering/motor works and with this came an interesting archive of material from the 1960s which he believed the Faculty's fashion students could help him with in designing a related fashion collection.

A series of meetings at E1's company headquarters followed with academic staff who were interested in the entrepreneurial opportunities for themselves as a research project. Following the initial discussions, a selected group of students were chosen to develop a fashion range. Students undertook this project as a 'live brief' with the winners chosen to develop the range to manufacture with a small fashion show at the company to decide which to put into production. It was at this point that the relationship went from a friendly 'live brief' project to one of tension regarding mass manufacturing of clothing and the costs involved in trans-national manufacturing. The project ended by E1 employing two students directly after graduation so he could 'control' their work and develop his understanding of clothing manufacturing. His advice to the students was *'not to look for the million-dollar deal, as it takes at least seven years to become an overnight success'*;

and it became clear he was motivated by demonstrating his own success and brilliance in front of the students. It transpired later that one student was a distant relation and she has remained with the company doing all sorts of marketing related work, whilst the other student was 'let go'.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

During the relationship between the Faculty and E1, there was little in terms of this relationship being about one where extensions to knowledge or funding opportunities were ever going to be developed. Income for his core business was more of an interest than in supporting the university and in fact the failed attempts at the business venture to bring revenue into the faculty was squashed at an early stage and there was little else in furthering the entrepreneurial relationship with the faculty. However, a donation to a university appeal was forthcoming, and although never mentioned as such, the author likes to think this was in part a reward for the efforts that had been made.

In developing academic entrepreneurialism in the faculty, E1 did not accept the academic landscape and saw his role as one where he could 'make anything work' as a businessman. He was not interested in investing in the academic or university cultures but thought it would be an easy way to gain some of the skills that he needed, namely design and manufacturing. At first, it seemed a genuine desire to help some students through live projects and eventual employment but in reality, it did not work out that way although he did employ two students at good graduate salaries to begin with. However, the later revelation that one was a relation, albeit distant, soured the original understanding of genuine help. There was no further contact with the faculty, once the project was completed and he mentioned to the author that he would be more at home with different faculties such as business or engineering, and, as such, maybe lessons were learnt as to how business skills translate, or not, to other sectors.

7.2.2 Entrepreneur 2 (E2)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

There was a genuine desire from E2 to help students and staff with business ideas to reach their potential, either by testing and development or to see ideas move to market, but only after he tested building his own business model first, which was based on university spin outs and developments. He was focused on investment and angel development/dragons den type activity and he was motivated by the potential to explore a model that he had developed that would be a fool proof way of testing to see if a market

idea had any value. E2 was always very controlled in his speaking and attire, and was never exuberant in any way, which at times gave an impression of being very characteristic of entrepreneurial behaviour. Interestingly he presented an image of wealth and success but there were never any real signs of this. The author interpreted his comments around developing pilots of activity and needing dragon den type successes as his desperation to become the entrepreneur persona he had developed for himself. He revealed at one stage that he had had a business partner whom he had fallen foul of and it seems that might have soured his demeanour.

He was attracted to the Faculty as he believed that introductions to graduate students would enable a bypass of the KTO and that he could fully test his entrepreneurial model. The Faculty did introduce the head of KTO who was generally quite interested in what he proposed but he did not take the introduction or offer of further testing beyond the faculty any further.

E2's motivations for working with the faculty were completely based on investment strategies between start-ups and angel investors. Because of his approach and demeanour there was limited trust initially from the faculty but there was a small creep of interest once E2 started to explain a bit more about his entrepreneurial model's potential, which in turn helped to create a 'modified belief system' (Clark, 2008) amongst academic staff. This attraction, however, was short lived, as there was limited scope to further investigate with staff and he felt his model would be better trialled in London.

2. Engagement and activity

E2 was introduced to the author (as Dean of Faculty) through a member of staff who had engaged with E2 in another occupation. E2 contacted EntUni having made several similar contacts with other arts based universities and had some success with one regarding post graduate students. The main aim of the engagement was to introduce the faculty to a means of analysing potential graduate ideas that might mature into start-ups, through a particular 'model' he had devised. E2 was familiar with the perceived failure rate of start-ups and E2 had devised a method of looking at raw student ideas and evaluating them for potential commercial success. E2 was looking to utilise this concept with the university's arts students and potentially seeing if he could adapt a model for other faculties to use.

The activity used a series of relentless *post it* notes to attribute value (commercial or otherwise) to an idea or a product. This method holds copyright and the author cannot

explain the process in detail but it involved constant referral to different scenarios and stakeholders to see if the product/idea would be successful. Written as such it sounds quite simplistic but in practice, was a highly complex and sophisticated model of attribution. The issue was not to give the model away for free but to trial it with student/staff ideas, with the scope of taking to market the model and potential share of equity. The snag was that the faculty was expected to pay up front for the pilot model to the tune of £7,000. A very brief one-day version was explained to faculty members for free, but the interest from E2 fizzled out once he realised that the faculty was not able to commit the sort of money he was after. He was able, however, to work with one particular member of staff through another organisation and successfully realised the new product but it failed to gain the commercial support it needed to take to market. E2 was keen to demonstrate and argue that the work of the faculty was a constant repetition but he could offer something new and innovative to the faculty in terms of process. *'If you always design things from your own perspective you just design for yourself'*, but his model would change and add value to the teaching style of which he was critical.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

E2 was proposing an interesting idea to the faculty that had potential to develop academic entrepreneurialism and develop a relationship that could pay financial and knowledge-based dividends. Although the model had potential for spin out, it was too tightly guarded to be any real use to the faculty. The risk was also high in terms of initial financial outlay and the faculty's ability to spend funds in this way, but it did demonstrate the tension between the academic heartland and the KTO, and tested a relationship in a way that went beyond student projects. It was an interesting idea to get early purchase on student/graduate/staff ideas, and would fit neatly with the entrepreneurial university concept and could be linked to the idea of an expanded periphery.

Interestingly, the model that E2 had devised might have had more success had he gone in the first place to the knowledge transfer office and benefitted from their ability to provide some seed corn funding either through tying him into the university a bit more through some connection with his model, or through straight funding. The issue was that the faculty did not have any scope or leeway to make these sorts of speculative investments. Whilst both parties had a great deal of respect for each other and there was some mutual understanding of the inherent ideas led nature of the faculty's staff and students to come up with potential ideas, it was possibly a bit early in the faculty's capacity to deal with this. E2 was engaging and enthusiastic when at the university but was too busy with other investment projects to be a regular communicator and, as such,

the small buy in enabled was quickly lost through long stretches of time in between. There was some scepticism, given the nature of the faculty, that E2 was after a '*fast buck*' not only for himself and the model but also a method; as one member of staff said '*disguised as support*' for early engagement with potential successful start-ups.

7.2.3 Entrepreneur 3 (E3)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

It was observed that E3 was ostentatiously rich, with dyed hair and a love of motor racing. He had a pleasant but possibly shallow personality. His attraction to the Faculty had come via the University and he was keen to get involved in trends with new business start-ups, particularly those concerned with alternative energy. He characteristically demonstrated impatience and seemed to want quick and easy solutions without any real understanding of the mission of the university. Or indeed why students and staff were not ready to drop everything to support his ideas and suggestions. Despite this, he was still very much attracted to the Faculty, as he enjoyed the student outputs, from fashion to graphics and product design. He felt he could relate to this more than to the outputs of other faculties, which might have been why he found others difficult to work with.

E3 displayed entrepreneurial characteristics in that he was very appealing to the students, who found him engaging and as curious a character as the author did. He was very engaged and a regular visitor who kept in contact via email when he was not available in person. E3 was the only external entrepreneur to offer reciprocal and regular visits to his offices which were refurbished old mill buildings. He had originally approached the KTO offices but with little success, which was unusual but maybe because his main interests lay in a lifestyle business rather than anything, considered to be more serious. He was motivated to try and ask for student led idea design concepts that would keep his good but ailing business alive in a very competitive retail market. He was keen to make fast decisions, but impatient as to how these might come about and had very little interest in the environment of the university in which he was trying to work. However, once he was committed, he was honourable to continue, although he made it clear it was not as he had expected. The characteristic of being comfortable with risk taking became obvious when he talked about his other business interests beyond his core business.

2. Engagement and activity

E3 contacted the author after several '*frustrating*' (his words) attempts at making contact with the university through other faculties and the KTO. He emailed the author and a meeting was set up to discuss ideas and the engagement that he wanted with the faculty. He was interested in giving design opportunities to student from his business, which focused on leisure /lifestyle accessories for the female and sports retail market. His opening line to the author was '*I love design*', as if that was a credible opening for engagement of this type.

The market he was dealing in was low cost with outlets in the high street and as concessions in larger supermarkets. He had inherited the business from his father but now with significant reduction in manufacturing most of which was now done overseas. One other smaller operation he owned was based in the East Midlands. He owned branding rights to several major brands which were added to the accessories lines.

His aim was to engage with the faculty via a competition for students to come up with new styles that could be manufactured overseas and with potential employment as design staff. There was clearly a get 'in and out' quick mentality and one of wanting something quickly from the students to solve some product line issues, but eventually a considered project was set up with a group of students which fitted in with the curriculum. The author and the course leader made visits to his premises, a disused mill, which appeared rather tatty and run down, with little investment in resources for design work. E3 offered small amount of prize money (£500) for the winning ideas and was part of the assessment process. He later employed one student on a permanent basis. No further contact was made, as it seemed to the author he both did not appreciate the time and curriculum needs or the rhythm of the academic year, and was after a much quicker solution to his business problem.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

E3 was keen to try and make a fast product adjustment to his business range without really having to really invest any of himself (his knowledge or business acumen) into the relationship with the faculty and was not able to let go or hand over to anyone else. E3 seemed to be running his business on a shoestring whilst trying to keep up with the other entrepreneurs in the vicinity that he knew. In terms of the relationship, he was very engaged when the project was occurring but it did not continue once the project was finished. He never showed any real sense of a desire to help students get experience but was successful in employing one graduate who seemed happy to work in this environment. There was no further contact with the faculty after the initial project

although his name was mentioned many times as potential for work based learning activities, internships, etc., which never materialised. He seemed to display a view that the faculty was a provider of design talent that he could access cheaply in comparison to the professionals and he was not concerned with the development of a return to the faculty in any way.

7.2.4 Entrepreneur 4 (E4)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

Fun loving E4 had a zest for the finer things in life including flash cars, but underneath this persona was a very clear business brain. E4 had made his money by selling the main business that he had grown but was keen to keep developing markets and in supporting new business start-ups. He was keen to pursue ideas and innovations in products and lifestyle, mainly for markets concerned with young people. He was keen to talk to students about his own background and was offering support for anyone who showed an interest in introducing new products, whether they were commercial or not. He would describe his life as one where he could not stop himself from investing and developing businesses. E4 came across as very interesting if a little self-obsessed, and self-styled as the grandfather of all regional entrepreneurs in how he tries to help others. His main attraction to the faculty was to see others succeed with his help and then acknowledgement of the role he played.

He was motivated by a keen interest in design and its impact in the wider economy as a competitive force for advantage and keen to see his home town have a world class design faculty. Occasionally E4 would purchase art work directly from students for his own purposes and saw this as an added benefit for close working with the faculty. He had characteristics as expected from an entrepreneur and a self-made millionaire and liked to talk up his connections, but used this for the wider benefit of helping and supporting young people with business and enterprise skills. In this respect, he was very closely linked to the incubation unit and the KTO and a believer that *'to teach something you have to be one'* (entrepreneur) and that academics were the *'last of the honest brokers'* who could act as facilitators and negotiators without fear of industrial competition.

