Book Section:

Education or Exploitation? Reflecting on the entrepreneurial university and the role of the entrepreneurship educator

Richard Tunstall, University of Leeds

Act 1: Scene 1 The university disrupted

It is a bright summer morning on campus. Semester has ended and conference season has begun. This conference is no different to any other. There is a registration list, name badges are handed out, old relationships are rekindled over questionable coffee and delegate lists are scanned for new people to meet.

We sit comfortably, dressed in suits in an air-conditioned lecture theatre in a glinting new glass and steel campus building, dedicated to a historical local luminary who three hundred years ago inspired a national social movement. The topic today is entrepreneurship and innovation, and I attend as a researcher, but academic delegates are few in number and we sit alongside small business owners, university spin-out officers and innovation managers of major multinational corporations. We are listening to a keynote from a government minister, who explains the importance of the conference to the national agenda for university-business collaboration. So far, so normal, yet not a traditional university event by any means.

Suddenly, there is an ear-piercing shriek as the lecture theatre doors burst open. The minister stops mid speech and backs away from the podium as six students walk across the stage and unfurl a large banner which poses one question to us:

EDUCATION OR EXPLOITATION?

At first delegates seem shocked by the stage invasion and air horns, but they become relaxed and good humoured as all the signs of a student protest in progress become clear.

Student Protestor (Shouting from the lectern):	We are here today to protest against companies involved in some of the most horrendous human rights abuses! Exploitation of the planet and animals! And government ministers who are colluding with big business! This is not what elected representatives are supposed to do! There are some of the most horrible companies around today! There was a terrorist attack yesterday! Nine people killed! Companies here are killing far far more people than that every single day! Making cluster bombs! making bombs and tanks! And guns! That are used to oppress people! Used to destroy the planet!
Small Business Owner Delegate:	Why are you here?
Student Protestor:	To protest against multinationals
Small Business Owner Delegate:	So where did that Goretex coat come from that you're wearing? And those Nike shoes?
Student Protestor:	I got them from a charity shop
All Delegates:	[Laughter]
Small Business Owner Delegate:	Look. We are having a conference. You've made your point now. Can't you leave and let us get on with it?
Student Protestor:	We are exercising our right to protest. [Begins shouting again] We are here to protest! Multinationals are killing the planet… (etc).

The shouting continues. Uniformed University security appear and attempt to escort the protestors out. One female student drops to the floor and is picked up, dragged screaming. The doors close. The government minister regains his place at the podium.

Government Minister:	Well at least when I was involved in student protests I took the time to get my facts right. I'd be a lot more worried about nanotechnology if I were them, it is far more potentially harmful than GM crops.
All Delegates	[Laughter]

Despite continued sirens outside, the conference continues. The noise dies down and the protests are forgotten about. The formalities of the conference returns. We look forward to our glass of wine at the Vice-Chancellor's welcome reception.

Notwithstanding the convivial nature of the occasion, the discussion at the reception return to the conference invasion. The idea of a student protest resonates with some delegates as part and parcel of being on a university campus, yet for others it is a clear frustration that the serious work of the university-business conference has been disrupted in this way.

During the conference, I felt myself torn between my role as researcher of entrepreneurship on the one hand and in my role as entrepreneurship educator on the other. My understanding of the positive intention and importance of the conference, versus my sympathy with the student's request to be allowed to speak and engage, created a sense of personal dissonance. This was particularly symbolized by that student banner:

<p style="text-align:center">EDUCATION OR EXPOLITATION?</p>

What is the purpose of the University? To educate and disseminate knowledge for the sake of knowledge, with no prior assumptions of the consequences or relevance to the outside world? To generate research impact through innovation and ensure the industry potential of students, as an instrumental component of the knowledge economy, so as to maximize competitiveness in the global economy (Down, 2009; Dahlstedt and Herzberg, 2012)? The protestors' question directly engages with these alternative perspectives of the purpose of the University, posited as traditional versus entrepreneurial. It was through the organized protestors invasion of the formal event that these alternatives collided. Through their direct action protesting the presence of commercial interests on campus and their banner, the protestors highlighted their argument that the ideals of traditional university values were under threat. For my part, as a participant in the conference engaged in both entrepreneurship research and education, the protest illustrated the apparent contradictions inherent in entrepreneurship education at universities. The protest therefore provides us with the occasion to look critically at alternative ideals of the University, the extent to which these ideals compete, and further consider the implications and tensions this creates for entrepreneurship education. The conference was a place where the legitimacy of market-related activity in universities was questioned. As an entrepreneurship educator and researcher, this also raised questions about my own practice(s). On the one hand my role as an academic is to critically examine entrepreneurship and its consequences, engaging students in this as part of their academic studies within the university. On the other hand, my legitimacy in teaching entrepreneurship is tested on the basis of my prior business experience, where an emphasis on practical knowledge and market-relevance is expected and where questions are asked about whether it is academics or business owners who are best placed to teach these topics. Business people at alumni events and parents at university open days may perceive entrepreneurship education as a primarily practical exercise requiring business practitioners to lead it, and therefore ask, as Farny et al's (2016) students ask of academic faculty "How can you then lecture on the topic?" (p.519).

Act 1: Scene 2 The traditional values of universities

Before the conference took place, protest websites presented it as a meeting place for unethical multinational corporations. The University was portrayed as seeking to make deals with these actors by exploiting knowledge in a way which undermined the traditional purposes and activities of the University.

In the scope of this chapter, and its dialectics of **education or exploitation** the emphasis on entrepreneurship education becomes **education about entrepreneurial exploitation** where entrepreneurship is a subject to be studied dispassionately as a remote object, as one of the canon of topics which a business school student reads during the liberal engagement of the student in their overall intellectual development. In this sense, I might position myself as a traditional university academic, teaching a speciality subject. Here I am asked to provide my course as part of a management student's curriculum within management studies and it is vital that my subject can be considered appropriate to be taught as an academic field.

Entrepreneurship is relatively new as a field of study and much academic labour has sought to establish entrepreneurship as a disciplinary science which can hold its own within business and management studies (Wiklund, Davidsson, Audretsch and Karlsson, 2011; Zahra and Wright, 2011). Yet this is not uncontentious, as the push towards academic legitimacy has had an institutionalising effect (Aldrich, 2012) tending to privilege normative science where individual entrepreneurs as economic actors are emphasized over perspectives and paradigms which might provide alternative intellectual tools to study the subject (Pittaway and Tunstall, 2016). This can cause challenges for educators when teaching entrepreneurship in a traditional academic mode, where the demands of the disciplinary science are countered by students' demands that certain topics or famous entrepreneurs are considered and that industry and employability relevance be included in the classroom (Farny et

al, 2016). Answering these challenges requires not only a change in pedagogy, but a change in priorities for the university towards those of the entrepreneurial university.

Act 1: Scene 3 Supporting the entrepreneurial university

The disrupted conference was officially instigated to promote corporate venturing, entrepreneurship, innovation and collaboration between universities and industry. Delegates included small firms, university technology commercialization officers and members of the innovation units of multinational firms. By hosting the conference, the university was presented as entrepreneurial, and therefore an equal partner in economic activity with industry and government.

> 'The Conference was certainly a valuable experience for policy makers, practitioners and researchers as there was a rich and varied source of entrepreneurial experiences and above all the willingness to share and exchange views and ideas.' (University events website)

The concept of the entrepreneurial university originates in the perspective that universities are traditionally remote and disengaged from the needs of society. By becoming entrepreneurial, universities are seen to become engaged by assuming their role as contributors to the knowledge economy in a 'triple helix' of university, government and industry (Etzkowitz, 2003; Etzkowitz and Leyesdorff, 2000) through intellectual property creation and subsequent development (Perkmann and Walsh, 2007). As a key element of the triple helix, the entrepreneurial university may be seen a key developer of new knowledge, through patents, licenses and spin-off firms developed on the basis of faculty research (Etzkowitz, 2003; Etzkowitz and Leyesdorff, 2000; Perkmann and Walsh, 2007). This approach often acts as a key element of government regional development policy (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 2000) as well as an important aspect of industry open innovation strategies, through which commercial businesses seek ideas external to their firm to develop new innovations (, 2006).

The conference was in this sense an embodiment of entrepreneurial university activity and attracted significant attention. In addition to corporate multinationals and government ministers, the University Vice-Chancellor appeared later that evening at a welcome reception to speak on the importance of university-business collaboration and the role of the University in providing innovations from research, employability from education and the importance of cultivating campus entrepreneurship. Through discussions and presentations, the event was positioned as an example of the triple helix in action.

