

The entrepreneurial university: an idea for its time

Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation, by Burton R. Clark, Guildford, IAU Pergamon/Elsevier, 1998

Sustaining Change in Universities: Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts, by Burton R. Clark, Maidenhead, Open University Press, 2004

Michael Shattock*

Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK

This article explores the context, contents and impact of Burton Clark's two books devoted to the concept of 'the entrepreneurial university'. It describes the widespread influence of the entrepreneurial idea particularly in Europe and discusses its relevance a decade or so after its first formulation. It argues that *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities* had a major impact on the way European universities thought about the appropriate balance between institutional autonomy and state control and it released energies in many countries and a concern for self-management which had hitherto lain dormant. It also raised the important question of the relationship between the organisational framework necessary to assist institutional self-reliance and the conduct of academic work.

Keywords: entrepreneurialism; autonomy; transformation; collegiality; Europe

Very late in what would normally be regarded as the creative working life of a scholar Burton Clark identified a new vein of research ideas based around the idea of the 'entrepreneurial' university. Unlike his previous published work which had been much concerned with systemic issues in higher education, *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation* addressed specific institutional issues. Moreover, whereas in the past his readership had been primarily academic and scholarly this, in his own words, 'turned out to be the right book at the right time' (Clark 2004, 2) attracting interest from an enormous range of practitioners in and around the international world of universities and governments. Indeed as Clark himself wrote, 'Such organized critical attention has never happened to me before in half a century of scholarly writing' (Clark 2001, 9). He followed it up, this time in his eighties, with a second volume *Sustaining Change in Universities: Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts* which introduced new case studies and reflected on the debate which had been generated by linking institutional behaviour with the idea of entrepreneurialism.

I can claim some association with both these books: I played a part in selecting the five case study universities for *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities* and acted as host and mentor when he was researching the Warwick case; I also argued vigorously with him (wrongly I now think) as to the merits of 'Innovative' over 'Entrepreneurial' in the title. *Sustaining Change* reflected discussion we had had, since the first volume, and in particular a joint session we spoke at, at Strathclyde University in 2002, which is generously referred to in the acknowledgements; I

*Email: m.shattock@ioe.ac.uk

introduced him to the Open University Press. Subsequently, with Paul Temple and Gareth Williams, I secured a grant from the European Commission (the EUERЕК project) to study the relationship between university entrepreneurialism, based on Clark's concepts and the so-called Europe of Knowledge which was later published as *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy* (Shattock 2009). I could therefore be described as not an entirely unprejudiced reviewer of the two works.

The generation of the concept of entrepreneurialism in universities

Unlike the other books discussed in this collection of essays *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities* grew substantially out of Clark's European experience. In *Sustaining Change* he drew on a more international set of case studies and related some general findings from them to the original five (Warwick, Twente, Strathclyde, Chalmers and Joensuu) but the contextual differences from the originals made the comparisons less compelling. The research ideas came out of his regular attendance at the annual EAIR and CHER conferences and the audience at which they were aimed was also primarily European. More remarkably, although he had grants from the Mellon and Spencer Foundations to cover travel, accommodation and incidental costs he had none of the research assistance that accompanied many of his previous projects. So at the age of 73-plus he embarked on visits of up to a fortnight at each of the universities to be used as case studies engaging in one to two hour taped interviews with vice-chancellors, pro-vice-chancellors, faculty and administrators, collected statistical and strategic data about the institution and attending meetings, then returned to an airport hotel to write up his preliminary findings and, much later, when the outlines of the book had been completed, returned to the universities to reassure himself of the accuracy of the material he had gathered. This was real 'hands on' research; as he said:

I focused very little on so-called theory and very much on practice. I stayed away from legislators, planners, ministers, and all others who claimed that they were in the business of defining broad policy in higher education. Instead I spent my time with those who did the work inside universities. (Clark 2004, 2)

He argued that as he proceeded with his research he came to understand that 'practical wisdom' was:

... acquired by plunging into settings inside universities that directly condition and enact research, teaching and student learning. The work of higher education is highly localised: it is done in university base units as varied as departments of physics, economics and history, and in places as dissimilar as schools of medicine, education, computer science and performing arts. The best way to find out how universities change and the way they operate is to proceed in research from the bottom-up and the inside-out. 'System' analysis done top-down cannot do the job. It misses the organic flow of university internal development. (Clark 2004, 2)

In other words it was 'more from "practice" to "theory" than the other way round' (Clark 1998, xv). He was concerned to construct a 'narrative' or 'pathways' for each of his case studies covering 10 to 15 years because that was the kind of timeframe in which he believed institutional transformation could take place (Clark 2004, 2).