2. Engagement and activity

E4 became a very regular visitor to the faculty and he was first introduced to the author by the head of the knowledge transfer office and subsequently in joint meetings with the

Vice Chancellor. E4 had a keen interest in design and having made a fortune in a non-related business, he was interested in enabling design-led businesses to flourish and this was the basis of his activity with the faculty. He became very engaged through a formal relationship as a visiting professor and then entrepreneur in residence and was instrumental in developing the incubator facility.

He became a great friend of the faculty, particularly interested in product design and fashion courses and as a result, he provided many 'live briefs' with funding to those particular courses, and was willing to tell his story to students. The activities however were always lightweight but several members of staff were engaged in designing products that were then developed into commercial propositions for the new business ventures. He gave his time freely, but rarely any financial value other than the odd prize money for the live briefs.

E4 was larger than life with a great sense of self-importance but in a manner that was not difficult and would often refer to his early start in life and his lack of university education and wanting to catch up on time he had missed in his youth. A great believer in the town and gown and would introduce many business people to the faculty. This in itself helped to raise the profile of the faculty and the institution locally and regionally.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

E4's relationship with the faculty was positive but eventually not that fruitful. There was a lot of bluster and a need for his ego to be stroked, but nevertheless the relationship was longstanding over many years and he got to know faculty well and was always proud to support the faculty as best he could. During this time, he learnt quite a bit about fashion and product design, but he was always more interested in product for business ideas and fashion as an entertainment. He had a genuine desire to help the university as a whole and did a great deal for its overall reputation. He provided a good commitment for informing others of our value and worth, but little in the way of resources for the faculty financially.

E4 understood the various roles in the university from the head of KTO to those in the faculty, but maybe not defined as an expanded periphery. He would pick and choose the faculties he wished to work with. He had little understanding of the main role of the faculty, and its academic responsibilities, but would work around whatever the author told him. Importantly he was very keen to 'give back'.

7.2.5 Entrepreneur 5 (E5)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

E5 was a large man, with a casual high street style; he had always been employed in large companies. He had risen to senior positions in the food retail industry, but E5 was keen to go it alone and saw working with the university, through an introduction by E4, as a positive way to set his new ventures on the right design footing. He was motivated to make design the thing that would give him competitive advantage. He was not willing to pay for it at the market rate, and this came as a surprise to him, but he was eventually won over. E5 had an entrepreneurial spirit but was always in the shadow of those more successful than him, but nevertheless liked the trappings of success. However, despite this characteristic, he was very thoughtful, as his own money was at stake, although the sense of self-belief was clear.

2. Engagement and activity

E5's Initial contact with the faculty was made via E4. E5 was interested in academic support for a business venture he was pursuing which involved changing one form of retail to become a destination and not just a functional point as it currently was. He was keen to tap into the 'yummy mummy' culture of women who had money and time to kill and would go destination shopping for particularly high-class retail outlets. The aim was to encourage a destination shopping experience through rural market foods shops and exquisite coffee/deli type experience and buy other essential goods as an afterthought; this would be alongside petting farms, or play parks in beautiful scenery. Most of the retail outlets were on busy A roads in tourist areas and the welcome stop could be seen as a destination for locals as well as a welcome relief for tourist motorists. The engagement with the faculty was to initiate a design project for staff to come up with interior design solutions that could be replicated as more retail outlets were brought up. The initial interest was very positive but soon became clouded when the fees were suggested for this type of design work. Academic staff in the faculty are all practising designers and although this could also be classed as a research, project staff were aware of fees that would be charged in professional practices, whereas E5 thought this could '*just be research*' and not command a fee. Eventually a fee agreement was reached and work commenced. Although at one point a royalty or equity deal was discussed this never came to fruition. The relationship with the academic staff was positive and E5 was able to provide lectures to students on emerging retail futures and his experiences with large supermarket chains. The relationship with the faculty ended when E5 went to work for

E1! Although he maintained his own business interests, he liked the faculty as he *'likes creatives, they are more at the market end, and not the fuzzy front end – I get that'*.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

Although E5 was friendly and pleasant, it took a long time for him to understand the role of an academic, and particularly one working in an art and design faculty. The University's slow decision making led to some frustrations with the project, but he was honourable and it did eventually come to fruition, which helped the academic staff understand his role in relationship to the KTO, which he sought out to support him. The project was completed and he moved on to work (back as an employee) with E1. His business ventures eventually folded, but he has enough tenacity to try again and it would not surprise the Dean if he called in again in an attempt to make another relationship deal. The author believed that E5 was initially in a relationship with the faculty as it offered a way to access cheap talent, but he was more particularly interested in working with staff than students.

7.2.6 Entrepreneur 6 (E6)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

E6 had always worked within the creative industries, and being a self-made man, was motivated to explain his story as a way of gaining access to new talent. He was keen on all aspects of the creative industries although his work was predominantly with the advertising agency world. He was conscious that he had no formal training, and therefore was fairly humble in his approach. E6 had gained a reputation for having the best impact for his work with a diverse range of products and key accounts in many key cities across the world. He understood and was attracted by the fact that new and young talent going into his company was a key facet in remaining at the top of his game. E6 was probably seen as the favourite external entrepreneur, as he was generous in spirit and time and would advise anyone who needed advice for a special pitch or business idea to always *'wear your lucky pants!'*

E6 was not motivated by what the terminology meant but he did eventually understand what an entrepreneurial university might mean and what it could do for both faculty and students. In gaining an understanding of the entrepreneurial concept, he was attracted to the VC's vision for innovative ideas and interdisciplinary interests. The support from the KTO in gaining funding to support a visiting professorship was an acknowledgment from the steering core of his value and usefulness although he was always slightly wary,

as he was not considered 'conventional' in the entrepreneurial sense compared to, say, the way E4 or E7 might be.

He was characterised by understanding that risk taking and fast decision making was a key component to being better than his competitors and used this to influence students and faculty in their way of thinking. To motivate students he would often quote the lead singer of the Grateful Dead as to what is really needed to stand out in the crowd: *'it's not about being the best of the best but being the only one who does what you do'*.

2. Engagement and activity

E6's long standing relationship with the faculty and with the previous dean was enhanced with the arrival of the new dean, the author. E6 was prominent in the creative industries and very fond of the university, having previously agreed to an honorary doctorate for his work with the university and the creative sector. His engagement was initially based on 'live projects' and he gradually moved onto more entrepreneurial work, with prize money and internships on offer. He was always good value, as he was a very engaging person with plenty of life experience he was willing to divulge to students, and interested in gaining students' perceptions of his work. He was always encouraging and enticing students to change their mindset by asking them to *'attempt it (his project) as if you cannot fail'* and statements such as *'can I grab your mind and have a share of it, to let you know what is possible'*. E6 used his role to really promote entrepreneurial thinking and working outside of his mainstream industry, as he was keen for students to mix with others from different disciplines. He was a great believer in multi- and inter- disciplinary working as a way of sparking new ideas and innovative thinking. He was very keen to induce innovation as a thinking tool as well as having commercial potential so nothing was ever off limits. E6 was unknown to the other entrepreneurs and he brought with him a creative freshness which seemed more genuine than some of the others referred to in this study.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

E6 was very keen to be involved and have a supportive relationship with the faculty. He was incredibly generous in his support both with time and his own money. He provided opportunities for students in a way that ensured they all benefitted. He did this by giving lectures, support tutorials and competitions where everyone was a winner. On one occasion, he was so impressed by the work students had done, he gave everyone a £10! The relationship with the academic heartland was largely through students rather than staff, but they equally felt very valued by his acknowledgement of their work. The

relationship grew over time and he became a respected visiting professor and one where E6 really wanted to give back rather than just take. He understood the potential of business start-ups and finding alternative income streams to support the theoretical models of the entrepreneurial university concept, but was more interested in the work of the faculty, as the academic heartland.

7.2.7 Entrepreneur 7 (E7)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

E7 was always extremely smartly dressed, always wearing a suit of the finest fabrics and well cut, which demonstrated his character. He was always smart, sharp and to the point. He has little in the way of small talk but this might have been because English was not his native tongue. He had always been in major engineering corporations and took to roles that were looking for new business ventures or take over opportunities and internal innovations in corporate organisations. E7 was business savvy with international experience, not quite fitting the description of an entrepreneur but more of a corporate intrapreneur. However, he was attracted to working with universities generally. During the engagement with the faculty, he left the corporate world to invest in his own lifestyle start-up businesses, where he always seemed as keen to learn for himself as well as giving knowledge to others and this gave him the motivation to engage with the faculty on a longer term basis.

E7 was characteristically willing to take risks and make quick decisions and used to working at a very senior level, but he was very aware of the time that decisions take to come to fruition when working for global corporations, and to some extent found the university culture would move quite quickly if the Vice Chancellor was behind the idea.

2. Engagement and activity

E7 was introduced to the faculty through a third party and the Vice Chancellor. He was initially reluctant, as he did not really know what to expect from an art school environment, having previously only had university experience in engineering and the sciences. His first engagement was to give a talk to product design students but he was soon interested in other disciplines, in particular textiles and fashion. His opening line was to '*stop entrepreneurship as being only available on the TV*', in response to the Dragon's Den series on television. He actively worked with all students in the faculty who were interested in innovation, as this was his main interest. E7 worked entrepreneurially

but for big corporations and was used to seeking out talent and in particular new enterprises that had potential for buyout. E7's main engagement with the faculty was largely to do with setting up design challenges that would translate into competitions and he would judge alongside others.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

It was a very awkward relationship at first, and the author was very conscious that this was a significant relationship for the university as well as the faculty. At first the faculty tried to find allied subjects to his main concerns such as product design and innovation in textiles, but after a while E7 found the work of the faculty interesting in terms of innovation and ideas generation. The relationship remained awkward but pleasant, but his personality was very intense at all times. He undertook his own research when visiting the university to ensure he could keep himself and his venture opportunities open which the author found compromising at times, but nevertheless was probably more of the type of entrepreneurial relationship that was needed in the academic heartland. E7 was probably the most aware of all the entrepreneurs of the relationship between business start-ups and a university as he had global experience of this, although perhaps not in the art and design arena. However, he eventually saw this as useful for his lifestyle businesses.

7.2.8 Entrepreneur 8 (E8)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

E8 is very interested in the arts and culture, and had built a sound business base after many years' experience of gaining public funding to support creative and cultural interests. He developed a business culture to ensure success and sustainability that relied on a private sector mentality and so was unique amongst the entrepreneurs. He would more appropriately be called an intrapreneur for his organisation. Always polite, humble and attentive, which gave him a demeanour that was very different to the other entrepreneurs, this style betrayed a very active promoter of young talent. E8 had received many national honours that he was grateful to receive but had never actively sought and this is typical of his character. He was very motivated to support his locality and his local university whilst also understanding its mission quite clearly. He had an arts education but had accidentally fallen into being one of the country's most outstanding but unassuming arts practitioners. He characteristically was a quick decision maker but was often slow to act on his decisions because of the link with the public sector.

2. Engagement and activity

The author made the first contact which was a result of needing to mend a previously broken relationship involving the former dean of faculty. E8 was very accommodating and willing to engage with shared understanding and beliefs that something positive could come from the relationship. He initially agreed to a joint project with students but after a while a formal agreement was signed to enable his organisation to share benefits with the university. Joint projects emerged naturally over a period of time which included the author being invited to be part of a national steering group, and developing a joint doctoral programme, and an internship model for arts based students. This was an important move as most of the external entrepreneurs had been very much design based as most saw this as a discipline that would enable commercial potential. By contrast, E8 saw the activity as being arts based but within the concept of entrepreneurship, this was interesting to develop as it led to concepts of innovation and experimentation that come from a different creative mind-set.