'The responsiveness of the university sector to innovation and venturing was exemplified by the work of [the] university, portrayed by the Vice Chancellor.' (University events website)

This seems to indicate that beyond specific economic activities such as IP innovation and spin-out venturing, there was something within the unique nature and purpose of this specific university which made it a particularly valuable partner. Similarly, the concept of the entrepreneurial university is often seen to focus attention on openness to change in otherwise bureaucratic university processes and towards the exploitation of opportunities for innovation across the university (Gibb and Hannon, 2006).

In our dialectic of "education or exploitation?" the entrepreneurial university emphasis on entrepreneurship education becomes "education for entrepreneurial exploitation" where education acts as a mechanism to exploit students' capacity for innovation as an internal knowledge resource, through which they become entrepreneurs (Dahlstedt and Herzberg, 2012) and to exploratively generate new partnerships with commercial firms. Here my role as an entrepreneurship educator is no longer to be an expert on the academic discipline of entrepreneurship, indeed from this perspective disciplinary knowledge is viewed as no longer privileged, but an entrepreneurial resource which may

be obtained anywhere inside or outside the university. Instead my role is to act as the guide on the side, not the sage on the stage (Lobler, 2006). Coaching and facilitating student learning which is self-deterministic, abandoning traditional assessment by examination or research dissertation and instead helping students to fine-tune their business plans and pitches to enable them to launch start-ups while further assisting them in shaping their identity as future entrepreneur to carve out their niche in the global economy (Smyth, 1999; Lobler, 2006; Farny et al, 2016). This alternative approach to university teaching is often presented as a modernising innovation for university education. This innovation is argued to be essential to the relevance of a university to the modern economy and to student expectations of their experience as consumers of knowledge in a crowded space, where universities must compete against other providers for their market share and academic educators must shift their mode of operation from knowledge creators and disseminators to professionalised service providers (Olssen and Peters, 2005).

Act 1: Scene 4: Debating the entrepreneurial university

While the perspectives presented through the official conference programme and counter-conference protest websites on the role and legitimacy of the entrepreneurial university competed in their outlook on the consequences of change, they both represented the entrepreneurial university as an approach which engendered movement from traditional university activities to a more industry-focused approach. While there was a shared acknowledgement of this change, the two groups differed in how they presented the underlying purposes, intentions and potential outcomes of this change.

The protestors directly drew on the idea of a University as an institution for the advancement or betterment of knowledge in developing their argument that the shift in modes for the university was an erosion of pure academic principles and values. Here they proposed that the event illustrated this erosion was caused by the entrepreneurial university, through the pursuit of business and market

investment activity, the interference of government and corporations, leading a creeping spread of managerialist thinking within universities:

'As universities are forced to rely on external funding to a greater and greater extent, the face of the Academy is changing. Increasingly decisions are made by faceless bureaucrats, and traditional values such as 'academic freedom' are eroded by business plans and links with multi-national corporations, who expect returns for their investments.' (Protest website)

In a wider context, the event was described as a significant indication of the wider marketization of universities, which was deliberately engendered and sustained by powerful multinationals and national government, with detrimental impacts on subjugated universities and increasing attempts to subvert faculty and students so that they might become more entrepreneurial and market-focused, as noted by one mainstream national newspaper commentator:

'Central to [the national government's research and innovation policy] document was that universities must work much closer with business and indeed must behave more like business. The plan was bursting with policies and funding programmes to expand not only corporate sponsorship of research, but also entrepreneurial activities amongst academics themselves. The corporate venture conference which was the target of the protest at [the university] was one manifestation of this policy.' (National newspaper)

The proponents of the conference conversely presented the changing mission of the university as a necessary, positive development. This modernising perspective exhibited similar concerns to protestors in bemoaning bureaucracy in universities, but argued that this is endemic in the very same traditional institutions and values that the protestors sought to protect. The proposed solution was to instead seek to create new opportunities for generating innovation across the university by disrupting

9

the existing order (Gibb and Hannon, 2006) and offer empowerment to previously restrained faculty by allowing them to behave entrepreneurially (Etzkowitz, 2003; Perkmann and Walsh, 2007). Conversely, this modernising tone has been argued to act as a strategic ploy by university leaders to influence external and internal stakeholders (Mautner, 2005) and du Gay (1997) notes that in an organisational context, entrepreneurialism is used as a way to gain power over employees by giving them the impression they have the creative capacity to create change, yet limiting this within the strategic aims of the organisation.