Such research was particularly applicable and topical in Europe, where, excluding the UK for a moment, university systems were locked into Humboldtian or Napoleonic models and highly dependent on state support. If we compare such European systems with, for example, the picture of the 'Multiversity' painted as long ago as 1963 by Clark Kerr (Kerr 1963) we see constraint, state dominance, and the absence of any vestige of the managerial self sufficiency and diversity of mission which Clark advocated. In selecting Chalmers, Twente and Joensuu as case studies Clark was deliberately identifying universities which for particular reasons did not

answer to this description, Chalmers because it had opted for a distinctive legal and funding model within the Swedish system, Twente because of its non-traditional origins and commitment to industrial partnerships marking it out from most of the rest of Dutch higher education and Joensuu because of its implicit regional and economic role within Finland. The UK universities, while moulded by common state funding systems, nevertheless retained a greater tradition of institutional freedom and ability to manage their own affairs. Of the two UK case studies, Warwick was regarded by Clark as a prototype of the proactive university while Strathclyde demonstrated how an institution could redefine itself under the banner of 'useful learning'. Both universities could claim distinctiveness amongst comparator UK institutions. In his selection, therefore, Clark could be said to be weighting his argument. However, he was profoundly original, first in writing about universities from an organisational perspective and relating this to their academic profile, second in doing so by using an institutional case study approach as a basis for drawing out theory.

So much for the methodology of the research. Why did he undertake it? Clark had a long standing interest and affection for Europe and one of his early books was an organisational study of Italian universities (Clark 1977). In his retirement from UCLA he had been a regular speaker at European higher education conferences and had undoubtedly developed a fascination for the restrictions – financial, cultural and organisational – that appeared to be imposed on the typical European university. The book's argument was that these universities were entering 'an age of turmoil for which there is no end in sight' and that 'the demands on universities outrun their capacity to respond' (Clark 1998, 129): more and different types of students were seeking access to higher education, labour force demands were becoming more specialist, governments were expecting more for less, knowledge growth was outrunning resources. These pressures were producing a demand overload. However, he had a longstanding belief that changes introduced at system level were 'blunt instruments for reform' and had 'great difficulty in activating local initiatives'. This was particularly true in Europe where 'system organisation traditionally has worked to induce institutional passivity and weak local leadership' (Clark 1998, 134); only universities themselves could take the necessary adaptive actions and correct the imbalance between the institutions and their environments. To resist these pressures and perceived environmental imbalances universities had to transform themselves to become more self-reliant, more flexible in their responses and, he implied, more 'corporate' in their decision-making.

Clark drew from the analysis of the five case studies five key organisational elements of transformation:

- The strengthened steering core.
- The expanded developmental periphery.
- The diversified funding base.
- The stimulated academic heartland.
- The integrated entrepreneurial culture.

These 'elements' have become so well known that it is hardly necessary to expand on them and I do so only to provide a context to Clark's thinking. If you can imagine a university which balances a direct relationship with the state, mediated through powerful state officials, an elected rector and a representative – and therefore conservative – senate constitutionally inclined to protect the departmental *status quo*, you can appreciate the force of the identification of the first of these 'elements', the strengthened steering core as an 'administrative backbone' which 'fused new management values with traditional academic ones' and where a group of academics 'trusted by their peers served in central councils and took responsibility for the entire institution'. This gave the institution 'a greater collective ability to make hard choices among fields of knowledge' (Clark 1998, 137), provided the mechanism for resource allocation and for

the cross subsidy of academically valuable but impoverished departments by taxing the wealthier ones, driving institutional strategy and responding to external pressures. The Warwick Steering Committee and the Strathclyde University Management Group offered Clark the most obvious models for this kind of body, both bringing academics and administrators together to manage 'collegial entrepreneurialism'.

The second 'element', the expanded developmental periphery, comprised administrative units that promoted contract research with external bodies, self-financing research centres linked to established academic departments, university consulting organisations and science parks all characteristics of Kerr's 'multiversity'. 'As a halfway house to the outside world the developmental periphery becomes an organisational location within a university for the absorption of whole new modes of thinking' (Clark 1998, 139). In other words, by encouraging non-traditional organisational structures which connected it to the outside world, the university created its own mechanism for internal transformation.

To become 'self-reliant', however, a university needed to develop the third 'element', the diversified funding base, which provided the discretionary finance necessary for investment into entrepreneurial activities and compensated for shortfalls in state income; it represented the prerequisite for institutional adaptability. The Warwick 'earned income group' offered one model of machinery to bring this about while the Chalmers 'foundation' status and Foundation Board (which almost uniquely amongst continental European universities launched a highly successful development appeal) provided another. In both cases the income generated was to be used to invest back into the academic programme and not into prestige projects which carried little academic value.

The fourth and fifth of these organisational 'elements', the stimulated academic heartland and the integrated entrepreneurial culture, emphasise the importance of this last point. Marginson and Considine in their study of the 'enterprise university' show how the marketisation of Australian universities stimulated the first three of Clark's 'elements of transformation' but not the last two, and encouraged the imposition of greater managerial hierarchies and a greater concentration on the commercialisation of academic life with much less academic participation in governance or institutional strategy being the consequence (Marginson and Considine 2000). Clark argued strongly for the importance of collegiality and the success of his case study universities in proving that 'collegiality and difficult choices are not mutually exclusive' (Clark 1998, 148) represents an important corrective to much contemporary thinking. Clark argued that institutional transformation springs not from a single person 'who runs everything from the top down' but occurs 'when a number of individuals come together in university basic units and across a university over a number of years to change, by means of organised initiative, how the institution is structured and orientated' (Clark 1998, 4). He believed in collective entrepreneurial action rather than the high profile leadership scenarios so often painted for us in the myriads of top-down re-structurings which we have seen so often in UK universities and he quoted David Leslie approvingly:

... change in colleges and universities comes when it happens in the trenches; what faculty and students do is what the institution becomes. It does not happen because a committee or a president asserts a new idea. (Leslie 1996, 110)

As a consequence institutional transformation came about incrementally and not as a big bang, and he quoted business literature to show that successful firms do not attempt strategic change in single overnight actions but prefer incremental change, and that 'leading change involves action by people at every level of the business' (Pettigrew and Whipp 1991) not simply by those at the top. This remains a hard-sell in many UK universities where authority and hierarchy has often become embedded in their structures. Equally, it must be said, entrenched collegiality in

many continental European universities has discouraged making hard choices and has fuelled resistance to change.

The impact of the concept

The book's immediate impact was considerable and all the greater because the concept of entrepreneurialism in higher education was being advocated by such a senior scholar who was known to be liberal in his ideas and whose previous work was distinguished by its theoretical contributions. Publication in the UK coincided with a very long period of austerity in higher education when the Tory Government, apparently being aped by its Labour successor, had proved to be relentless in pursuing a policy of reducing the unit of resource coupled with a determination to impose a more economically instrumentalist rationale through funding policies. A call to institutions to be more entrepreneurial and to commit themselves to self-help rather than reliance on the state was therefore timely. In continental Europe funding shortfalls, 'massification' and, in some countries, an increasing interest in neo-liberal policies, had stimulated a realisation that alternative funding strategies had to be explored. It chimed with the spirit of the times. The IMHE/OECD Board adopted entrepreneurialism as the theme of its Year 2000 General Conference and an international conference around the book was held in China in 2001. Strathclyde University organised a further conference on the topic in 2002. Barnett wrote an interesting article about the globalisation of entrepreneurialism as an idea and quoted it as an example of 'knowledge travel' (Barnett 2005). But perhaps its most powerful influence was exercised within the European Union where the Commission saw it as the antidote to the sluggish, state dominated systems of continental Europe: its Communications, particularly *The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge* (CEC 2003), *Mobilising the Brainpower of Europe* (CEC 2005) and *Delivering the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and Innovation* (CEC 2006), bear testimony to the ideas Clark had unleashed. Indeed the first of these Communications, published in 2003, with its invocation of the challenges facing European universities: internationalisation, relations with industry, the reorganisation of knowledge and the emergence of new expectations together with the need for a diversified income base represented a clear echo of Clark's demand-response thesis. The book was widely quoted at European conferences, where Clark was a regular speaker. Clark, himself, was the subject of a special award from UNESCO.

However, there were also critics. Some particularly focused on the word 'entrepreneurial' which to them implied at best a slavish adoption of market principles and at worst a subordination to commercialism. In the UK in particular the word was tarnished by the Tory Government's enthusiasm for backing 'entrepreneurs' against any form of economic planning (cf. *DTI: The Department of Enterprise*, DTI 1988). Barnett's article, for example, referred to above, links it with Slaughter and Leslie's *Academic Capitalism* (1997). When Frans van Vught and I were engaged in founding the European Consortium of Innovative Universities, which was based around the original five Clark case study institutions, the Autonomous University of Barcelona told us that they could not join if the title contained the word 'Entrepreneurial' so in true entrepreneurial fashion, we changed it to 'Innovative', to get them in. Clark had himself implied that the two words were interchangeable but was quite obviously sensitive to the criticism, writing in his address at the IMHE/OECD General Conference in 2000 that:

Entrepreneurial character in universities does not stifle the collegial spirit; it does not make universities hand maidens of industry; and it does not commercialise universities and turn them into all purpose shopping malls. (Clark 2001)

On the contrary, he argued that it strengthened collegiality, institutional autonomy and university academic achievement. In *Sustaining Change* he moved much more to using phrases like 'the self-reliant university'. There can be little doubt, however, that 'entrepreneurialism',

even as reinterpreted as stressing academic entrepreneurialism as we did in *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy* (Shattock 2009), was not a concept which would easily be accepted by critics who believed in the continued provision of higher education as a predominantly state funded system, and in the UK it became entangled in the concerns of those who were opposed to the introduction of student tuition fees. Such critics were mostly concerned with the implications of the title and its assumed endorsement of corporatism and managerialism and ignored the argument that it offered a mitigation of state dominance and an approach to institutional self-determination.

A further comment was made by Gareth Williams who argued that the element of risk in entrepreneurialism was insufficiently emphasised (Williams 2004). I think he is right and we incorporated this into our concept of entrepreneurialism but broadened it to include reputational as well as financial risk in our EUEREK book (Williams 2009).

Reflections on *Creating entrepreneurial universities*

In his second volume on the entrepreneurial theme, *Sustaining Change in Universities*, Clark reflected more on the organisational detail of institutional change and how particularly organisational structures could sustain 'a steady state of change'. Published in 2004 the book did not significantly add to the impact of its predecessor. The changes which that book had stimulated were ongoing and the theme was a good deal more cerebral. Essentially it asked the question: what converts entrepreneurial change from being a temporary shot in the arm to being a permanent phenomenon? First it reviewed the progress of the five original case study universities and then it provided nine other case studies drawn from continents other than Europe. These case studies were not personally researched, however, although Clark must himself have been very familiar with UCLA, Stanford, MIT and Michigan, the outstanding quartet of US research intensive universities which he profiled. However, at least one of the remainder, Monash, might in the eyes of some observers, look very much less entrepreneurial now than it had in 2002 and two of the others may not have progressed into the steady state of change that the theory might have anticipated. Of his original case studies, Warwick, which he describes as 'a paradigmatic case' and 'an entrepreneurial prototype' continued to exemplify his basic organisational argument because here the organisational culture survived a five-year challenge from new and unsympathetic leadership with its dynamism, vitality and ability to confront external issues apparently undiminished. Warwick clearly illustrates Clark's argument which in summary was that while not all universities would take the necessary steps to become entrepreneurial and self-reliant those that did and those that sustained it over a long period developed 'an organisational framework that encourages fluid action and change orientated attitudes' (Clark 2004, 174). Critical to this was the development of a 'bureaucracy of change as a key component of their character' (Clark 2004, 176) the essential features of which were the diversified funding base, a strengthened steering core – a collegial body not a senior management team combining elected academics and professional administrators – the continued proliferation of interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary research centres, an entrepreneurial academic heartland and an organisational culture which was self-confident, competitive and assertively ambitious. Writing exclusively about US institutions, two years after *Sustaining Change*, Zemsky, Wegner and Massie in *Remaking the American University: Market Smart and Mission Centred* (2006) reach very similar conclusions, emphasising the need for institutional focus, the centrality of academic departments and the transformation of university management. Neither prescription produces an easily replicable set of management tools to achieve success except to indicate that they do not lie in more obvious textbook solutions. As Clark concludes:

Facing the same external forces some universities change extensively, some change moderately, and some hardly change at all. The demands of the day clearly do not produce change. What counts are the responses, summoned from within diverse universities. (Clark 2004, 184)

More than a decade on from the invention of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ how relevant are Clark’s ideas today? Do they stand up in the period of austerity in which we now find ourselves? On the one hand the evidence from the 27 case studies on which we based *Entrepreneurialism in Universities*, and one of our main conclusions, was that European – by which for this purpose we meant continental European – universities were considerably more entrepreneurial than they were sometimes given credit for. Clark’s ideas accelerated and made intellectually acceptable a process that was already grinding very slowly into action. If you analyse data for the decade 1994–2004 for universities like Lund, Tampere and the Technical University of Valencia, all universities with a strongly academic focus, the movement towards Clark’s entrepreneurial model, and the presence of his five organisational elements of transformation is unmistakable. In 1994 the word ‘entrepreneurial’ was never used in continental European universities except pejoratively; now it is part of the *lingua franca* of higher education. The book’s impact legitimated its use in countries which would previously have been culturally fundamentally opposed to the ideas it propagated. What the 1998 volume did in particular was to bring the focus onto institutions rather than disciplines or individual scholars and argue that not only could organisational frameworks make a significant impact on the conduct of academic work but proactive university management (self-reliance) could open up opportunities for innovation which might never become available to institutions which allowed themselves to be inhibited from following an independent path by the dominance of state systems and state regulation.

On the other hand some legitimate questions might now be asked about the original Clark thesis:

- The five organisational elements of transformation, all imply a strong research component, which was certainly present in Warwick, Strathclyde, Twente and Chalmers. Even in the new models quoted in *Sustaining Change*, particularly those drawn from the US, there are no primarily teaching institutions. Temple’s chapter in *Entrepreneurialism in Universities* on entrepreneurialism in teaching and learning, however, broadens the way entrepreneurialism in higher education can be viewed (Temple 2009). Although Clark had himself written a study of teaching led liberal arts colleges, *The Distinctive College* (1970), I do not think he gave enough attention to the mission differentiation that has taken place in European mass higher education and although Joensuu of the five case studies was certainly more specifically teaching orientated than the other four it is somewhat counter intuitive to read in *Sustaining Change* of its determination to emphasise research in its mission over its original dedication to regional interests. Mission differentiation, if on cost grounds alone, must be a growing feature of European higher education, and it would be unfortunate if teaching orientated institutions felt inhibited from adopting an entrepreneurial agenda, especially when models of entrepreneurialism in such institutions are available.
- A second question arises in regard to the dominant role the state occupies in some European countries. Seen from a European perspective all five of the original case studies were special in one sense or another as compared with the mass of European universities: Warwick and Strathclyde were UK models in the UK’s exceptional autonomous tradition; Chalmers had exceptional autonomy within the Swedish system; Twente and Joensuu were both founded for distinctive regional purposes and were expected from their outset to be different from their countries’ traditional models. This may have led Clark to underestimate the inhibitions which the state often imposes on institutional freedom in Europe to become entrepreneurial. If one reads the litany of criticism of state influence in the first

of the European Commission's Communications – 'a tendency to uniformity and egalitarianism', insularity and over-regulation where 'minute *ex ante* controls hinder universities' ability to react swiftly to changes in the environment' and because 'change is always a matter of legislation, reforms are bound to be few, disruptive and uniform' (CEC 2003) – one has to recognise that the state can represent an ultimate impediment to the stirrings of entrepreneurialism in the institutions themselves.

- I am personally profoundly sympathetic to Clark's thesis that universities have it in their own hands to become 'distinctive', 'self-reliant' and 'entrepreneurial'. However, the extent to which a university can transform itself to the entrepreneurial model without a loosening of state over regulation which is characteristic of some European states is modest. Clark is clearly right when he says that the state is a blunt instrument for the reform of higher education but while in 1998, I would have agreed that universities which had in effect made themselves masters of their own fate could, by example, change a system from the bottom up, in 2010 I would give much more credence to the view that the impact of the role of the state remains more dominant in some countries than Clark allowed for. Entrepreneurialism can too easily be hobbled by embedded state processes – the operation of state run human resource provisions, restrictive financial regulation or a principled defence of the *status quo* in university–state relations.

What Clark provided, however, was a starting gun for recapturing institutional self-reliance; his assertion of the importance of organisational structures and culture and the way in which they shaped academic work was original and set up a whole new collection of research questions. What he did do in a way that no one else in the field of higher education study has done was to set alight a flame of institutional independence which, perhaps for the first time in some European countries, has encouraged a serious challenge to the enveloping political and cultural traditions of the European nation state. In his last published works he became one of the few higher education scholars of whom it can legitimately be claimed that their ideas transformed the way higher education was practiced.

Notes on contributor

Michael Shattock is a Visiting Professor in the Centre for Higher Education Studies, Institute of Education University of London; he was previously Registrar of the University of Warwick. He has published widely in the field of higher education: his most recent books are *Managing Successful Universities* (Open University Press 2003, 2nd ed. 2010), *Managing Good Governance in Higher Education* (Open University Press 2006) and *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy* (Open University Press 2009). He is now researching a book on *Making Policy in British Higher Education 1946–2006*.

References

- Barnett, R. 2005. Convergence in higher education: The strange case of 'entrepreneurialism'. *Higher Education Management and Policy* 17, no. 3: 51–65.
- Clark, B.R. 1970. *The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed and Swarthmore*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Clark, B.R. 1977. *Academic power in Italy: Bureaucracy and oligarchy in a national university system*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, B.R. 1998. *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organisational pathways of transformation*. Guildford: IAU Pergamon/Elsevier.
- Clark, B.R. 2001. The entrepreneurial university: New foundations for collegiality, autonomy and achievement. *Higher Education Management* 13, no. 2: 9–25.
- Clark, B.R. 2004. *Sustaining change in universities: Continuities in case studies and concepts*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

- Commission of the European Communities. 2003. *The role of the universities in the Europe of knowledge*. Brussels: CEC.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2005. *Mobilising the brain power of Europe*. Brussels: CEC.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2006. *Delivering on the modernisation agenda for universities: Education, research and innovation*. Brussels: CEC.
- Department of Trade and Industry. 1988. *DTI: The department of enterprise*. London: HMSO.
- Kerr, C. 1963. *The uses of the university*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Leslie, D.W. 1996. Strategic governance: The wrong questions? *The Review of Higher Education* 20, no. 1: 101–12.
- Marginson, S., and M. Considine. 2000. *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pettigrew, A., and R. Whipp. 1991. *Managing change for competitive success*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shattock, M.L. 2009. *Entrepreneurialism in universities and the knowledge economy*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Slaughter, S., and D.W. Leslie. 1997. *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Temple, P. 2009. Teaching and learning: An entrepreneurial perspective. In *Entrepreneurialism in universities and the knowledge economy*, ed. M.L. Shattock, 49–62. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Williams, G. 2004. *The enterprising university: Reform, excellence and equity*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Williams, G. 2009. Finance and entrepreneurial activity in higher education in a knowledge society. In *Entrepreneurialism in universities and the knowledge economy*, ed. M.L. Shattock, 9–32. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Zemsky, R., G.R. Wegner, and W.F. Massy. 2006. *Remaking the American university: Market-smart and mission-centred*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.