E8 had been very entrepreneurial in his time, having developed major cultural organisations over a period of time and had enabled a visitor and tourist culture to emerge at a time when other industries were struggling or shutting down. E8 had developed arts practice as a serious opportunity for emerging artists and worked with the faculty to engage both enterprise and study together but only for those at the highest levels of academic engagement. This he saw as a role he could contribute to as more junior levels (BA Hons) were still learning their craft in his view and those at doctoral level were in the experimentation phase, in that technique learnt earlier would enable them to be really creative and innovative. He saw '*creativity at the problem-solving level and not just the ideas level*'.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

From the outset, there was a great deal of trust and engagement from E8 with mutual benefits and shared beliefs for all parties. He shared understanding with the faculty from the beginning probably because the ideas of both the author and E8 were of a similar nature and based on the arts industry, so there was an immediate connection. He shared an ambition that both the university and the institution would benefit from shared collaborations particularly as the university was becoming more prominent, and would make a clear link between the academic heartland and the university. Initially there were slow beginnings, but developed into great foundations and are still returning on the investment made in terms of time and culture within a very positive relationship. Little

was done that involved any financial return and all collaborations were formed on trust and mutual and shared benefits.

7.2.9 Entrepreneur 9 (E9)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

E9 was the youngest of the entrepreneurs and was very hip and trendy in comparison to the other external entrepreneurs and very much in tune with students and young talent, which in turn motivated him to get involved with the faculty. Although E9 was an alumnus of the product design course, the business sector of his company was retail and lifestyle, particularly interior design products. He characterised his business culture as one of experimentation, and was an example of someone at the beginning of the entrepreneurial career rather than at the end. This was an important variant for the faculty. He characteristically demonstrated that he was at the beginning of his entrepreneurial career and, with the confidence of youth, had nothing to lose from the engagement with the faculty. E9 would speak often about wanting to create his own academy or talent pipeline for his business, as he was very aware of the need to find the right personnel to support his business ambitions if they were going to be successful. He was always a keen supporter of the other activities the faculty did, such as exhibitions and shows, and this attracted him to work closely with the faculty.

2. Engagement and activity

E9 was introduced to the author through the faculty alumni office; he was an ex-student who had gone on to become a well-known local young businessman. His main engagement was one as a motivational speaker to students initially. He demonstrated that business start-up was possible in the locality and that success would only come if you could '*adapt or you would die*'. He always had a mind-set that would be to '*do things better*'. Latterly, he became more involved in student presentations as an external visitor, and then eventually became a key supporter in terms of business engagement and knowledge transfer with the faculty staff. E9 engaged students on internships and academic staff in joint research projects. He was a great supporter of the faculty, which he claimed had given him the confidence to develop his business. The engagement was always regular, although without the same gravitas as some of the more mature entrepreneurs. He was enthusiastic and keen to be involved.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

E9 developed a positive relationship that developed over time and one that would pay dividends, as he was keen to employ creative students in his business. He was supportive of the faculty and those members of staff from the faculty that he remembers teaching him, which gave the relationship a different spin. He was keen on giving back, but with a sense of a developing a future relationship.

7.2.10 Entrepreneur 10 (E10)

1. Entrepreneurial characteristics, attraction and motivations

E10's interests were in the creative and cultural industries, with particular expertise in the built environment, new advanced manufacturing and place making. E10 was similar to E7 in that his nationality often hid his real character. However, once he was known, he was very charming, if slightly distant at times, as if thinking of other things. E10's main motivation was pressing for a paid role for himself within the university as well as trying to contribute to the greater good. Ideally he would have preferred to have been doing business at an American university but found himself at EntUni in an environment that was slightly alien to him. However, he warmed eventually. EntUni was keen to engage with him for a variety of reasons and eventually gave him a visiting professor role but this was short lived as he moved on to a more prestigious university. E10 was the most status conscious of all of the external entrepreneurs and in particular the reputation (even though good!) of the institution he was engaging with.

2. Engagement and activity

E10 was introduced to the author and the head of KTO through E7. He had a very engaging personality that was difficult to turn down, but with a range of expertise that was directly relevant to one of the courses in the faculty, and for which he had an international reputation, particularly for those in the same industry. His engagement from the outset, however, was one where the mutual benefits were difficult to understand. It seemed that they were for his interests only and thus the relationship always seemed one-sided. He had, through E7 secured considerable funding to work with graduate students at a US institution. It had claimed some remarkable work that had commercial potential and was now being put into practice.

A change of CEO at the host company meant that E10's work in the US was to finish and he was looking for a similar 'deal' in the UK. He thought the faculty might benefit from not only the model he had used in the US but that it would put the faculty on the international map – all of which was true, with the exception that the faculty could not

find the equivalent amount of money to that which he had been given in the US. The amount of money would have been the equivalent to £40,000 and there was little guarantee of any return, so this was not realised. E10 did develop the relationship by giving some guest lectures and some work with students, but was looking more for a financial arrangement upfront before departing too much of his experience. He was made a fractional professor, which enabled some REF returns to be made and an engagement with the faculty on a more traditional basis.

3. Overview and analysis of relationship to the academic heartland

E10 was Interesting and feisty, although at times not dissimilar to E8, as there was a great deal of natural chemistry because of his subject matter. E10 was interested in the faculty and was willing to add his expertise to develop its reputation, but at the same time he was a difficult external contributor in that he was always looking to his own financial situation first and this made the relationship difficult to maintain. He did not continue as a fractional professor for long and the relationship dwindled.

7.3 Conclusions

In this section I bring together the findings from above to answer the research sub-questions of the characteristics of the external entrepreneurs, alongside their engagement and activity and the relationship with the academic heartland.

7.3.1 The characteristics of the Entrepreneurs

The ten entrepreneurs all have different backgrounds, but an overview of the vital statistics shows that they are all male, and are aged from 30–70 years. However, the majority, six, were over 45 while one was under 35 and three were over 60. Those that were over sixty had declared themselves at some point that they were that age, and the one under 35 similarly. However, for the other entrepreneurs all ages are approximate. Interestingly, seven of the ten had been to university (albeit one at an art school which would have been classed as a higher education institution in today's terminology) and only one had a 'left school at 14 and had made good' story so often promoted with famous entrepreneurs such as Richard Branson. Two did not disclose the information at any time, but the majority had a higher education qualification.

A range of business sectors presented themselves from engineering, health to lifestyle and those working in the creative or cultural industries. Most of the ten, with the exception

of one, had had a main business interest which had dominated their careers and, once successful, had branched out into other sectors, largely following a passion or an interest. Two therefore were in engineering, two in health care sectors, and two had moved into investment directly linked to angel investment for new start-ups. One was in education as a commercial private sector, and four had interests that can be described as lifestyle which were following trends or fashions, particularly at the lower end of the market. Two were in retail but mainly alternatives to the high street, and three were in the creative industries, with one being described as cultural and not for profit.

Some of the ten entrepreneurs were known to each other. Four knew each other well and could be part of the local business 'mafia' as it was known; two of this four had worked directly together, although it was never clear as to whether this influenced their decision to contact the faculty. Two others had known each other and had worked together in Europe and this was a major factor in recommending a contact to the faculty. Four were completely independent of the ten and contacted the faculty directly.

The ten all displayed the characteristics of entrepreneurs regarding self-belief and were able to recount their success stories and how they got there, including failures along the way. Most displayed (although not so significantly in E7 and E2) a 'can do' attitude which they were keen to display to students. This review showed that their role or engagement in this section as to who they are was 'to **pose**'. In other words, to utilise their personality, their attitudes, interests and passions to pose to students and staff a position based on their own characteristics.

7.3.2 The entrepreneurs and engagement

The entrepreneurs all entered the university via the Faculty of Art and Design, and can all be said to have the traditional characteristics of an entrepreneur. Some had contact with the vice chancellor who had recommended the contact, others knew of each other and some were direct cold calls; in this respect, it was about 50/50 as to whether they were aligned to the steering core (e.g. senior staff of the university). All had made significant amounts of money, largely in the millions of pounds' region, through a series of business and investment opportunities, and all seemed to be guided by their own self-interest from an early age and in this respect all were trying to 'repay' in some way, albeit very differently, and to make a difference in some way. The majority were offering to engage students in different ways. Either a project to benefit from new and young ideas, or offering benefit through the tradition of learning by doing and live projects often used

in art and design teaching, or offering a package of work to be undertaken semi commercially. Two were very clearly 'giving back' and wanting to use their expertise and experience in an influential way. One was very clear in trying to understand what makes education tick and if he could improve on the model itself by developing more private based enterprise or entrepreneurial schemes and was looking to pilot ideas. Most of all they showed interest and excitement with working with the faculty. This rarely faulted: with each visit, the passion was clear.

Their academic field of knowledge is noted above but most were relying on the support of the Faculty of Art and Design via their offer of engagement links to lifestyle businesses rather than any scientific or research based activities. This might be due to an interpretation of what the faculty presented through teaching methods, or because of the embryonic research agenda in the discipline. The business sectors varied, as did the purpose of their interactions. All had business interests in the north and south of the country and most were operating internationally, with two being based permanently in Europe. In reviewing the section on what they offer, through their engagement, motivations and attraction to the faculty it was very much about assuming a role that was to do with **progress**. They needed to progress from something they came in with and develop it and to accept the function of their engagement as ascribed to them, or more often, one they assumed.

7.3.3 Entrepreneurial role, culture and relationship

With all the entrepreneurs, risk and uncertainty, as identified in the literature review, plays a continuing role in all their lives. All demonstrated passion about their background, their story and their success, although some were more flamboyant than others who were more serious characters. All had remarkable self-belief, all fulfilling the traditional traits of entrepreneurs as identified in the literature. Most understandably had little awareness of the concept of the entrepreneurial university per se, but most probably understood the sentiment of the university to distinguish itself from others and to take a proactive stance in developing the links with industry and student engagement.

Some of the roles, with E4 as a good example, were incredibly positive and supportive, took quite a bit of time nursing egos but in the end were really quite fruitless for the faculty, although they had a very strong link to the Vice Chancellor. E4 in particular seemed keen to go 'with the craze' affecting universities to find start up talent to rescue local economies. Others who had a very direct offer, such as E6 and E8, provided

opportunities and guidance to staff and students who overtime became respected visitors with significant expertise to work with in a collaborative manner.

Some were very good at bringing in current thinking to the faculty, again using E6 as an example, which highlighted some deficit potentially in academic staff but also complemented the staff team with a different view on things. The role they played here was about **performance**, in some ways performing with knowledge gained elsewhere or performing based on their own beliefs and behaviours, but in a setting different from the one they normally inhabited.

In reviewing these descriptions and the links to the research questions, roles were emerging from the entrepreneurs in relation to understanding how their interactions with the academic heartland were developing. The first role identified was to **Pose**, meaning that they brought their own personality to the faculty and presented this to students and staff. From this the author identified attitude as being a common feature, an attitude to do with success and not failure, whatever happens, in which risk is embraced as seen in comments such as 'adapt or die' (E9) or 'I'm from business' (E1) or 'what would you do if you cannot fail' (E6). The entrepreneurs saw the faculty particularly the studio set up, as being a collaborative space without boundaries in which to present their personality. Interests and passions were displayed regardless of any sense of correctness. Having made money, they now wanted to make a difference (although the difference often being unspecified). As E7 stated, *'I'm here to de-criminalise entrepreneurship'*. The second role was to **Progress**, which means an emphasis on development and collaboration, regardless of what happens around them but going 'with the craze', 'doing it better' (E9) and to ensure that whatever they were doing was always going to move something to another place from when they came in, to take 'creativity from ideas to problem solving' (E8). Thirdly, to **Perform**, which means how they performed in the faculty, 'let me have a have a share of your mind' (E6). During the period of observation, none of the entrepreneurs lost their zeal and passion for business and innovation however it was expressed.