The debates illustrate two different conceptions of the purpose of a university, the goals of research and education and the expectations which should be placed upon university faculty and students. At the same time, the arguments employed by media on both sides of the argument illustrated a related set of concerns regarding avoiding bureaucracy within universities, engendering academic freedom and developing pedagogies which enable students, albeit these were framed from entirely different perspectives on the purpose of these activities. The conference and counter-protest therefore provide the opportunity to compare these arguments as they were directly employed by university faculty and students in their everyday practice during the conference. But the conference was just the beginning.

Act 2: Scene 1 University values on trial

After University security took the protestors out of the building, allowing the conference to proceed, the protestors continued their protest outside. This was a surprise to delegates when we took part in our conference break, but when police arrived the protestors dispersed. The excitement over, the conference continued and we looked forward to the Vice-Chancellor's wine reception.

After the conference, delegates exchanged emails to follow up on their earlier conversions at the conference. Through this email discussion it became apparent that this had not been the end of the story for the protestors at all. The university had pressed charges against their students. The case went

to trial and was recorded verbatim by an underground University counter-magazine. Further coverage was provided by national newspapers, student associations and left-wing organisations:

'Six students….could be jailed for staging a protest on university premises against 'the commercialisation of university research' (National Newspaper).

'[Charged with] 'Momentarily disrupting a conference'? In my day students would have been disrupting things for a lot longer, where's their staying power?' (Online cartoon sketch).

The official University communication channels and official conference media provided no coverage of these events.

During the trial and subsequent re-trial at a regional court the student protestors and a range of university staff were called to speak. During these trials the prosecutor put forward the case that the protest had been an illegal trespass of a private event. The defendants, countered that as the protestors were students their presence was legal. As these arguments were presented, the protestors themselves sought to use the trial as an opportunity to continue their argument by putting the entrepreneurial university on trial. Two key arguments emerged about the entrepreneurial university: the legitimacy of commercially-related activities and the role of students in universities.

Act 2: Scene 2 What is legitimate in a University?

The student protestors, defending, particularly focused their arguments on the legitimacy of their protest and further proclaimed the illegitimacy of entrepreneurship and research commercialisation at universities. They suggested that education and exploitation were mutually exclusive, and that the encroachment of enterprise meant that academic integrity was under threat:

'Because of his own research [a post-graduate student protestor] had been concerned to hear about the conference, because of its implications for the independence and freedom of research. Such concerns were widely held amongst his colleagues and other scientists.'

'[A student protestor] was "concerned about the impact of the privatisation of the university on the objectivity and direction of academic research."' (University counter-magazine)

A University faculty member, speaking in the protestor's defence, noted his surprise that the students had been arrested, yet also expressed sympathy for the legitimacy of the conference;

'The witness [University professor] was then asked about his statement that the commercial involvement in university research was 'fraught' and if he also thought that the use of university premises for commercial purposes, especially common outside term time, was also controversial. He replied, "Yes, but less so. Universities have to make money." He said this issue was less significant than issues of academic integrity.' (University counter-magazine)

In addition to students and academic faculty, a number of University support staff were cross-examined. One member of staff, when asked about university commercialisation, suggested that this was completely legitimate but acknowledged the right to protest:

'Asked about the appropriateness of corporate links to the university, [the Head of Security] replied, 'We live in a capitalist society', adding that he respected the opposition view being voiced by the [protestors], and would have supported a peaceful demonstration.' (University counter-magazine)

These arguments illustrate diverse perspectives on the legitimacy of commercial activity at universities amongst those involved. Where commercial activity was presented as illegitimate, the primacy of academic integrity and independence above contractual profit-seeking activities were used as a discursive vehicle to challenge the purpose of the conference. Where the conference was defended, this was on the basis of the primacy of profit-seeking activity as the expected norm and the hierarchy of university management governance, along with the expectation of individuals to act according to their contractual roles as employees within a corporate organisational system. Each sought to justify their behaviour as ensuring the obligations of the university were fulfilled to those it served. In this sense the conference, student protest and trials illustrate the different perspectives and frequently emotive debates about the underlying purpose of the entrepreneurial university and universities as a whole (Mautner, 2005; Gibb and Hannon, 2006; Perkmann and Walsh, 2007; Barnett, 2011; Collini, 2012).