This chapter has provided a description of the ten entrepreneurs who were observed for the role they were playing and the contribution they were making to the faculty, and this is enhanced by the previous chapter, which focused on the external work of the author in networks that were important to give distance in using the self-ethnography methodology. A compelling factor in the four external networks and the ten entrepreneurs is the view that *there is* a role and contribution from the external entrepreneurs into the

academic heartland. The findings in these first research chapters show that roles are related to Pose, Progress and Perform, and these three areas will be further analysed in the next research findings chapter. The next chapter refers to the thirty-seven themes that emerged from following Alvesson's five recommendation framework for considering the research question, using self-ethnography.

CHAPTER 8 – RESEARCH FINDINGS: THE CONTRIBUTION IN DEVELOPING ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY IN THE ACADEMIC HEARTLAND

8.1. Introduction

This chapter consolidates the research findings by utilising another process to analyse the data as prescribed by Alvesson as good practice when using self-ethnography as a method. The descriptions of the ten entrepreneurs, discussed in the previous chapter, analysed initial findings of how they fitted largely into three main themes of Pose, Progress or Perform these became the categories for consideration in the analysis section. However, these initial findings need to be put to one side temporarily whilst the data is cut in different ways, as discussed by Alvesson and this forms the basis of this chapter. The findings from this chapter and the previous two will then be analysed together to enable conclusions to be reached.

The research design for this chapter focused on advice by Alvesson to look at and cut the data in many different ways. This chapter aims to complement the other findings chapter by using the five areas of recommendation that were discussed in the research design chapter. As a reminder, these five themes were adapted from the advice of Alvesson (Alvesson, 2003) from which the author developed her own words and phrases. These themes were: **Surprises**, **Knowledge Based**, **Learning and Teaching**, **Entrepreneurial University Concept**, and **Relationships**. In devising her own words from the five themes, the author referenced the need to look at the data collected from the entrepreneurs but also to be mindful of the themes that were attached to the Academic Heartland concept from Clark (Clark, 2008).

Whilst reviewing the data, the author was able to match areas that emerged repeatedly from the core data into a coding process that fell into one of the key themes. This led to an eventual total of thirty-seven sub-themes. The five core themes are directly adapted from Alvesson's five recommendations for analysing the data and the 37 sub-themes are those that the author revealed whilst going through the data which she then fitted into the five main categories as listed in the chart below in Table 4.

Surprises	
1	University as perpetual motion machine
2	Curator rather than entrepreneur when in university setting

3	The Agora concept dominates as trading ground for knowledge base
Knowledge Based	
4	Integration and mutual dependency
5	Design Thinking
6	Knowledge – shared, valorisation, increasing value of knowledge
7	Boundary crosser with shared conversations
8	Circles of influence
Learning and Teaching	
9	Self-Efficacy and one's belief in one's self to succeed
10	Societal benefits and giving back
11	Distraction to feed into study, not to distract from it, no academic agenda
12	In support of study and giving back
13	Vicarious learning effect
14	IP realities/market driven concepts of making money v learning
15	Entrepreneur as teacher professional
16	Angels and dragons, giving back real experience
17	Learning by doing and real life scenarios, practice based
Entrepreneurial University	
18	Separating the dance from the dancer
19	Entrepreneurship as method not a concept
20	Environment to do with business not just education
21	Definition as part of the problem, new venture or make happen regardless of resources
22	Micro v macro schemes
23	Values, educational, entrepreneurial and confusion between the two.
24	Disruptive – new higher education regimes
25	Commercial v entrepreneurial
Relationships	
26	Control

27	Innovation, 'spirit' of academic freedom/not business innovation
28	Feeling valued
29	Partnership- but not all is equal, deal breakers
30	Funding or no funding
31	Spinning in
32	Deal breakers for relationships
33	Serendipity
34	Ambiguity of role, and fog/transparency of role
35	Entrepreneurs as privileged sector (people) with access to university
36	Access to resources for free/cheap/exploitation
37	Being young and hungry at heart and needing access to new young talent

Table 4. Sub-themes Listing

8.2 Research outcomes

From the 37 sub-themes, the distribution fell into the five core areas which enabled the author to discuss the findings within these five areas. As Alvesson(Alvesson,2003) suggested to avoid being too close to the data a reworking of the data, into the five recommended areas was advised. The author's adaption of the themes came from Alvesson's five recommendations, which, as a recap, are repeated below.

1. Self Irony for which the author used the word 'Surprises' and 3 sub-themes were identified.
2. Challenges to the data for which the author uses the phrase ' Knowledge Base' and 5 sub-themes emerged.
3. Interpretative repertoire which the author refers to as 'Learning and Teaching' and 9 sub-themes were revealed.
4. Working through the notion of 'reflexivity' which the author adapted to the 'Entrepreneurial Concept' for which there were 8 sub-themes.
5. Procedural nature of the self which the author adapted to 'Relationships' and 12 sub-themes emerged.

In analysing each sub theme, it is important to understand the nature of the emerging results, and they will be discussed in turn, albeit in a revised order so that each of these five categories can be considered in relation to the **Pose, Progress and Perform** findings from the previous chapter.

Teaching and learning was a useful alternative interpretative model as, although this is not the main focus of the research project and there is plenty written elsewhere about mechanisms for developing entrepreneurial teaching and learning materials for students, it is one of the primary functions of any university. Alvesson recommended using an interpretative repertoire that was not the theme of the research but a closely associated theme and thus teaching and learning seemed to be an appropriate choice in this respect.

The nine sub-themes with a teaching and learning focus were concerned with:

1) *Learning by doing, real life scenarios and practice based learning.* This is an unsurprising finding, given the nature of the traditions of art and design teaching and learning, which is equally relevant for entrepreneurs.

2) *Giving something back in support of study.* Is also not surprising given that entrepreneurs were often at pains to support the next generation of employees who are ideas driven and who would benefit from their personal stories.

3) *Self efficacy.* Is a common theme in entrepreneurial education in that to believe in oneself helps towards being successful. This was borne out regularly in the observations and data collection. The personal stories of the entrepreneur coming into the faculty often started with the delivery of their own journey to success as a way of inspiring students.

4) *Societal benefits – giving back.* This theme is not dissimilar to point 2 above and the role that entrepreneurs often play, particularly those who have a disposable income to support the next generation and as a form of atonement for any particular guilt about their wealth compared with others.

5) *Distraction, to feed into study, not to distract from it, without academic agenda or focus.* The role the entrepreneur plays when he is working with students, is often not informed by the knowledge of the curriculum or past or future teaching sessions, but,

rather with the sense that the knowledge they have is important and they are passing it on and it will be relevant in some way.

6) *Vicarious learning effect.* The way of learning by observing the behaviour of others was often reinforced through the personal stories of the entrepreneurs in the observations and data collection, and the fact that this was repeated by all ten entrepreneurs leads to the concept of vicarious learning where the behaviours could be imitated by others, such as students.

7) *IP realities/market driven concepts of making money versus learning.* The entrepreneurs would focus on how they made money and how they learnt from their mistakes and the risks that they took, which conforms to the characteristics of an entrepreneur.

8) *Entrepreneur as teacher professional.* This was often the case when either an entrepreneur was given a visiting professor role or was called upon to talk with students about particular experiences and using learned experience to relay their knowledge to others.

9) *Angels and Dragons – giving back, real experience.* The popularity of the Dragons Den TV series was often used as a method for practising and pitching for new products or ideas but the angels were not investors with money but investors in time, by giving back in return for experience and knowledge to learn from, and also at times as a way of seeking out new opportunities for investment.

These sub categories for teaching and learning link directly back to the role identified in the previous chapter, of the entrepreneur to **Pose** and to utilise their personality as one of the key characteristics of their involvement and activity within the academic heartland.

Knowledge Based The outcome of the coding identified five sub-themes where knowledge was seen to be a major part of the role of the entrepreneurs and, in particular, the challenge as set out in the literature by Fuller as to the primacy of the role of universities in creating new knowledge. This follows Alvesson's recommendation to challenge the data by using a critical perspective. These outcomes demonstrate a new way of sharing and developing knowledge. This is an alternative approach to that which is described in the teaching and learning section above where the role of the university is not under question, whereas it is in this section.

1) *Integration and mutual dependency*. The role of the entrepreneur as being one of a collaborator who shares for mutual benefit the work they do and that of the faculty in a way that is seamlessly integrated.

2) *Design thinking*. As in the literature where design thinking as a methodology for innovation is utilised.

3) *Knowledge, shared, valorisation, increasing value of knowledge*. Knowledge is given a new meaning by being shared and developed from different sources including that being brought in by the entrepreneurs, whilst equally the faculty is getting maximum value from the expertise of those external to the university, and thereby being of greater value to all concerned.

4) *Boundary crosser – shared conversations*. As above, the knowledge that is brought into the faculty enables a shared conversation from a different disciplinary basis, particularly those entrepreneurs who do not come from a creative industries background.

5) *Circles of influence*. The opportunity for influence from all parties to be utilised to maximum effect, and in particular how the growth of entrepreneurs entering the faculty was supported, and encouraged, through the partnerships and allegiances of the entrepreneurs and their extended networks.

These sub categories for knowledge base link directly back to the role of the entrepreneur to **Progress** and develop at faculty level. In progressing the relationship the entrepreneurs provide a space for co-design and collaboration and through their experience and knowledge provide relevant help to academic practitioners to contribute to their profession.

Entrepreneurial University This section was an area where Alvensson recommended working through the data with a different mind-set to get alternative viewpoints to emerge. Reflective practice as a higher education practitioner was used in defining the problems and solutions that emerged from the coding exercise. Eight themes emerged:

1) *Separating the dance from the dancer*. An understanding of the real issue being investigated and how much an entrepreneur really does add to the understanding of the entrepreneurial university. The issue for the Faculty of Art and Design is: where does the

knowledge for the academic heartland belong? If the main 'dance' is the education of students and yet the 'dancer' is the entrepreneur who is entering, not to enhance the academic heartland in the way that is being perceived, but to add a different dimension to the relationship.

2) *Entrepreneurship as method, not concept.* This is identifying that it is a way of thinking or a methodology which goes beyond a concept that is something an organisation can adapt to or buy into.

3) *Environment to do with business not just education.* This identifies that the entrepreneur working within a faculty (as opposed to the whole institution) is as much to do with environment from a business perspective as it is for education, and as such influences the behaviours of the academics differently.

4) *Definition as part of the problem, new venture, or making things happen regardless of resources.* This outcome looks at defining the problem and how the approach taken within the faculty from the external entrepreneurs means they are free from the bureaucracy of the institution and can make things happen quicker and in a different manner than those within the academic heartland.

5) *Micro vs macro schemes.* This theme is concerned with the development of knowledge and how the individual and the institution can be at odds with each other in forming positive relationships.

6) *Values, educational, entrepreneurial, and confusion between the two.* The differences between the aims of the university and the role that the entrepreneur plays and that which the academics think they play are demonstrated through different belief systems (as identified by Clark). However, when they are collaborating, confusion is added to the relationship, which is not always conducive to the academic heartland.

7) *Disruptive – new higher education regimes.* A willingness to undertake a different way of thinking about the challenges to higher education policy and where the dominant mindset lies versus the disruptive elements that might come from externals entering the faculty and the receptiveness of staff and students.