The differences in perspective on the university as a system, with their own internal consistencies, illustrates how the arguments employed were based on different discourses inhibiting incompatible arguments. For proponents of the liberal university the university was an idea, part of a noble tradition following Humboldt (1810) and Newman (1852) of free speech and independent thought, unfettered by base economic concerns. The protestors diverged from this traditional understanding by emphasising freedom of speech for students, which has been argued to be related to, but not the same as academic freedom (Connolly, 2000), instead emphasising how the local historical context of the university legitimised their actions.

For the proponents of the entrepreneurial university, while the conference aims portrayed the university as an entrepreneurial university integral to an ecosystem of regional economic and industrial development (Etzkowitz, 2003) the participants in the conference and the university's legal defence team went further by framing it as a professional organization which competitively offered

services into the market, thus positioning it as an entrepreneurial organization seeking to compete (Miller, 1983, Covin and Slevin, 1991) where opportunities are sought and exploited (Gibb & Hannon, 2006), justified by wider acceptance of capitalism as a desirable social good (Berglund, 2013). The trial illustrated that to some extent, the concept of an entrepreneurial university, as an instrument of economic development through innovation, education and knowledge services, is directly aligned with neo-liberal market connotations. As the Head of Security put it 'we live in a capitalist society'.

Act 2: Scene 3: The role of students in the University

It was noted during the trial and the subsequent wider media debate, that this particular University had a history of student activism in the 1960's, of which many associated with the university were proud, including campus-based protests and blockades. This was referred to specifically within the trials as an activity that today, while not necessarily approved of, was at least viewed with respect as part of a legitimate student right to engage in critical debate and open access on campus as a member of the University:

Defence Lawyer: 'This was an attack on the culture of openness and public space which traditionally prevailed in universities and as [a university manager] had said, such events were common in universities (and elsewhere) 20/30 years ago.'

'[A student protestor] said he hadn't been aware that delegates were paying to be there, but that would have made no difference to his view that he had a right to protest inside the conference. It was a conference held at a university in a public building with a government minister present. Normally protests at the university by students are tolerated, and "people don't over-react".' (University counter-magazine)

In these arguments, the point was made that the traditional values of the university around research and education extended to the right for freedom of speech and open dialogue. These values were proposed to have primacy not only in interactions between members of the university but also in the use of material space on campus. It was noted by the defendants that the building in which the conference took place was named after a local founder of a national social movement known for activism, philanthropy and concern for social responsibility. Consistent with their framing of the role of a university they emphasised how the building's name was a material expression of the values of the liberal university. From this perspective they positioned the role of students as free thinkers and their rights to engage in dialogue and protest, to move freely across buildings as members of the community who could critically engage in any context with debates and arguments.

Yet in direct response to the defence lawyer's reference to open-access rights, the prosecution lawyer firmly portrayed the University as a contractually defined entity, which may give or deny licence to students and commercial users as it wishes;

> 'He stated that [the University] had complied with its code of practice on the day of the corporate venturing event. [The lawyer] stated that the demonstrators were trespassers within the terms of the law on aggravated trespass. Although they had a license to be on university premises, they exceeded the terms of the license by protesting in a way that interfered with the rights of the delegates.' (University counter-magazine)

These arguments firmly positioned the university as a business, relating back to wider rhetorical framing of the university as an entrepreneurial undertaking which seeks to generate competitive commercial value. In this context, the student's role was as a consumer who is provided education services and therefore has rights which are limited to the terms indicated by the university in the provision of that service.

These alternative explanations of the role and rights of students point at differences between the values of the traditional liberal university, with a liberal philosophy focussed on the development of liberal intellectuals who engage in the betterment of society, and a neoliberal philosophy whereby students act as customers who engage in a contract for the use of services as part of an overarching market system where financial return on investment is prioritised.

Act 3: Scene 1: Rethinking Entrepreneurship Education: The Yes, the No and the Becoming

At the trial and subsequent re-trial of protestors, the prosecution succeeded in arguing that the legal licence of the university to host commercial conferences superseded the moral arguments of open access to all campus buildings from the defendants, and the final judgement of the Court was that the student defendants be given suspended sentences, which were extended at the re-trial. Through this legal verdict, the argument for the legitimacy of profit-seeking activity in the corporate entrepreneurial university was confirmed. Yet while this was the final verdict of the court, this was not the final word in the media articles which followed, where one of the protestors commented on the verdict:

Student Protestor (in local newspaper interview): 'We remain proud of what we did and we still believe that the moral victory is ours. As far as we and our supporters are concerned, it has been the university's ethics that were and are on trial, and again and again they are being found guilty.'

Despite the conclusion of the trial and final verdicts, the contrasting discourses remained intact and intractable. It is worth then considering how these discourses connect to the literature on entrepreneurship education.

16

Entrepreneurship education literature tends to put forward a view of entrepreneurship as an aspirational good which should be promoted across all educational levels and within all schools and faculties in universities (Farny et al, 2016), this 'Yes'[1] approach proposes that entrepreneurship education's primary purpose is to encourage students to learn to behave as entrepreneurs and launch start-up businesses for personal gain (Hannon, 2012). Conversely, views of entrepreneurship education acknowledge and often systematically investigate the role of power, meaning and legitimacy in the entrepreneurial university and entrepreneurship education and what this means for students and educators (Fournier, 1998; Olssen and Peters, 2005; Bragg, 2007; Connell, 2013). Despite this, there is a tendency to set up the entrepreneurial university as a definable set of assumptions which are dominant and enforced by institutions and government, with the only solution being disobedience or protest to seek to preserve liberal ideals. This 'No' approach however ignores investigation in to the specific systems and processes which sustain the entrepreneurial university and the ways in which protest could be organized. It further ignores local context and seeks to generalize about the pervasiveness of capitalism and its effects as an entirely negative force. The 'No' is valid, but also self-perpetuates by acting as an outsider to the mainstream, positioning critical entrepreneurship education as a periphery activity, which is provided to a special class of the disaffected and marginalised (Hannon, 2005). In perpetuating 'Yes' and 'No' arguments, both sets of assumptions about entrepreneurship education serve to support and strengthen the internal consistency of their arguments, but do not seek to engage with alternative conceptions of universities, students, education and entrepreneurship and how these systems might look when applied to entrepreneurship education. It does not seek the engage with the 'becoming' and what might be. As identified through this case, this requires us to take our analysis of entrepreneurship education beyond pedagogy to consider the overarching purposes of entrepreneurship education, its formulation and

[1] Weiskopf and Steyaert (2008) put forward related concerns about the study of entrepreneurship and approach this through Nietzsche to propose a **Yes**, **No**, and **Becoming** of entrepreneurship studies.

practice in the lived-experience of those who participate and the interests of those would seek to develop it.

Post-Script: The Becoming.

The conference, protest and trials illustrated the importance of understanding how the entrepreneurial university is understood and enacted. Universities are different, and entrepreneurship within universities, including entrepreneurship education, is not neutral. The differences expressed illustrate alternative ways of framing the purpose and practice of education and the role of those involved. The trial illustrates that in the case of the specific university where the conference and protest took place, it was not possible to identify one objective rationalisation of the universities' purpose, instead multiple explanations, values and interpretations existed and collided at the conference and subsequent trials. Similarly, Jain, George and Malatrich (2009) found that university scientists' engagement in technology transfer activities were required to assume a commercial role identity, but that they attempted to assimilate this into a hybrid role by working to simultaneously maintain their academic personas. While Heinonen and Hytti (2010) indicate that not all students will want to engage in one single form of entrepreneurship education and Hannon (2005) notes how alternative aims and purposes may drive different forms of entrepreneurship education, the trials illustrated that student expectations go further than simple topic selection and personal career goal motivation, to deeper concerns about the purpose of higher education, the role of students on campus and the different valuing of university provision.