8) *Commercial v entrepreneurial*. A potential conflict of interest as to the role of the entrepreneur and their own commercial interests and that of 'being' entrepreneurial in behaviour or concept.

These sub categories for the entrepreneurial university concept link directly back to the role of the entrepreneur to **Progress** the development of the relationship at faculty level as discussed above but with the sense of providing opportunity for innovation within the university itself.

Relationships When working through the data the recommendation from Alvesson was the routine nature of the self, in this case, of the author as a dean of faculty to work through the material with regard to the relationship of entrepreneurs to the university. This section is important in considering the research question about relationships, and the coding produced the most sub-themes, with 12 identified:

1) *Control*. The difference in where the control of the university lies in practice versus reality at faculty level, or whether it was questioned through the role of the entrepreneurs who were able to exercise a certain amount of control through prestige.

2) *Innovation 'spirit' of academic freedom/not business innovation*. The spirit of innovation whilst referred to and enabled by the concepts of academic freedom, was often conflicted, whereas those who were external to the university were able to play a role that supported innovation in a more overt way.

3) *Feeling valued*. The relationship of the entrepreneurs with the faculty was based on a notion of feeling valued and that the work they did was appreciated by those who came into contact with them.

4) *Partnership – but not all is equal/deal breakers*. Egos played a significant role in the relationship between the two parties (the faculty and the entrepreneur) and whilst trying to maintain an equal partnership, if it was not perceived as such then it could lead to relationships breaking down.

5) *Funding or no funding*. A thorny issue during the research period, as the economy had slowed and the entrepreneurs were looking to either 'give back' or look for partnership that might enable some joint funding; this was equally reciprocated by the faculty.

6) *Spinning in*. A welcome into the faculty and the university for the entrepreneurs, particularly for those who might bring in company or start-up opportunities. This was in direct conflict with the purpose of the concept of the entrepreneurial university where business start ups might spin out of the university.

7) *Deal breakers for relationships*. These were often ill defined and based on relationships and commitment to the engagement by both parties. Where this was more strained was when potential funding or monetary discussions had taken place.

8) *Serendipity*. Quite often the role and relationship of the entrepreneur related closely to work going on in the faculty which enabled a certain amount of good fortune and good will to be generated. This is difficult to predict or prescribe from a faculty perspective but is seen as an opportunity from an entrepreneur's perspective.

9) *Ambiguity or role, and fog/transparency of role*. This would often relate to what and why the entrepreneurs had been invited in to do and what actually emerged as the role they took on, and their own understanding of life within a faculty, particularly for those who had not attended university themselves.

10) *Entrepreneurs as privileged sector (people) with access to university*. This is an important factor to note, as the entrepreneurs tended to be confident and connected enough to have access to the university, particularly those who had already made it and were successful. This was the case for the ten entrepreneurs used in the research.

11) *Access to resources for free/cheap/exploitation*. Often a perceived use of entrepreneurs to help students gain experience, but also an overt use of additional resources, particularly with new technologies, that could be exploited.

12) *Being young and hungry at heart and needing access to new young talent*. The characteristics of an entrepreneur to always look out for opportunities never leave them and they continue to look for openings whilst in the faculty.

These sub categories for relationships link directly back to the role of the entrepreneur to **Perform**. Regardless of how they or others interpret their relationship, they perform to the agenda of being an entrepreneur which in turn might support the development of the academic heartland. The characteristics of external entrepreneurs are to use their

expertise and behaviours to search out new applied contexts for innovation that would support the wider university concept.

Surprises The three sub-themes that emerged from Alvesson's recommendation of self-irony to see if the data would expose any new or unexpected meanings are as below. Whilst the interpretation of surprises might be different in meaning from that of being able to laugh at oneself or self-irony, it did hold a similar sentiment, in that the surprises were not anticipated and led to a different way of thinking.

1) *University as perpetual motion machine.* This is through the consistent and at times relentless need to get through a set of criteria to ensure that the delivery of effective teaching and research was maintained and led to stagnation in the eyes of the entrepreneurs who were able to step out of projects with ease, and go on to new things.

2) *Curator rather than entrepreneur when in university setting (especially art and design faculty).* This is an interesting theme in that the entrepreneurs themselves noted a different role for themselves as they brought together different aspects of their own experience for the benefit of others, either as on lookers or participants.

3) *The Agora concept dominates as trading ground for knowledge/ideas.* A place to exchange knowledge and services along the lines of a Greek Agora came to the fore as a potential for an expanded university offering, recognising that a university is no longer the sole producer of knowledge but can act as a facilitator and entrepreneur in its own right to support the exchange and development of ideas and services. This idea is explored further in the next chapter.

The sub-themes in the 'Surprises' section here do not particularly fulfil one of the three P roles (Pose, Perform, Progress) identified earlier, but lead to interesting new variants on a theme and possibly where the role of the entrepreneur has come into its own by a collective and unintended instance of collaborative innovation for the university. For the author, this was an exciting theme to emerge.

The findings demonstrate through the five main categories in this section that the research questions can be answered through the analysis of the data, and the next section outlines what this is telling us.

8.3 Conclusions

The analysis begins to identify that the entrepreneurs who enter the faculty are having a real impact and one that goes beyond that previously expressed in the literature. Clark's view of the academic heartland as resisting laggards is not corroborated, but more that the academic heartland is the place for exchange and collaboration of knowledge and one where the entrepreneurs are part of the heartland. The entrepreneurs play a role as a **Pose** to masquerade their knowledge as being non-academic but at the same time present to students their life's work as a teaching tool. The section on teaching and learning particularly reinforced some of the traditional methods of teaching in an art and design faculty. The use of the entrepreneur as a promoter of self-efficacy and the use of the vicarious learning effect helps with students but might not do enough to challenge staff in being more proactive. The greatest role that entrepreneurs have on teaching and learning is more to do with students than faculty and the para-academic role then assumed by them.

The role was rarely discussed with staff and an acceptance of their role was taken by all entrepreneurs; only on one occasion (E1) was the role ascribed for the intervention of a major new commercial line, the rest of the occasions were fairly traditional. A role they play in regard to the development of the subject area and currency is important alongside the networking that acts as a continuous pipeline into the creative industries. A positive outcome of these findings is that it creates value attached to the tacit and experiential learning the entrepreneurs bring in. They also act as a bridge between industry (particularly the SME culture of the creative industries) and the university, continuing in their established role as the go-between, as described in the literature.

Bason's (2010) intention to support innovation in the public sector can be reinforced by the entrepreneurs bringing new thinking through currency and consumer awareness to the faculty and in turn to the university. Etzkowitz's (2008) notion of collaborative entrepreneurship is supported through these findings and the fact that knowledge produced can be for economic reasons in the wider community as well as for the advantage of income just in the university. However, this might not fulfil Fuller's claim that too much knowledge is produced, although it would support the need for a greater distribution of knowledge production and in particular the role of 'trader, surplus, and market' of knowledge. Thorp's view of culture being more important than structure in developing an innovation mind-set that links to a culture of entrepreneurship is supported through these findings.

The role of the entrepreneur to **Progress** developments was identified in the knowledge base and concept sections where it was clear that knowledge could be 'spun in' and a new knowledge creation might be attached to this idea. This can go beyond applied knowledge and more as knowledge that is embodied or experiential from an external practitioner which gives more commercial currency to the curriculum than maybe at first appreciated. A different type of knowledge that supports a culture of innovation and collaboration from different sources was shared and in the process gave new or extended meaning that became accessible to students and staff.

The mind-set where the attributes of entrepreneurship can be utilised within the academic heartland setting, more as intrapreneurs, the internal corporate entrepreneurs, is useful if it supports innovative thinking. Although, the confines of the regulations and processes that are incumbent on all universities is highlighted through the findings as being largely ignored by the external entrepreneurs. The findings begin to demonstrate the role of the external entrepreneur as a boundary-crosser who enables different points of view, and circles of influence to be developed.

The role of the entrepreneur within the concept of the entrepreneurial university is again one of Progress. The original description and thoughts of Clark did not involve individual personalities at faculty level; it was much more the work of the expanded periphery to seek opportunity, mainly with larger companies. Also, Etzkowitz wished to see the linkages between industry, government and the university, but these findings show that individuals have a part to play, not least in 'separating the dance from the dancer' which is about understanding just how much is given by external contributors beyond the education of students. Another finding was that it is seen more as a method, a mind-set, or way of acting rather than a concept that universities can just buy in or adapt to. The rise in the number of universities adopting Clark's model was described earlier but it is more about understanding cultures and adapting to the methodology than purely a business type of process. This in turn leads to a culture of intrapreneurship and one where things can be more agile if freed from the restraints seen as barriers to development and progression. The encouragement to disrupt current higher education systems was clear in the literature but the research demonstrates that much of the disruption will lie in mind-set rather than physical/digital products.

In reflecting on the role of the author alongside that of the entrepreneur, the research demonstrates that traits appropriated by entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs have a place in a new model of entrepreneurial university. The notions of control were questioned by

the externals as to its real value as one of prestige in working with the senior staff, or steering core, or one of control from the administrative sections, whilst at faculty level there was an ability to steer around the regulations to get control. The academic heartland's tribes (Becher, 2001) were challenged by the externals, as their role is undefined, whereas there is over- definition of an academic's role and could lead to differences in approach. Being agile was important to the faculty, more so than the university, as it became comfortable with its own definition of the entrepreneurs' role and also gave entrepreneurs a perceived position of privilege.

The role of the entrepreneurs to **perform** revealed some traits around personality and delivery whilst on campus but the surprises section gave the best examples of a different type of performance. In particular, the role of the external entrepreneur being able to be aloof from the relentless agendas of the academic cycle and being able to step in and out added a freshness and currency to the entrepreneurial concept that was not part of the academic heartland as set out by Clark. A role that occurred was one of curator when they performed in the faculty, one where they had explicit knowledge that could be used selectively to exhibit this knowledge in a way of their choosing, as they saw the stakeholders as being either participants or on-lookers. The third surprise was in the way the university as an entrepreneur would use it as more of a trading place, not only for knowledge, much in the mind of Fuller, but also as a place for facilitation and exchange rather than just production. The Agora effect for the market place for connecting, exchanging, and expanding knowledge led the author to consider the academic heartland more as an expanded heartland.

CHAPTER 9 - ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS AND WIDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Introduction: findings and analysis

The primary research question is concerned with how external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity with the academic heartland of a university. This study aims to answer them through a self-ethnography methodology that observes the role played by ten entrepreneurs in a faculty of art and design. Three research sub-questions were identified that would help in informing the study. These related to the characteristics of the entrepreneurs, their activities and the relationship with the academic heartland.

For the first analysis, of the research data, in answering the three sub questions, the data was collected and analysed by coding themes which allowed the key themes relating to the entrepreneurs tendency to Pose, Perform and Progress to emerge. Each one of these is a characteristic feature of an external entrepreneur. Either they were posing and using their personality as part of the contribution, or they were performing in such a way as was ascribed to them in the role of the entrepreneur. Finally, they were keen to progress something either for their own or the faculty's benefit. This first analysis answers the research questions concerning character and engagement.

Following this, a second analysis was undertaken using the five recommendations from Alvesson and utilised to ensure that distance was created from the author and the subjects being researched. This second analysis produced further and far reaching insights into the relationship value provided by the entrepreneurs for the faculty and led to a greater refinement of findings than would have been the case if only the first analysis had been done. To ensure distance was created, the author also reviewed four key external organisations she was a member of, to provide a wider context and an alternative view. The findings of all three sections are brought together here to answer the questions under consideration.