While a key element of debate in the student protest was the legitimacy of academic research commercialisation activities, it also suggests a different form of university entrepreneurship. Once the protest and the University's decision to press charges was made public, a number of protest and mainstream media websites provided commentary on the event and the subsequent trials. Amongst these, an underground internal university online magazine was launched by university faculty

members in response to the prosecution of the students by university management, that set out to provide a different voice for the university staff than the one provided by those who instigated pressing charges on behalf of the University. This initially set out to show the discontent by faculty for the student protestor's arrest as well as a general discontent with university management, which subsequently became the focus of the developing magazine:

'The last few months have been interesting ones for many of us in the University community. It will have escaped the notice of few that certain events have given rise to remarkable levels of distrust, anger and resentment as well as, more positively, the awakening of a certain solidarity and activism … The prosecution of the [protestors] and the peculiarly heavy-handed approach to the reform of our corporate governance should be seen as symptoms of much wider developments that have been subtly spreading their tentacles for some years now.' (Counter-magazine opening editorial).

While not an act that came out of a specific research project nor intended to be commercialised, this counter-magazine can be viewed as an entrepreneurial act, albeit unofficial and underground **skunkworks**. The counter-magazine sought to indicate an alternative to the dialectic of traditional university versus entrepreneurial university and the ways in which individual roles are positioned within them, by means of the re-appropriation of managerial language and the assertion of an alternative form of institutional legitimacy and moral authority:

'One of our aims is to contribute to the University's tradition of being a democratic and open institution. Universities are communities based upon the open sharing of (and disagreeing with) opinions, and in our view they flourish best when the traditions of dissent and open discussion are respected and encouraged. More widely, we hope also to contribute in some small way to the task of enhancing that sense of community and collegiality that has been sadly diluted in

recent years. In sum, we could do worse than…adopt as what our esteemed managers would call our 'mission statement' an adapted clause in our now often-forgotten Royal Charter: 'The object of [this publication] shall be to advance knowledge, wisdom and understanding by teaching and research and by the example of its corporate life.' (Counter-magazine opening editorial).

This launch can then be seen as a world-making act (Spinosa, Flores and Dreyfus, 1997) and as an alternative form of social-political entrepreneuring, which through entrepreneurial action generated a culturally-linked output from the university academic community to the wider public. While not the official purpose of the conference, it may be said that the event itself stirred university faculty to engage directly in entrepreneuring in order to make a difference.

To some extent, this is not at odds with the concept of academic entrepreneurship, as making a difference is often the reason why academics become involved in entrepreneurship, rather than financial reward (Perkmann and Walsh, 2007), and the online magazine intended to directly influence the development of change in the institution (Gibb and Hannon, 2006), but these perspectives are usually explicitly related to profit-seeking outcomes. The counter-magazine allows us to see how entrepreneurship in universities may be seen as enabling via social change: a civic outcome of the critique, development and advancement of knowledge. Relating entrepreneurship to the process of social action, rather than simply focussing on potential financial outcomes, puts the purpose of entrepreneurship in universities, and entrepreneurship education, in a new light.

As Fenwick (2008) emphasises, enterprise itself as a concept, remains unsettled and ripe for challenge. So too does enterprise and entrepreneurship education. This does not therefore give us a sense that an option can be simply chosen, but instead that the interaction of contested terrains sets the scene for an approach where overlapping interests combine. This generates a concept which is

inherently political, in which the competing pressures of the political context of University management, culture, student expectations, government pressure and industry expectations combine to set a theatre in which the direction is unclear, but should not be seen as uncontentious.

As was the case with the counter-magazine and has been emphasised by entrepreneurship theory, opportunities may be created as well as exploited. Through reflecting on entrepreneurship education, its purpose and goals and the wider context in which it is carried out, there is the opportunity to shape it into something which has the freedom to challenge assumptions of university teaching and curriculum. To create new ways to tackle the interface of teaching, research, society and economy. To create alternative voices and new ways of doing.

References

Aldrich, H.E., 2012. The emergence of entrepreneurship as an academic field: A personal essay on institutional entrepreneurship. Research Policy, 41(7), pp.1240–1248.

Barnett, R., 2011. Being a University, Abingdon: Routledge.

Berglund, K., 2013. Fighting against all odds: Entrepreneurship education as employability training. Ephemera, 13(4), pp.717–735.

Bragg, S., 2007. "Student Voice" and Governmentality: The production of enterprising subjects? Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28(3), pp.343–358.

Chesbrough, H.W., 2006. Open innovation: A new paradigm for understanding industrial innovation. In H. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West, eds. Open Innovation: Researching A New Paradigm. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–14.

Collini, S. (2012) What Are Universities For? London: Penguin Books.