The research findings about the external entrepreneurs led to new insights and wider implications than the original research questions and design anticipated, and these could be used to address what it would mean for the entrepreneurial university concept and future models and also what the implications might be for a Faculty of Art and Design in the future. Whilst these issues are not the main focus of this study, it is useful to note the wider implications here first. They can be described under the following headings:

- A new model of the entrepreneurial university that might be adjusted or changed to be suitable for the 21st century, given the interest of external people in working closely with a university.
- Art and design faculty expertise could influence the overarching university strategy and be defined and implemented through a new description of the academic heartland.
- Academics could learn from the behaviours of an entrepreneur, which are characterised in part as being comfortable with uncertainty and complexity and utilise this as a positive characteristic within the university setting, which is more comfortable with bureaucratic structures and certainty.

The wider implications of the study provide a contextual umbrella as the detailed findings in support of the primary research question are discussed below. However, when looking at the findings that support the primary research questions there are clear implications for development of the academic heartland. The contributions that external entrepreneurs make to this are addressed in turn.

The primary research question: **How do external entrepreneurs contribute to the entrepreneurial activity within the academic heartland of the university**, is answered through the three main thematic findings as set out below.

9.2 The Expanded Heartland

Clark pointed out that the academic heartland was the sticking point in an entrepreneurial university being successful, as faculties were often reluctant to change their culture. However, as is clear from the research findings, that perception of the deep-rooted nature of an academic heartland can be eased up to provide opportunities to advance the understanding of the entrepreneurial concept. The roles that external entrepreneurs play have implications for the future, as they provide scope to become official learning partners offering a range of experiential knowledge and an ability to inform currency and innovation through their work with staff and students. This is evidenced in the findings regarding the role of the entrepreneurs to progress and perform, but is also seen as a form of learning from others. It is easier to see how this might be embraced more readily with students than staff, but the staff within an art and design faculty are open to engagement generally based on the common ground of creative practice. There is a greater fit between the academic/practitioner in creative subjects with externals than

possibly in other disciplines, so this fits a Faculty of Art and Design well. It leads to a notion of progression to an '**expanded heartland**', rather than just an academic heartland, that is collective and collaborative in its overall pursuit of supporting the creative industries. The external entrepreneurs demonstrate that more engagement with the external world is beneficial and can enable more knowledge production through collaboration between the academics and the entrepreneur as a practitioner.

The exciting theme that the author found in the 'surprises' section of the research findings was that of the Agora concept which dominated as a trading ground for knowledge and ideas (Martin,2000).This fits in well the expanded heartland theme. The original definition of an entrepreneur as a 'go-between' (Fillion, 2008) would fit the idea of the Agora university, where the university acts as the go between where new knowledge is produced and exchanged and becomes the trading place regardless of where that knowledge is produced. It extends the mode 3 concept (Carayannis and Campbell, 2014) as it means giving up some authority of knowledge production and accepting that knowledge tends to be produced where it is needed and can then be traded (Fuller, 2009). By looking at translational subjects, such as those in the creative sector, the entrepreneurial university can start to imbue the university with other knowledge, and develop the traits of an entrepreneur, that is prepared to take more risks and is prepared to trade and experiment and therefore engage in subjects in a way that might not have been previously possible.

Shared knowledge is suggested as a positive contribution to leadership and innovation (Valsania, Moriano and Molero, 2014). This notion is embraced in the idea of the Agora university as it enables ordinary citizens (non- academics), to share with those in the academy and form a relationship between the public and private sectors. This also enables the idea to go beyond the place-making concept of an anchor university (Cantor, Englot and Higgins, 2013) to embrace people both as individuals and as members of an organisation. The re-invention of the Agora as a modern university builds on the original Greek idea as a critical and creative space in which citizens contribute to knowledge and innovation and therefore aids the understanding of the expanded heartland concept.

The expanded heartland as a concept enables greater openness in support of the art and design subject area and promotes the value of tacit and experiential learning. The communities of practice involved are able to bridge the gulf often felt between industry and the university. This enables a proactive driver of change to come from the faculty rather than top down from a centralised steering core. Some of the expanded heartland

will lend itself more openly to enquiry based learning, following a problem rather than an idea. This is particularly relevant to a Faculty of Art and Design. These findings are supported by the themes that emerged in the second analysis surrounding collaborative relationships.

9.3 The Intrapreneurial University as a developing concept

The findings for a new model of an entrepreneurial university (Clark, 2000; Etzkowitz, 2008; Carayannis and Campbell, 2014) into a developing concept of an **Intrapreneurial university** stem in part from the expanded heartland concept. There is a need for a self-review of how universities operate with their faculties or they may be in danger of becoming the type of out of date mature enterprise that is no longer fit for purpose; this is equally true of the entrepreneurial concept. A different type of leader is required and emerges out of the findings. Rather than the 'steering core' of Clark's (Clark, 2000,2008) hero leader to one of the 'collaborative intrapreneur' who takes the dynamic approach of an entrepreneur with an appetite for risk and innovation and yet understands its potential within the bureaucracy of the organisation. The collaborative intrapreneur is more closely identified with the authentic leader (Valsania, Moriano and Molero, 2014) or the servant leader (Blanchard, 2008) who offers transparency and shared knowledge to enable greater internal innovation to occur in the organisation. Whilst not necessarily new, the effective Intrapreneurial leader will welcome external knowledge and collaboration and, armed with this know-how, will recognise market shifts, be attuned to the consumer (stakeholders/students) and engage with the expanded heartland. In welcoming the external and vague relationships of outsiders, this type of leader will assess how people fit with their culture rather than the bureaucratic structures of the organisation. The new leader will see the integration of different practices as an opportunity rather than a restriction.

To advance thinking in this area, the concept of the intrapreneurial university emerges, which helps to close the perceived gap between the university and faculty. This then enables the broader external entrepreneurial links to be made. It is important for a Faculty of Art and Design to feel valued in within the entrepreneurial university concept and the idea of the intrapreneurial university enables much of the activity of the faculty to be recognised in this way. Other faculty disciplines could also learn from this approach.

The concept of the intrapreneurial university lies more in the culture of the organisation than structures. This is probably the biggest departure from Clark's model. It stems from the development of relationships identified in the research analysis. The concept of an intrapreneurial university accepts that ambiguity is constant and does not try to shoehorn all university faculties into a particular model. The intrapreneurial university concept is one that is ready for change and puts more focus on the need to be agile and responsive to change in the same way that the external entrepreneurs demonstrated.

9.4 Collective entrepreneurship

The role played by external entrepreneurs will never be codified or procedurally driven because of the nature of the actors involved but there are lessons to be learnt from the role they play and how they might influence the expanded heartland and the intrapreneurial university. The first being the role they play in critical reflection and holding a mirror to the faculty operations; this reflection is critical in understanding their role and their value.

The other role is one of **collective entrepreneurship** or co-design as a process that can enable different ideas to come together for an effective interpretation of the intrapreneurial university. The characteristics identified through the analysis of the entrepreneurs' role indicate that attitudes to risk and failure, interest and passion are essential from all involved if collective entrepreneurship is to take place. Drawing on earlier literature (Valsania, Moriano, Molero, 2014) demonstrates that shared knowledge has a positive impact on innovation and thus supports the findings for collective working practices. By contrast Clark (2000, 2003, 2008) was more in favour of a 'one size fits all' approach to the entrepreneurial university concept, which seemed to favour the hero leader as opposed to the servant leader (Blanchard, 2008) to encourage empowerment through shared discourse and participative practice.

The idea of collective entrepreneurship expands on the literature of knowledge production from that of the triple helix system as discussed by Etzkowitz (2008) to those of mode 3 and quadruple helix systems referred to by Carayannis and Campbell (2014) and can be further developed to include aspects of the anchor institution with regard to place (Cantor et al, 2013) and the idea of the Agora university. Whatever label might be ascribed, collective entrepreneurship enables a differentiation of knowledge production to be captured and valued, as the role of the external entrepreneurs will be unknown and will vary by discipline and location. This will depend on which

entrepreneurs voluntarily (in most cases) give their time to the faculty. This development changes the way the external entrepreneurs enter the faculty as largely invisible colleagues to one where their contribution might be more explicit. For some, this will not be welcome, but the powerful collaboration might be equally attractive.

Finally, the idea of 'curators' of knowledge rather than 'creators' of knowledge allows for innovation to develop from a range of sources that is facilitated not only by those inside the academy but from those outside. This process supports collective entrepreneurship. The external entrepreneurs act as the go-between and find a new role in bringing it all together and bringing it inside the academy. Hence, they change from being the 'go-betweens' to the 'in-betweens'. The curators of knowledge change the perception of who has academic authority to one that is collegiate and shared as discussed in the agora university and expanded heartland themes. However, the curators become the new brokers of benefit, the ones who can work within the concept of the anchor university and the intrapreneurial university. They are now the 'honest brokers', as one external entrepreneur described it, to ensure facilitation in the way knowledge is exchanged, but not in a formal or structured manner.

The implications for the findings and suggestions for development are in part reinforcing the work of Clark and others who have developed the concept, but the findings are also moving the thinking forward, to be more appropriate to the current setting. Clark was promoting the need for being proactive and collegial but was focusing this from a centralised steering point of view. By contrast, this study proposes that the entrepreneurial university can be re-cast as the intrapreneurial university to support a view that leads from the academic heartland up into the centralised university and becomes an expanded heartland. The expanded heartland enables a greater focus as an intrapreneurial university rather than a peripheral activity, or the 'resisting laggards' (Clark, 2003) that had to be harnessed in some way.

9.5 Implications for policy

The author, in ensuring a robust research methodology, utilised the same approach with the external policy-making organisations that she was involved with. The findings were included in the above sections. However, an additional set of points can be made regarding implications for policy. With the emphasis on universities being required to innovate to aid economic development, a change in approach to third mission strategies may be needed, to involve more of the local entrepreneurs to ensure that those in

regional settings are not disadvantaged. The perception regarding spin out businesses to enable new innovative processes and products to be brought to market is not to be reversed but other opportunities through other disciplines need to come to the fore. A more universal approach to all disciplines in adding value in a variety of ways could be incorporated into policy making.

The creative industries are in danger of being neglected, despite continuing to show increases in contributions to GDP, because of a lack of understanding of the roles and benefits of external entrepreneurs in the faculties that support these industries. If greater awareness was raised at government levels, then the supply chain of students entering these subjects and the encouragement of more externals to 'give back' would be beneficial.

9.6 Conclusion

This chapter has revealed three core findings in answer to the research questions about the role the external entrepreneurs play in a Faculty of Art and Design. Three key findings relate to the Intrapreneurial University, Expanded Heartland, and Collective Entrepreneurship. However, the study has limitations, as it concentrates on one faculty and one discipline, but the model of self-ethnography with external contributors could be tried in other faculties or disciplines. A similar approach with another faculty would enable the idea to be tested to see if the implications for change and advancing the entrepreneurial model would be substantiated.

Similarly, more external contributors who might not identify themselves as entrepreneurs would be useful to research to see if they have an equally strong role to play. For example, industry specialists, corporate representatives and policy-makers could be considered. A further issue is the ready and willing supply of entrepreneurs. Some of the engagement is based on the personality of the deans and their willingness to engage as much with the externals as the external engaging with them. If none are forthcoming, then the study and its implications for development would falter and this would necessitate a larger study to be undertaken to justify some of the findings.

CHAPTER 10 - REFLECTIONS, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

10.1 Introduction

This chapter considers the contribution to knowledge, and the contribution to practice that this thesis provides. It acknowledges the professional development of the author during the process of the research and her own reflections on the DBA.

10.2 Contribution to knowledge

The contribution to knowledge is to provide greater understanding of the role of external entrepreneurs and their place within the academic heartland, in this case the Faculty of Art and Design, in contributing to and advancing the understanding of the entrepreneurial university concept. Taken together, the different analytical sections show that the external entrepreneurs are contributing to activity in the academic heartland in a way in which three main themes emerge.

The research findings conclude that the contribution to knowledge lies in an extension of the entrepreneurial university concept via an expanded heartland, as opposed to just the academic heartland, and this is developed into the concept of an intrapreneurial university that shares and recognises the relationship with external entrepreneurs through collective entrepreneurship. Thus, the conclusion is that the external entrepreneurs are playing an important role in contributing to the debate and the activity of the academic heartland.

This thinking is enhanced by the notion of an expanded heartland that might suit a newly engaged faculty with a greater understanding of the roles of external contributors and where practitioner/academic relationships are seen as positive. The expanded heartland enables greater collective entrepreneurship to enable shared attitudes to risk, co-design and co-thinking. The research findings are also set within the recent literature concerning anchor institutions. Here the importance of partnership between private and public institutions rooted in the geographical locality are central in terms of place, but adds to this idea through the use of individual external entrepreneurs adding to the mix of knowledge production that can be seen as useful both in local and global settings.

The contribution to knowledge also provides a greater understanding of the entrepreneurial university through the concepts of intrapreneurialism, as a means of engaging in new leadership styles, such as authentic or servant leadership, which promote shared knowledge and understanding in organisations to achieve better prospects through internal innovation. The expanded heartland as a concept adds to these debates.

This study has reviewed the concept of the entrepreneurial university and considered it as a potentially outmoded concept, given the rapid changes in higher education in the UK. In particular, it has looked at the concept in the light of the academic heartland where the focus has been on those within the faculty as seen from some of the literature, but not on those who come in from the outside to contribute to the working of the faculty of whose role there has been limited understanding. The literature is vast when it comes to entrepreneurial characteristics, training for students, and management structures within a university, but was not developed when it comes to the academic heartland and external entrepreneurs and their contribution. This study hopes to address this deficit.

10.3 Contribution to practice

The contribution to practice occurs at a time of great change for UK higher education managers and therefore it is important to try and find new ways of working to ensure continued success in the higher education sector. Just as important is finding new ways of working for deans of Faculties of Art and Design. This thesis contributes to practice by exploring the legitimacy of enabling a greater collective approach to research and teaching through embracing the role that externals can play both in an informal and formal way. The discussions regarding collaborative entrepreneurship are particularly valuable in this respect.

During a time of great change, it is necessary for senior managers in universities to look for new ways of working and to ensure that their institutions do not become time bound and therefore restricted to old working practices that will not be fit for purpose currently or have prospects for the future. This thesis therefore contributes to the practice of the higher education manager, encouraging a detailed review and consideration of all those who work with the faculty and the role they play in a positive or negative way. This study adds to the debate and discourse on new leadership and management behaviours in higher education particularly at a strategic level, and enables practitioners to develop and contribute to their profession.

10.4 Limitations of study/future research

The aim of the study was to look at the role external entrepreneurs play in a faculty of art and design. This work has limitations but enables further research to be developed. In particular, the author would be interested in continuing to work with external contributors to value and assess their input from their own viewpoints. Where this weakness has been ameliorated is through the continued practice of the author to engage positively with externals in a variety of forms, such as the high-level elite groups she has been involved in and with developing stakeholder relationships beyond the ten written about here.

To continue with this theme, the author would prioritise the investigation with externals and follow a more traditional approach of questionnaires and case studies. Having changed university since the study began, the author would also be interested to use the same approach but with a different set of actors and then make comparisons because of the differences in institutional setting. The comparative approach would have the advantage of identifying specific and generic conditions for a new model university and any limitations because of mission and scale of the institution.

10.5 Reflections and professional development

The DBA has been a long but interesting journey for the author. The containment of ideas to a narrow but defined focus supported by evidence, is an interesting process to go through. This has been an amazing opportunity which has gone beyond her normal comfort zone. The DBA has helped her professionally and personally even at times when it felt like both were out of control. Professionally it has given her the courage of her convictions and shows her that ideas can work and can be grounded in a research context as well as living by doing and following her more traditional routes. The DBA taught her that the literature supporting higher education management is huge, growing and at times swamping any opportunity for clear thought. However, it also taught her that through all the literature and management advice is the opportunity for experimentation and deliberation and this is what she has enjoyed the most. The challenge to take a non-traditional research methodology approach and to use external entrepreneurs who have always fascinated her in terms of why they approach universities in the way that they do, and to turn it into a research project was fascinating.

In all the DBA has enabled her leadership capacity to grow to the extent that she was able to move from a dean's post at a post-92 generic university to a deputy vice chancellor post at a small specialist arts university, which was a dream come true. However, the move physically, geographically and promotionally took its toll and led to some slippage with the DBA as she focused on getting her home and new job in order. The DBA therefore taught her resilience as it nagged away at her until she was able to refocus. In her new role she continues to work with entrepreneurs at a more senior level and continues to bring them into the university. The DBA has enabled her to take this one step further and look at crowd funding opportunities with them in support of hatchery ideas for graduate start-ups and agency work.

The DBA was international in its focus, the delivery style with residential blocks meant that great global friendships have been made, and a shared commitment to the value of Higher Education across the world was powerfully made during the course of the residential weeks. She will always be grateful to the team at DBA Bath, staff and students which supported her in her endeavours.

10.6 Conclusion

This thesis has found that the role of the external entrepreneur could have implications for the future university, particularly a new focus on the intrapreneurial university with an insider approach to innovation and collaboration. It found that the external world could usefully work with the academy in a manner that moves from the academic heartland per se to one of an expanded heartland that might suit a newly engaged faculty based on intrapreneurship and one where collective entrepreneurship is desirable.

This thesis provides scope for further research with external entrepreneurs which the author would value as the next stage in the study, whilst also providing a framework for study in other disciplines beyond art and design.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991) *The Theory of Planned behaviour*. Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes. Vol 50. Pp 179-211
- Alvesson, M. (2003). *Methodology for Close Up Studies - Struggling with Closeness and Closure*. Higher Education. Vol 43.pp167-193.
- Alvesson, M and Gabriel, Y. (2013). *Beyond Formulaic Research: In Praise of Greater Diversity in Organisational Research and Publications*. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 245-263.
- Alvesson, M (2013) *The Triumph of Emptiness, Consumption, Higher Education and Work Organisation*. Oxford University Press.
- Anheier, H. (2008). *The Cultural Economy*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Atkinson & Hammersley, (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Audretsch, D. (2007). *The Entrepreneurial Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ball, L. (2010). *Creative Graduates: Creative Futures*. Brighton: IES.
- Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Barnett, R. (2005). *Reshaping the University. New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*. London: OUP and SRHE.
- Bason, C. (2010). *Leading Public Sector Innovation. Co-Creating for a Better Society*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society, Towards a new Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Beck, U. (2007). *World at Risk*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Becher, T. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and Culture of Disciplines*. England: OUP and SHRE.
- Benneworth, P. (2005). *University Spin Off Policies and Economic Development in Less Successful Regions*. European Planning Studies, 32.
- Berger, J. (1972). *Ways of Seeing*. London: BBC and Penguin Books.

- Birch, E, Perry,D, Taylor,H (2013) *Universities as Anchor Institutions*. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement. Vol 17.
- Bird, E. (2000). *Research in Art and Design The First Decade. Working Papers in Art and Design*. Wolverhampton: University of Wolverhampton.
- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management Fads in Higher Education. Where They Come From, What Do They Do, and Why Do They Fail*. Jossey Boss.
- Blanchard,K & Johnson,S (2004) *The One Minute Manager*. Harper Collins
- Blanchard,K & Hodges, P (2008) *Lead like Jesus*. Harper Collins
- Bleiklie I, Enders J,&. Lepori B (2015). *Organisations as Penetrated Hierarchies: Environmental Pressures and Control in Professional Organisations*. Organization Studies, 1-24.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the Market Place: The Commercialisation of Higher Education*. New Jersey: Princetown University Press.
- Bojica,M and Fuentes (2012) *Knowledge acquisition and Corporate Entrepreneurship. Insights from Spanish SMEs in the ICT sector*. Journal of World Business. vol.47. pp 397-408
- Borja de Mozota, B. (2003). *Design Management. Using Design to Build Brand Value and Corporate Innovation*. New York: Allworth Press.
- Borja De Mozota, B. (2011). Microeconomics and Macroeconomics: Exploring the value of designers skills. *International Symposium for Design Education Researchers* (pp. 17-39). Paris: Cumulus/Design Research Society.
- Brannick, T and Coghlan, D. (2007). *In Defense of Being 'Native'. The Case for Insider Research*. Organizational Research Methods , 59-74.
- Breneman, D. (2005). *Entrepreneurship in Higher Education*. New Directions in Higher Education, 3-9.
- Brown, T. (2009). *Change by Design. How Design Thinking Transforms Organisations and Inspires Innovation*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Cable, V. (2011). *UK Commission Employment and Skills*. Retrieved October 29th, 2012, from UKCES: <http://www.ukces.org.uk/about-us>.
- Calvey, D. (2008). *The Art and Politics of Covert Research:Doing 'Situated Ethics' in the Field*. Sociology , 905-918.

Cantor,P,Englot,P, Higgins,M (2013) *Making the Work of Anchor Institutions Stick: Building Coalitions and Collective Expertise*. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement. Vol 17.

Carayannis, E. and Campbell, D.. (2012) *Mode 3 knowledge production in quadruple helix innovation systems: 21st-century democracy, innovation, and entrepreneurship for development*. New York; London: Springer.

Carayannis, E and Campbell,D (2014) *Developed democracies versus emerging autocracies: arts, democracy, and innovation in Quadruple Helix innovation systems*. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. Springer.

Carlsen, A. (2016). *On the Tacit Side of Organisational Identity: Narrative Unconscious and Figured Practice*. *Culture and Organisation* , 107-135.

Castells, M. (1996). *The Information Age:Economy,Society and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Christensen, C. (2011). *The Innovative University. Changing the DNA of Higher Education From the Inside Out*. Jossey Boss.

Clark, B. (2000). *Collegial Entreperneurialism in Proactive Universities:Lessons from Europe*. *Change* , the Magazine of Higher Learning, pp10-19.

Clark, B. (2001). *The Entrepreneurial Univeristy: New Foundations for Collegiality, Autonomy, and Achievement*. *Journal of the Programme of Institutional Management in Higher Education* , 9-24.

Clark, B. (2004). *Sustaining Change in Universities. Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts*. New York: OUP and SHRE.

Clark, B. (1998, 2008). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities:Organisational Pathways of Transformation*. Bingley: JAI Press.Emerald Group.

Clews, D. (2009). *Looking Out: Art, Design and Media*. Brighton: Higher Education Academy: Art, Design and Media Subject Centre.

Coffey, P (1999) *The Ethnographic Self*. Sage. London.

Conklin, J (2005) *Dialogue Mapping: Building Shared Understanding of Wicked Problems*. Wiley.

Corte-Real, E. (2010). *The Word' Design' Early Modern Dictionaries and Literature on Design*. London: Working Papers on Design 4.

- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Cross, N. (2001). *Designerly Ways of Knowing: Design Discipline Versus Design Science*. *Design Issues* , 49-55.
- Crossick, G. (2006). *Knowledge Transfer without Widgets: The Challenge of the Creative Economy*. Royal Society of Arts. London: RSA.
- Cunningham, B. (1991). *Defining Entrepreneurship*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45-61.
- Davies, J. (1987). *The Entrepreneurial and Adaptive University*. *Institutional Management of Higher Education* .
- Davies, J. (2001). *The Emergence of Entrepreneurial Cultures in European Universities*. *Higher Education Management* , 25-43.
- Davies, J. (2009). *The Entrepreneurial University International Perspectives*. Bath, England: ICHEM University of Bath.
- Davies, J. (2010). *Entrepreneurial University Notes. ICHEM* . Bath, England: University of Bath.
- Deem, R. (2001). *Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities*. *Comparative Education* .
- Deem, H. R. (2007). *Knowledge, Higher Education and the New Managerialism. The Changing Management of UK Universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deem, R. (2009). *Knowledge, Higher Education and the New Managerialism of Higher Education*. Oxford: OUP.
- Department for Business Innovation and Skills. (2011). *Innovation and Research Strategy for Growth*. London: HM Government.
- Department for Business Innovation and Skills. (2011). *Students at the Heart of the System*. London: HM Government.
- Department for Business Innovation and Skills. (2012). *A Review of Business, University Collaborations*. London: HM Government.

- Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (2013) *Clarifying and Measuring the Creative Industries*. HM Government.
- Douglas, I. (1979). *The World of Goods. Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*. Penguin Books.
- Dovey, K. (2015). Invisable Practices: Innovative Outcomes: Intra-preneruship within the academy. *Action Learning Resarch and Practice* , 276-292.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practice and Principles*. London: Heinemann.
- Drucker, P. (1998). *The Discipline of Innovation*. Harvard Business Review .
- Dyson, J. (2010). *Ingenious Britian. Making the UK the leading high tech exporter in Europe*. Dyson.
- Ebner, A. (2005). *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development. From Classical Political Economy to Economic Sociology*. *Journal of Economic Studies* , 256-274.
- Eriksson, T. (2010). *Being Native - Distance, Closeness and Doing auto/self ethnography*. Artistic Report. University of Gothenburg.
- Etzkowitz, H. (2008). *The Triple Helix. University-Industry-Government Innovation in Action*. New York: Routledge.
- Farrell, N. (2010). *The University Mission and Sustainability in Higher Education*. Bath DBA assignment: unpublished.
- Filion, L. (2008). *Defining the Entrepreneur Complexity and Multi-Dimensional Systems: Some Reflections*. *World Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* , 41-52.
- Florida, R. (2005). *The Flight of the Creative Class*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Frayling, C (1993) *Research in Art and Design*. Royal College of Art Research Papers. Vol 1. London.
- Friedman, K. (2012). Models of Design: Envisioning a Future Design Education. *Visible Langugage* 46 .
- Fuller, S. (2009). *The Sociology of Intellectual Life. The Career of the Mind in and Around the Academy*. Sage.

- G.Crossick. (2006). *Knowledge Transfer Without Widgets:The challenge of the Creative Economy*. RSA Lecture.
- Gibb, A. (2006). *Towards the Entrepreneurial University*. NCGE. London: NCGE.
- Gibbons, M. (1998). *Higher Education Relevance in the 21st Century. The New Production of Knowledge*. UNESCO World Higher Education Conference, (p. 73). Paris.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Risk and Responsibility*. *The Modern Law Review*, 1-10.
- Grant, R. (1996). *Towards a Knowledge Based Theory of the Firm*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 109-122.
- Hartley, J. (2005). *Creative Industries*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hartman, S. (2011). *Unlocking The Enterpriser Inside*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Henderson, R. (2000). *Who Wants to be an Entrepreneur?* *Career Development International*, 279-287.
- Hoch, J (2013) *Shared Leadership and Innovation: The Role of Vertical Leadership and Employee Integrity*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. Vol 28. pp159-174
- Howkins, J. (2002). *The Creative Economy. How People Make Money From Ideas*. London: Penguin.
- Hunt, E. (2009, May). *Weighing It All Up. Is the Balanced Scorecard an Effective Mechanism for Achieving Strategic Change in a New University*. Bath unpublished BA assisgnment.
- Hunt, E. (2010, January 8). *A Critical Analysis of Key Policy Documents to Inform the Strategic Choices Available to Higher Education Art and Design Sector*. Bath: DBA Assignment.
- Hunt, E. (2010). *Creativity in a School of Art and Design: Opportunites, Barriers and Achievements in Contributing to a University Entrepreneurial Strategy*. Bath: unpublished.
- Jackson S, S. M. (2006). *Developing Creativity in Higher Education*. Routledge.
- Julier, G. (2000). *The Culture of Design*. London: Sage.
- Kaplan, N. (2006). *Alignment.Using the Balanced Scorecard to Create Corporate Strategies*. New York: Harvard Business School.

- Karakas, F. (2012). *New Horizons in Higher Education; Design Inspired Leadership*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education Management Stimulus Paper.
- Kennie, T. (2012). *Disruptive Innovation and the Higher Education Ecosystem Post 2012*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education Stimulus Paper.
- Kenny, M. (2010). *Professor Pay Dissatisfaction: A Comparison of Academic Entrepreneurs and Traditional Faculty*. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly* , 24-30.
- Kirkby, D. (2006). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities in the UK: Applying Entrepreneurial Theory to Practice*. *Journal of Technology Transfer* , 599-603.
- Lauder, H. Young, M. Daniels, H. Balarin, M. and Lowe, J. (2012) *Educating for the Knowledge Economy*. Critical Perspectives. Routledge.
- Lambert (2003) *Lambert Review Business Collaboration*. Crown Copyright.
- Leadbeater, C. (2000). *Living on Thin Air: The New Economy*. London: Penguin.
- Leydesdorff, L and Etzkowitz, H. (2003) *Can 'the public' be considered as a fourth helix in university - industry - government relations?* Report on the Fourth Triple Helix Conference. 2002. *Science and Public Policy*, Vol 30. pp 55-61.
- Lockwood, T. (2010). *Design Thinking*. New York: Design Management Institute/Allworth Press.
- Lockwood, T. (2010). *Design Thinking*. New York: DMI.
- Long, W. (1983). *The Meaning of Entrepreneurship*. *American Journal of Small Business* , 47-56.
- Marginson, S. (2007). *Global University Rankings: Implications in general and for Australia*. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* , 131-142.
- Martin, I. (2000) *Reconstituting the Agora: Towards an Alternative Politics of Lifelong Learning*. Adult Education Research Conference. New Prairie Press.
- Maskell, D. (2002). *The New Idea of a University*. Thoreveton: Imprint Academic.
- McCahill, M. (2002). *The Surveillance Web. The rise of Visual Surveillance in an English City*. Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Miclea, M. (2004). *Learning to do as a Pillar of Education and its Links to Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education. European Contexts and Approaches*. *Higher Education in Europe* , 221-230.

- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Mosari, S (2015) *UKCES explains what is an Anchor Institution?* UKCES blog 19/3/2015
- Murray, R. (2003). *How to Write a Thesis*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Naidoo, R. (2000). *The 'Third Way' to Widening Participation and Maintaining Quality in Higher Education:Lessons from hte UK*. Journal of Education Enquiry , 24-38.
- Naidoo, R. (2003). *Repositioning Higher Education as a Global Commodity:Opportunities and Challenges for Future Sociology of Education Work*. British Journal of Sociology of Education , 249-259.
- National Council for Entrepreneur Education*. (2012, October 1). Retrieved October 1, 2012, from National Council for Entrepreneur Education: <http://www.ncee.org.uk>
- Neave, V. (1991). *Prometheus Bound; The Changing Relationship Between Government and Hlgher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Peramon Press.
- NESTA (2014) <http://www.nesta.org.uk/blog/toolkitting-transformation>. Accessed 29th May 2014.
- NESTA (2016) <http://www.nesta.org.uk/blog.Cultural Policy in the Time of the Creative Industries>. Accessed 20th January 2017.
- Norton, K. (2001). *The Strategy Focussed Organisation. How Balanced Scorecard Companies Thrive in the New Business Environment*. New York: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.
- Oliver and Eales (2008). *Re-evaluating the consequentialist perspective of using overt participant observation in managment research*. Qualitative Market Research , 344-357.
- Oxford Dictionary. (1995). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pieterse, A, VanKnippenberg, D, Schnippers, M (2010). *Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behaviour: The moderating role of psychological empowerment*. Journal of Organisational Behaviour. Vol 31. issue 4
- Pinchot, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring: Why You Dont Have to Leave the Corporation to Become an Entrepreneur*. Harper and Row.

- Polyanyi, M. (1974) *Personal Knowledge. Towards a Post- Critical Philosophy*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Powell, A. (2012). *Leadership for Improved Academic Enterprise*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education Stimulus Paper.
- Read, H. (1942). *Education through Art*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Reynolds, M. (1998). *Reflection and Critical Reflection in Management Learning*. *Management Learning*, 183-200.
- Romans, M. (2005). *Histories of Art and Design Education. Collected Essays*. Bristol: NSEAD. Intellect Books.
- Roworth-Stokes, R. (2013). *The Business of Research into Art and Design; Pararells Between Research Centres and Small Businesses*. *Journal of Research Practice*.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. USA: Basic Books inc.
- Seltzer, K., & Bentley. (1999). *The Creative Age: Knowledge and Skills for a New Economy*. London: Demos.
- Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing Successful Universities*. Oxford: SRHE and OUP.
- Shattock, M. (2009). *Entrepreneurial Universities and the Knowledge Economy. Diversification and Organisational Change in European Higher Education*. England: Open University Press.
- Sieber, J. (2004). *Empirical Research on Research Ethics*. *Ethics and Behaviour* .
- Simon, H. (1996). *Bounded Rationality and Organisational Learning*. *Organisational Science*, 125-134.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism. Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S. and Rhoades, G. (2009) *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. The John Hopkins University Press.
- Smallbone, D et al, (2015) *Anchor Institutions and Small Firms in the UK. A review of the Literature on Anchor Institutions and their role in developing management and leadership skills in small firms*. UKCES.

- Thorp, B. G. (2010). *Engines of Innovation. The Entrepreneurial University in the 21st Century*. North Carolina Press.
- Trowler, P (2014) *Doing Insider Research in Universities*. Amazon.co.uk. Marston Gate
- Valsania,S; Moriano,J; Molero,F (2014) *Authentic Leadership and intrapreneurial behavior; cross-level analysis of the mediator effect of organisational identification and empowerment*. International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal. Springer.
- Valsania, S; Moriano, J; Molero, F (2016) *Authentic Leadership and employee knowledge sharing behaviour: Mediation of the Innovation Climate and Workgroup Identification*. Leadership and Organisational Development Journal. Emerald Group Publishsing.
- Watson, C. (2011). *Accountability, Transparency, Redundancy: Academic Identities in an Era of 'Excellence'*. British Educational Research Journal , 955-971.
- Watson, D. (2011) *The engaged university: international perspectives on civic engagement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Watson, D. (2014) *The question of conscience: higher education and personal responsibility*. London: Institute of Education Press.
- Whitchurch, C and Gordon,G (2012) *Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education*. Routledge.
- Wolf, A. (2002). *Does Education Matter? Myths about Education and Economic Growth*. UK: Penguin Books.
- Wiklund,J and Shepherd,D (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance. Journal of Business Venturing. Elsevier
- Witty, A (2013) *Universities and Growth: the Witty review*. Department for Innovation and Skills
- Yeomans, R (1988) *Basic Design and the Pedagogy of Richard Hamilton*. International Journal of Art and Design Education. Vol.7.2
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. California: Sage Inc.