Connell, R., 2013. The neoliberal cascade and education: an essay on the market agenda and its consequences. Critical Studies in Education, 54(2), pp.99–112.

Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D.P., 1991. A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour. Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 16, pp.7–25.

Dahlstedt, M. & Hertzberg, F., 2012. Schooling entrepreneurs: Entrepreneurship, governmentality and education policy in Sweden at the turn of the millennium. Journal of Pedagogy / Pedagogický casopis, 3(2), pp.242–262.

Down, B., 2009. Schooling, productivity and the enterprising self: beyond market values. Critical Studies in Education, 50(1), pp.51–64.

Du Gay, P., 1996. Consumption and Identity at Work, London: Sage.

Gibb, A., & Hannon, P. (2006). Towards the Entrepreneurial University? International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 4. pp.73

Hannon, P.D., 2005. Philosophies of enterprise and entrepreneurship education and challenges for higher education in the UK. The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 6(2), pp.105–114.

Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. (2000) 'The dynamics of innovation: From national systems and "mode 2" to a triple helix of university-industry-government relations, Research Policy 29 (2) 109-123

Etzkowitz, H. (2003), 'Innovation in innovation: the triple helix of university–industry–government relations', Social Science Information, 42 (3) pp. 293-337

Farny, S. et al., 2016. A CULTure of entrepreneurship education. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 28(7–8), pp.514–535.

Fournier, V., 1998. Stories of development and exploitation: Militant voices in an enterprise culture. Organization, 5(1), pp.55–80.

Fenwick, T. (2008). Whither Research in Enterprise? A Response to Salaman and Storey. Organization, 15(3), 325–332.

Heinonen, J., & Hytti, U. (2010). Back to basics: the role of teaching in developing the entrepreneurial university. The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 11(4), 283–292.

Humboldt, W. (1810) "On the Internal and External Organization of the Higher Scientific Institutions in Berlin." From Absolutism to Napolean, 1648-1815, German History in Documents and Images.

[Online] Accessed: 28 February 2014 http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3642

Jain, S., George, G., & Maltarich, M. (2009). Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists involved in commercialization activity. Research Policy, 38(6), 922–935.

Lobler, H. (2006) Learning Entrepreneurship from a Constructivist Perspective, Technology Analysis & Strategic Management, 18, (1), 19–38.

Mautner, G. (2005). The Entrepreneurial University: A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword. Critical Discourse Studies, 2(2), 95–120.

Miller, D., 1983. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. Management Science, 29(7), pp.770–791.

Newman, J.H. (2009: 1852) The Idea of a University, Dublin: Ashfield Press.

Olssen, M. & Peters, M.A., 2005. Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. Journal of Education Policy, 20(3), pp.313–345.

Löbler & Helge, 2006. Learning Entrepreneurship from a Constructivist Perspective. Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, 18(1), pp.19–38.

Perkmann, M., & Walsh, K. (2007). University–industry relationships and open innovation: Towards a research agenda. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9 (4), 259–280.

Pittaway, L. and Tunstall R. 'Is there still a Heffalump in the Room? (2016) Examining Paradigms in Historical Entrepreneurship Research' in: Landström, H., Parhankangas, A., Fayolle, A. and Riot, P. (eds.) Challenging Entrepreneurship Research (Routledge Rethinking Entrepreneurship Series) Routledge.

Smyth, J., 1999. Schooling and enterprise culture: pause for a critical policy analysis. Journal of Education Policy, 14(4), pp.435–444.

Spinosa, C., Flores, F., & Dreyfus, H. L. (1997). Disclosing New Worlds: Entrepreneurship, democratic action and the cultivation of solidarity. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wiklund, J., Davidsson, P., Audretsch, D. B., & Karlsson, C. (2011). The future of entrepreneurship research. Entre- preneurship Theory and Practice, 35, 1–9.

Zahra, S.A. & Wright, M., 2011. Entrepreneurship's Next Act. Academy of Management Perspectives, 25(4), pp.67–83.

J. Connolly, (2000) ''The academy's freedom, the academy's burden'', *Thought & Action* 16(1): 71.

Weiskopf, R. Steyaert, C. (2008) 'Metamorphosis in entrepreneurship studies: towards an affirmative politics of entrepreneuring' In: Hjorth, D. and Steyeart, C. (2008) The Politics and Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar