



The Entrepreneurial University: An exploration of “value-creation” in a non-management department

Journal:	<i>Journal of Management Development</i>
Manuscript ID	JMD-06-2016-0098.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	The Entrepreneurial University, Celebrity course launches, Qualitative research

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

The Entrepreneurial University: An exploration of “value-creation” in a non-management department

Abstract

Purpose: This study highlights the strategies undertaken by “entrepreneurial” universities to leverage their bottom-line especially in response to withdrawals of public funding. Internationalisation has been the most prominent from setting-up overseas branch campuses to aggressive recruitment drives for international students; and more recently, the launch of new programmes to attract a wider market.

Design/ methodology/ approach: Based on a documentary analysis, this study explores the future of curriculum development in entrepreneurial universities, using narratives around an “unconventional course” launch as a case illustration.

Findings: The findings reveal an interesting interaction of innovation, opportunity recognition, risk taking, and proactiveness at play within a university environment. The study also highlights how instructors have, in the past, based their syllabi on celebrities – from Georgetown University to the University of South Carolina, University of Missouri and Rutgers University cutting across departments from English through sociology to Women’s and Gender Studies.

Practical Implications: Overall this study captures the relationship between hip-hop artistry and poetry, as well as meeting the demands of society – societal impacts – not the least, bringing “street cred” into the classroom.

Social Implications: The case illustration of a course launch at the University of Missouri linking hip-hop artists to curriculum development and pedagogy, opens up the discourse on the future trajectory of teaching and learning in higher education, with its attendant social implications – not the least for life after graduation.

Originality/ Value: This study provides fresh insights into the entrepreneurial potential of universities in co-branded/ marketing activities with the hip-hop industry.

Keywords: The Entrepreneurial University; Celebrity course launches; Qualitative research

1. Introduction and Research Context

The transformational role of entrepreneurship in the context of education is reasonably well-established in the literature (Gartner and Vesper, 1994; Etzkowitz, 2003; Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004; Hartshorn and Hannon, 2005; Johnson, Craig, and Hildebrand, 2006; Heinonen and Pokkijoki, 2006; Jones and Iredale, 2010; Draycott and Rae, 2011; Foss and Gibson, 2015a, 2015b). However, considering that the sheer volume of extant studies in this direction is on entrepreneurship training (Matlay, 2007), there seems to be a palpable lacuna on how universities themselves

embrace entrepreneurship as a platform for fulfilling the demands of the *third mission*. Accordingly, this study seeks to highlight the strategies undertaken by universities to leverage their bottom-line and marketing strategies entrepreneurially, and especially in situations where public funding has been replaced with self-funding, in order to remain competitive (Hemsley-Brown, and Oplatka, 2006; Mazzarol and Soutar, 2012). University management strategies have ranged from setting up overseas branch campuses (Madichie, 2015; Fantazy and Madichie, 2015); to aggressive recruitment drives for international students (George, 2000; Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003); and launch of new programmes to attract a wider market segment (Gutman and Miaoulis, 2003, Gbadamosi and Madichie, 2014), and enhance their brands (see Chapleo, 2007, 2010, 2011; Chapleo, Durán and Díaz, 2011; Opoku, Abratt, and Pitt, 2006; Brown, and Mazzarol, 2009; Judson, Aurand, Gorchels, and Gordo, 2009; Sultan and Wong, 2012). This study focuses on an examination of a course launch at the University of Missouri, tapping into hip-hop artists' fans as a means of extending higher education provision to a supposedly disengaged and diverse audience and/ or market (Gbadamosi and Madichie, 2014). As paraphrased from the university website, the programme which is entitled "English 2169: Jay-Z and Kanye West" is designed to examine the power-duo's joint and respective careers from three different angles:

- Where do they fit within, and how do they change, the history of hip-hop music?
- How is what they do similar to, or different from what poets do?
- How does their celebrity status power alter what we understand?

The proposed delivery mode revolves around "...listening to music and watching videos," as well as "reading critical works on rap music, poetry studies, and Jay Z's 2010 biography *Decoded*." The justification of the course is presented as "likening the academic study of hip hop now to the study of film back when movies were still seen as 'trash for the masses'..." and the need to think *out of the box*. Hence, this viewpoint study critically examines the entrepreneurial nature of the move concerning extending the current understanding on the extent to which Universities are embracing opportunity recognition, risk-taking and other dimensions underpinning entrepreneurship. Following this opening section is the review of the literature, which is followed by the research methodology and a detailed discussion of the case illustration of a celebrity course launch. The study ends with a discussion and practical implications derived from our analysis.

2. Literature Review

With the pressures facing universities, and prompting them to become more entrepreneurial, most of these institutions have adopted a number of strategic approaches – from engaging more with the business community, setting-up centres for entrepreneurship, launching new courses on

entrepreneurship and bolstering their internship programmes especially in the case of the UK (see Madichie, 2014). It is logical to posit that introduction of programmes that suit the needs of the societal members in terms of their aspirations is very essential for the survival of HEIs (Helgesen and Nasset, 2007; Heinonen and Poikkijoki, 2006). While this could imply creating new programmes, it could also mean laying less emphasis on the existing provision as a means of paving way for new ideas, thereby encouraging innovation and creativity with a view to boosting the image of these Universities (Sevier, 1994; Palacio, Meneses and Pedro, 2002; Sexton, 2011).

Nevertheless, the extent to which Universities embrace entrepreneurship vis-à-vis value co-creation is yet to be fully appreciated in the literature. From a broad perspective, entrepreneurship is typically associated with innovation and creating new businesses (Huang and Yu, 2011; Gbadamosi, 2015). In the view of Rogers (1995: p11), innovation could be explained as ‘an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption’. With reference to a body of literature (see for example, Van de Ven., 1986; Pisano, 1997; Ennen and Ritcher, 2010), O’Regan (2012) notes that innovation can be both product and process-oriented. He then argues that innovation is a value co-creation exercise. Meanwhile, it has been noted that entrepreneurship education will continue to be an increasingly crucial contributor to economic growth and development in the society (Hynes, 1996). It is a broad-based tool that has benefited from numerous definitions spanning a number of years (Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004; Rae, 2007; Jones and Iredale, 2010; Draycott and Rae, 2011; Beynon, Jones, Packham and Pickernell, 2014).

While the argument of whether entrepreneurship could be taught or not is widely discussed in the literature, Henry *et al.* (2005) show that there is a consensus that at least some aspects of entrepreneurship can be taught. In fact, it has been shown that the completion of one entrepreneurship course increases the likelihood of having entrepreneurial intention by 1.3 times (Farashah, 2013). Hence, there are many initiatives to stimulate people to act in an entrepreneurial manner in the context of HE provision (Klofsten, 2000; Beynon *et al.*, 2014). Meanwhile Gurol and Afsan (2006) identify entrepreneurial traits to be higher in entrepreneurially inclined students when compared to their entrepreneurially non-inclined students’ counterpart. They have higher risk taking propensity, internal locus of control, higher innovativeness and higher needs for achievements (Elenurm, 2012; Jones and Iredale, 2010, 2014).

Furthermore, in their exploration of enterprise education, Hytti and O’Gorman (2004) developed a conceptual schema used to analyse 50 enterprise programmes across four European countries (Austria, Finland, Ireland and the United Kingdom) – highlighting the need for institutional support for education and training. It has been shown that the proliferation of enterprise education in the UK underscores the importance of understanding the meaning of the term enterprise competency (Caird, 1990a, 1990b; Stanworth and Gray, 1992). Moreover, Rae’s (2007)

study extended early experiences of connecting graduate enterprise and employability in the UK and proposed the need for further research enquiry into the field as it develops in complexity (another key area when it comes to enterprise education – i.e. employability).

However, Jones and Iredale (2010) made what they describe as partly a plea for a more rigorous, practically informed analysis of the different strands (pedagogy, entrepreneurship, citizenship and civic responsibility) of enterprise education. According to these scholars, the “most appropriate way to construe the concept of enterprise education is from a pedagogical viewpoint.” They also opined that enterprise education should not be equated solely with business, as it is a broader, deeper and richer concept. From this study our focus would be on the first two strands – pedagogy and entrepreneurship. Draycott and Rae (2011: 127) undertook a “critical review of competency frameworks introduced in England to assist with enterprise education primarily for the 14-19 age group [comparing] their educational purpose and rationale (*why?*), their content (*what skills and knowledge they include*), and the approaches to teaching, learning and assessment they recommend (*how?*).”

Interesting elements here include *why*, *what* and *how* – we should be concerned with enterprise education. For the purpose of this study, the ‘*what*’ makes for curious exploration. Indeed, the “*how*” element is equally significant as we seek to explore the entrepreneurial learning at the University of Missouri following in the tradition of Gbadamosi and Madichie (2010) in their case study of the development of the SME Marketing course at the Business school of a London University. Atherton (2004) once recognised the need to unbundle the terms in order to identify the similarities and differences of purpose between them. This is in addition to a study by Price (2004: 4) offering a succinct distinction between enterprise, entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship thus:ⁱ

Enterprise is an inclusive concept, which provides both the context in which subject disciplines can be explored, as well as an approach, through skill development, which can be taken to the exploration and discovery of a discipline. In these respects, it can provide a challenging environment within which to explore a variety of teaching areas (the small business context) as well as provide a dimension to learning, that of developing the skills of being enterprising, which provide students with an attitude towards learning, which rewards and supports innovation, change and development.

While *enterprise* has been well documented to support the recognition of new market opportunities as well as the development of opportunity to change and develop at the individual, business and industry levels – ranging from the exploration of new ideas and developments from a corporate perspective (as *intrapreneurship*) to the creation of new ventures, social programmes and the exploration of new opportunities (Price, 2004: 4) – it also has other applications. Indeed, enterprise

education, as identified by Jones and Iredale (2010), it involves attempts to maximise opportunities for the development of enterprising skills, behaviours and attributes in young people in the expectation that these will be utilised, deployed and developed at some future point whatever the envisaged career choice. This is distinct from the pursuit and/ or reliance on entrepreneurship education, which is aimed more at encouraging people to start-up a business – perhaps more along the launch of an SME Marketing course in a London Business School (see for example, Gbadamosi and Madichie, 2010). In the light of the above, Jones and Iredale (2010: 11) teased out the different foci and emphasis given to enterprise and entrepreneurship education:

Entrepreneurship education focuses primarily on the needs of the entrepreneur, whereas enterprise education addresses the requirements of a wider range of stakeholders, including consumers and the community. However, the key difference between the two terms is that the primary focus of entrepreneurship education is on starting, growing and managing a business, whereas the primary focus of enterprise education is on the acquisition and development of personal skills, abilities and attributes that can be used in different contexts and throughout the life course.

According to these authors, the primary focus of entrepreneurship education was on a series of *how's* – notably (Jones and Iredale, 2010): How to start a business including the key processes of business start-up; How to plan and launch a new business venture; enhancing the necessary skills and behaviours needed to run a business; the deployment of entrepreneurial skills and knowledge in a business context; imminent use of the knowledge and skills needed to start a business; and Self-employment.

However, they highlight the primary focus of enterprise education to be on developing an active learning enterprise education pedagogy; knowledge needed to function effectively as a citizen, consumer, employee or self-employed person in a flexible market economy; development of personal skills, behaviours and attributes for use in a variety of contexts; the person as an enterprising individual – in the community, at home, in the workplace or as an entrepreneur; use of enterprising skills, behaviours and attributes throughout the life course; and understanding how a business works (see Heinonen and Poikkijoki, 2006). Indeed, enterprise education pedagogy (Iredale, 2010; Beynon *et al.*, 2014) can be used across subject areas and throughout different phases of education – delivered through subjects like business or economic studies at secondary and further education levels or via business school modules at university level. As Jones and Iredale (2010: 12), point out, “using creative, action and experiential learning pedagogies means that the enterprise education approach can be applied in different teaching and learning contexts, through different subject areas [...] to best meet different pupils/ students’ needs.”

Furthermore, and in addition to the detailed analysis of Jones and Iredale (2010), Draycott and Rae (2011: 137) in their discussion, posed a similar question: What does “enterprise” mean in the context of 14-19 education? They argue that enterprise has been “hijacked” by schools as a convenient vehicle for them to evidence a range of “soft” skills which they cannot easily do in other ways. As part of their observation, they opine that in some schools it is even the practice for “less academic” or “challenging” students to be directed towards enterprise, whilst academic “high fliers” are steered towards attainment of qualifications which improve school league-table performance (see for example, Thomas, 2009). While we would hope that students who may be marginalised by their educational experiences may be energised by enterprising learning, it does seem wrong to steer “the more able” away from enterprise, for, as argued below, they are as likely to need to be enterprising in their lives and careers (see the case of African students as reported in Madichie and Madichie, 2013). It seems that the rationale and philosophy of enterprise is poorly articulated and understood in the educational policy literature: is it free-market political ideology, the development of soft skills or the development of employable young people? Some of these positions would raise ideological and other difficulties for many educators.

As an alternative, Draycott and Rae (2011: 138) argued that enterprise should be “*about developing a mind-set, goals (self-efficacy) and skills (personal capabilities) to equip young people for their futures.*” Enterprising learning is the process of learning in enterprising ways as well as becoming enterprising. It is conative and affective as well as cognitive (Gibb, 2008), but education is often most comfortable in the safety of cognitive learning. Indeed, Draycott and Rae (2011: 138) viewed the definition of enterprise, in the context of secondary education (and beyond), to fall under three broad classifications – personal, situational, and economic.

First, in the *personal context*, these authors argued that the development of self-knowledge and self-efficacy to be able to investigate, develop and act on ideas and opportunities. Second, in the *situational context*, they argued that “being enterprising is contingent on subjects and situations, hence learning and acting in enterprising ways will be different in, for example, performing arts, biological sciences, or mathematics; yet there is a role for enterprising learning in all of these, as there is in, or between, all subjects. Enterprise is also concerned with the practical applications of taught subjects, and can be usefully described as “practical creativity”, especially in situations where the term “enterprise” is considered too value-laden. Third, and finally, they contended that in the *economic context*, an “outcome of enterprise is the creation of new value. That should be wider than simply financial value or the generation of personal profit, and include social, environmental, aesthetic and intellectual value that may be shared in a range of ways. Students have to survive in an economic world and an understanding of responsible enterprise should assist them in this.”

Moreover, in his study on universities and enterprise, Rae (2010) suggested that the international financial and economic crisis in 2008 produced a new economic era with significant implications for enterprise and entrepreneurship education. He, therefore, sought to explore the consequences of changing economic, social and cultural movements, and how entrepreneurship education and learning can respond to these challenges (Gbadamosi and Madichie, 2014). Likewise, this study proposes that the nature of entrepreneurship is changing in response to social and cultural movements in the new economic era – notably entertainment. Indeed, the implications for the future development of enterprise and entrepreneurial education highlighted in Rae (2010), which include factors shaping change – from social and economic context, learners, learning and teaching, and institutional change – are all identified in this study. Consequently, the study presents new thinking on the future challenges and directions for entrepreneurship and related education in the context of fundamental economic and social change.

3. Research Methodology/Approach

The qualitative study is based on a documentary analysis of the future of higher education in general and using the exemplar of an unconventional course launch – notably “*English 2169: Jay-Z and Kanye West*,” at the University of Missouri, as a case illustration. This research approach is becoming increasingly popular in recent times as evident in the literature (Elston and Fulop, 2002; Momeni *et al.*, 2008; Paul and Hill, 2013; McGraw and Drennan, 2014). The information relating to this course - i.e. *English 2169: Jay-Z and Kanye West* - was obtained from a variety of sources, but primarily from the website of the University of Missouri, which detailed the objectives of the course. Besides, comments on this programme has also been documented in other published sources such as *Riverfront Times* (Toler 2014), and *Consequent of sound* (Coplan 2014), *Hollywood 360* (Gargiulo 2014), and *MU News Bureau* (Daily Clips Packet, 2014).

If succinctly explained, documentary analysis is about the scrutiny of the manifest dimensions of documents, in which explicit words, and phrases are noted as indicators of values (Masterson, 1998; McGraw and Drennan, 2014). It was considered appropriate for this study based on the numerous advantages it provides. As Momeni *et al.* (2008) point out, documentary analysis is cost-efficient and does not involve the researcher’s physical presence for data collection. This strengthens the case for relying on the data obtained for this study without physical presence at the University of Missouri which is the organisation used for case illustration, as argued that engaging from a distance is possible through the use of documentary evidence and analysis (see also Bowen, 2009). Weaving the discussion around documentary evidence, based on both an analysis of media reports (see for example, Knibbs, 2014; Moore, 2014; O’Neill, 2014; Gbadamosi and Madichie, 2014), and a review of the extant literature (Hommel *et al.*, 2016; Foss and Gibson, 2015a, 2015b;

Doherty *et al.*, 2015; Jones and Rowley, 2011; Morrish, 2011; Hills, Martin, 2009; Hultman, and Miles, 2008; Hoy, 2008; Morris, Schindehutte, and LaForge, 2002; Stokes, 2000; Low and MacMillan, 1988), this study explores an emergent trend, and through narrative, extends the boundaries of the discourse in the domain of the entrepreneurial university.

Indeed, the approach undertaken in this study is deemed appropriate considering the trend in research in this area. For example, Foss and Gibson (2015b) in their edited book, relied on a series of case analyses drawing upon a narrative tradition that builds on an epistemological and ontological position that denies the possibility of a theory-neutral language. The explorative character of another but related publication by these authors also follows a theory-building approach in which they use case narratives written by participant observers from their unique perspectives as a key investigative tool to support other methods used. (Foss and Gibson, 2015a: 252).

Overall, our chosen methodological approach is consistent with established scholarship that advocates using a case study to build theory (Eisehardt & Graebner, 2007) and highlighting the basis by the use of narratives (Gartner, 2010, 2007; Gartner and Birley, 2002; Pentland, 1999; Phillips, 1995). This is also corroborated by Gummeson (2003: 492) who sounds out that researchers should, “evaluate the research on its own terms with adequate criteria and not on the terms of mainstream quantitative research.” Indeed, Gartner and Birley (2002) highlighted the appropriateness of qualitative approaches to entrepreneurship research. According to them:

Qualitative researchers are likely to be the connoisseurs of entrepreneurship scholarship only in that they are more likely to immerse themselves to a greater depth and in a wider variety of situations where entrepreneurship occurs. ‘We encourage all entrepreneurship scholars to develop a critical eye in their efforts to explore entrepreneurship, and hope that more work will be undertaken to utilize qualitative methods for seeking such an understanding’ (Gartner and Birley, 2002: 394).

Likewise, Eisehardt & Graebner (2007: 27) contend that:

A frequent challenge to theory building from cases concerns case selection. Some readers make the faulty assumption that the cases should be representative of some population, as are data in large-scale hypothesis testing research [...] they ask, how can the theory generalize if the cases aren’t representative? A key response to this challenge is to clarify that the purpose of the research is to develop theory, not to test it, and so theoretical (not random or stratified) sampling is appropriate. Theoretical sampling simply means that cases are selected because they are particularly suitable for illuminating and extending relationships and logic among constructs.

This contention also strongly explains the chosen methodological stance adopted in this study which also aligns very closely with the perspective of repeatedly raised by Gartner (2010: 16) that “the challenge then, for entrepreneurship scholars, is to be willing to build their own ‘big pile’ of knowledge, facts, theories, experiences, and insights about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship...” It is, in our view, that from this big pile – incorporating media reports and scholarly papers, meaning within the story told emerges. As Koch (1998: 1189) surmised in relation to the use of text and stories:

Meaning emerges as the text and the interpreter engage in a dialogue, in a hermeneutic conversation [...] The goal of this dialogue is an intersection of the horizon of the author and the horizon of the interpreter [...] I believe that careful, reflective, systematic study of phenomena or experience taken to advance human understanding can count as research.

This point is further reinforced by Gartner (2010: 12) who opines that “theories and methods only illuminate aspects of the text. But, the text, itself, is always at the basis of any analysis.” Furthermore, Goles and Hirschheim (2000: 264) point out that while “methods and perspectives are important [...] they are secondary to the contributions of ideas...” It is along the lines of such contribution to ideas that we narrate how a university’s department has demonstrated an entrepreneurial flair by reaching out to audiences outside of its traditional market.

Meanwhile, like most other studies, there are some limitations to our methodological choice, which may have been supported by complementary approaches (see Table 1 for a sample of studies in this area), and should, therefore, be considered potential areas for future research pursuit. The subject matter could have been investigated using alternative methodological approaches such as action research using participant observation techniques, experiments (Kraus, Meier, and Niemand, 2016). Another approach may well have been the use of focus groups (both on and off line) to explore the destination of graduates on the programme and conduct a follow-on longitudinal study tracking alumni of these programmes and how other university departments might link with the business school and local business community.

Take in Table 1

However, these were not considered appropriate for the study due to the issue of access – the current study was undertaken many miles away from the Missouri by UK-based researchers. It would be useful if future research could consider these avenues. Meanwhile, it is important to state

that these highlighted limitations do not appear to have comprised the contribution of this paper on its stated objectives.

4. Findings and Discussions

Prior studies have highlighted differences in opportunity recognition (see Hansen and Hills, 2004), and the “evolution and development of entrepreneurial marketing” (Hills, Hultman, and Miles, 2008) in a bid to remain customer-centric (see for example, Gummesson, 2008). There is also evidence of instructors having, in the past, based their syllabi on celebrities – from “*Sociology of Hip-Hop – Urban Theodicy of Jay-Z*” in 2011 (Georgetown University’s sociology department), “*The Sociology of Fame and Lady Gaga*” in 2009 (the University of South Carolina), and “*Politicizing Beyoncé*” in 2012 (the department of Women’s and Gender Studies at Rutgers), and a class based on The Simpsons (the University of California Berkeley) although these have not been full course launches *per se*. As evidenced from the case illustration in this study, the attempt to link rap with poetry is both entrepreneurial and marketing-focused, and thereby arguably culminating in the uncharted waters of the entrepreneurial university. Broadly speaking, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) pointed out the existence of five dimensions that constitute entrepreneurial orientation – notably risk-taking; opportunity orientation; innovativeness; pro-activeness; and autonomy – all of which are unpacked in this study. Our focus in this section is to treat these dimensions in three sub-categories: (i) innovation and opportunity recognition; (ii) risk-taking; and (iii) pro-activeness. By so doing, we do two key things to the five dimensions. First, we combine innovation with opportunity recognition. Second we exclude autonomy based on the fact that universities operate within institutional constraints (see Foss and Gibson, 2015a, 2015b).

4.1 Innovation and Opportunity recognition

In our discussion of this dimension to entrepreneurship, we posit that the celebrity course launch at the University of Missouri is clearly unconventional but, nonetheless, shows creativity, innovation, and opportunity recognition in that department in particular and across the institution at large. The innovative nature of this course launch seems somehow confirmed in the study of Hüsiger and Mann (2010), which also pinpoints the fact that remarkable changes do take place in the HE system as exemplified in Germany. According to Huiru (2009:95), ‘the ultimate target of the education and teaching reform in Universities is to improve the quality of teaching and talent training. This seems consistent with the justification given in the case of “English 2169” – the focus of this study. Essentially, it could be stated that this undertaking emerged not only as an opportunity for institutional competitive advantage, but also to aid its influence and connections to various relevant stakeholders in the society.

In discussing the notion of value co-creation, we focus on two interfaces. *Marketing/Entrepreneurship* interface on the one hand (see Hansen & Eggers, 2010; Morrish 2011; Miles *et al.*, 2011; Hultman and Hills, 2011); and *Entrepreneurship/Innovation* interface (see DTI, 2001; Pirich, *et al.*, 2001; Bessant & Tidd, 2007; Windrum & Koch, 2008; Morris, Kuratko & Covin, 2010) on the other hand. Citing David Blunkett, one-time minister for education in England, Rutherford (2005; 306) observed that “...in the knowledge economy, entrepreneurial universities will be as important as entrepreneurial businesses, the one fostering the other. The ‘do nothing’ universities will not survive - and it will not be the job of government to bail them out.”ⁱⁱ Logically, the sensitivity of the University of Missouri to an unconventional target market and incorporating hip-hop artists and other celebrities is symptomatic of value co-creation in higher education.

In a separate study, Hultman and Hills (2011: 120) investigate the influences between marketing and entrepreneurship and argued that while this “could be traced to the 1980s [...] it is hard to state when the first steps to research the interface [...] started.” These authors go on to argue that “entrepreneurship and marketing share some commonalities: both disciplines focus on the identification of opportunities and transforming environmental resources into value-creation for external clients (customers).” These entrepreneurship attributes equally apply to the marketing discourse especially as ‘new and innovative marketing methods’ had the tendency of leveraging to benefits from the innovation, where a high focus on opportunities, an innovative mind and behaviour, propensity to take calculated risks and pro-active thinking can together create a very-different situation on the market with long-lasting implications. Accordingly, this case illustration exemplifies this contention, as Hultman and Hills (2011: 123) point out, “the business community has changed in the last 25 years [and] the academic discipline of marketing needs to adapt” to this change.

4.2 Risk Taking

In our treatment of this entrepreneurship dimension, and its applicability to the entrepreneurial university, we rely extensively on Hommel *et al.* (2016), which sought to examine the state of risk management activities in business schools and evaluates the presence of discrepancies from first-best practices found in the corporate sector. Entrepreneurialism is transforming business schools into risk-taking organizations (see Hommel *et al.* 2016). Proprietary revenue streams tend to be highly volatile and are for instance affected by fluctuations in the school’s competitiveness due to changes in accreditation status or ranking positioning as well as structural demand shifts (e.g. demographic change). They are also affected by the business cycle or government policies (e.g. such as the introduction of student visa restrictions). Greater risk dependency warrants an explicit effort to manage these exposures; in financial terms “risk” and “return” are two sides of the same

coin (Hommel *et al.*, 2016: 607). To what extent business schools have moved forward in formally establishing risk management strategies remains an area of scholarly pursuit (see Kirby, 2004; Huber, 2011; Tufano, 2011; Edwards, 2012; Doherty *et al.* 2015).

Indeed, the rising number of business schools struggling financially also serves as evidence that risk taking is frequently not matched by formal risk management policies. As Hommel *et al.*, (2016: 606) point out, “the spread of entrepreneurial rent seeking (or entrepreneurialism for short) and market-based performance measurement (accreditation, rankings) have transformed many business schools into risk-taking organizations.” The largely uncontested statement of the Dean of a world-leading Business School, Rich Lyons, that 50 percent of business schools will disappear within the next five to ten years can only be rationalized in the context of risk not being appropriately addressed by business schools (FT, 2015).ⁱⁱⁱ We therefore, postulate that the management of such risk – both financial and reputational – would require some form of coping strategies epitomised by our final dimension, i.e. proactiveness.

4.3 Innovativeness and Proactiveness

The use of celebrities in teaching is not necessarily a new phenomenon, as Harvard Business School has often relied on this model for its delivery – albeit as teaching cases (see for example, Elberse, 2015; Elberse and Smith, 2014; Elberse and Owusu-Kesse, 2012). However, dedicating a complete course around celebrities may be arguably a proactive endeavour. Indeed, the attempt to connect the dots between entertainment, and the university curriculum is arguably a proactive move which is also innovative in the sense that rather than using case studies, an entire course is dedicated to this move. The course launch could also be seen as capturing the relationship between hip-hop artists and poetry (or poets) as well as optimism enshrined in the American Dream – notably social justice.

While it is arguably entrepreneurial and in alignment with the *third mission*, to ‘reach out’ to a non-traditional student population (see for example, Catterall, Maclaran and Stevens, 1999) using celebrities such as Jay Z and Kanye West, the mode of instruction raises some interesting issues for debate (see, for example, Lewis, 2014). For example, it could be perceived as distracting and spurious – i.e. “listening to music and watching videos... [and reading] Jay Z’s 2010 biography.”^{iv} With this pedagogy *vis-à-vis* entrepreneurship education, a critical question may be asked. What is the value added and how does it result in skills development? A focus on the business side of hip-hop will require that the business curriculum recognise this innovative agenda and, build upon it accordingly. However, audacious it might seem at the outset, the rationale for the Jay Z and Kanye West course launch has a long pedigree. It was based on the notion that a handful of universities have, in the past, incorporated celebrities into their course syllabi – from the University of South Carolina offering a course on “*The Sociology of Fame and Lady Gaga*” in 2009, Georgetown

University’s sociology department offering a class on “*Sociology of Hip-Hop – Urban Theodicy of Jay-Z*” in 2011, and the department of Women’s and Gender Studies at Rutgers offering a course around Jay Z’s wife, “*Politicizing Beyoncé*” in 2012, the University of California Berkeley taking a philosophy class based on The Simpsons, and Julius Bailey’s edited book “*The Cultural Impact of Kanye West*” (O’Neill, 27 January 2014).

5. Conclusions and Implications

Enterprise education has become a trendy pattern in higher education provision with many universities incorporating the concept and embedding the same into their curricula in one form or the other. Indeed, in England and Wales, the DfES (2003) recommends that enterprise learning is integrated throughout the curriculum. Overall the higher education market has become very competitive in recent years (Skinner and Blackey, 2010) prompting numerous attempts at consolidation of faculties/ departments, new course launches, aggressive internationalisation (Madichie and Kolo, 2013; Fitzpatrick, Davey and Dai, 2012; Paswan and Ganesh, 2009) and now unintentional demarketing of traditional provisions (see Madichie, 2014). However, while it might have been entrepreneurial (Leitch and Harrison, 1999) to see the value of hip-hop artistry in poetry, as epitomised by the University of Missouri’s English department, there are lingering questions as to whether these should be considered full-blown courses in their own right rather than topics or case studies embedded within courses.

Indeed, there seems to be more relevant hip-hop music artists who have demonstrated some entrepreneurial traits worthy of embedding into the curriculum, such as Dr. Dre, Will.i.am and Jimmy Iovine, the masterminds of the Beats Headphone that captured the interest of the technology giant Apple (see Garrahan and Bradshaw, 2014; Moore, 2014). Should all these artists translate to new course launches in entrepreneurship education? From the foregoing, we can only submit, albeit tentatively, that there should be some clarity on the degree of embeddedness of hip-hop artistry into the university curriculum. Should these be full-blown course launches or notable, case-by-case, selective case studies? Is entrepreneurship education at a crossroads? Could entrepreneurship education be on the verge of being *unintentionally* demarketed (see Madichie, 2014)? Should other universities launch new courses on hip-hop artists?

Answers to these questions would be worthy areas for future research enquiry. This study, in its contribution to the entrepreneurial university discourse, provides grounds for such scholarly pursuits. Overall this study makes three key contributions to our understanding of the entrepreneurial university. First, it provides some fresh insights into a known, but neglected field, autonomy of instructors to champion new course launches with institution-wide ‘buy-in’ in a manner recognised in the wider literature – in this case an instructor in the most unlikely of

departments/schools (i.e. the English department) has demonstrated. Such attributes epitomise the academic entrepreneur (see Pucci, 2016), who goes all out to justify the course launch as being demand-driven, but more importantly, broadens the appeal of university study amongst disengaged groups – notably the freelancers in the creative industry sector (see Carey and Naudin, 2006; Matheson, 2006; Rutherford, 2005). Second, the study highlights the links between an acclaimed ‘entrepreneurial university’ in the context of enterprise, as distinct from entrepreneurship education. Third, it provides an avenue for future research pursuits into the utility of new course launches, and their implications for socio-economic developments in, and around contexts. Notably, hip-hop may be more appreciated in US contexts, as opposed to other developed world contexts – notably the UK, Australia, Canada and Singapore as the case may be.

References

- Atherton, A. (2004) Unbundling enterprise and entrepreneurship: from perceptions and preconceptions to concept and practice. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 5(2), 121-127.
- Bailey, J. (2014) (Ed.) *The Cultural Impact of Kanye West*. US: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bailey, J. (2011) (Ed.) *Jay-Z: Essays on Hip Hop’s Philosopher King*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co (30 April 2011).
- Bennis, W. G., & O’Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(5), 96-104.
- Beynon, M., Jones, P., Packham, G., and Pickernell, D. (2014) Investigating the motivation for enterprise education: A CaRBS based exposition, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 20(6), 584 – 612.
- Binsardi, A., and Ekwulugo, F. (2003) International marketing of British education: research on the students’ perception and the UK market penetration, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 21(5), 318–327.
- Boulocher-Passet, V., Daly, P., and Sequeira, I. (2016) Fostering creativity understanding: Case study of an exercise designed for a large undergraduate business cohort at EDHEC Business School, *Journal of Management Development*, 35(5), 574-591.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Brown, R. and Mazzarol, T. (2009) The importance of institutional image to student satisfaction and loyalty within higher education, *Higher Education*, 58(1), 81-95.
- Caird, S. (1990a) What does it mean to be enterprising? *British Journal of Management*, 1(3), 137–145.

- Caird, S. (1990b) Enterprise competencies: an agenda for research. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(7), 3–8.
- Carey, C., and Naudin, A. (2006) Enterprise curriculum for creative industries students: An exploration of current attitudes and issues. *Education + Training*, 48(7), 518-531.
- Casidy, R. (2014) Linking brand orientation with service quality, satisfaction, and positive word-of-mouth: evidence from the higher education sector. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 26: 142-161.
- Catterall, M., Maclaran, P., and Stevens, P. (1999) Critical marketing in the classroom: possibilities and Challenges, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 17(7), 344-353.
- Chapleo, C. (2011) Exploring rationales for branding a university: Should we be seeking to measure branding in UK universities? *Journal of Brand Management*, 18, 411–422.
- Chapleo, C. (2010) What defines “successful” university brands? *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(2), 169 – 183.
- Chapleo, C. (2007) Barriers to brand building in UK universities? *International Journal of Non-profit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12, 23-32.
- Chapleo, C., Durán, M, and Díaz, A. (2011) Do UK universities communicate their brands effectively through their websites? *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 21(1), 25-46.
- Coplan, C. (2014), ‘University of Missouri Offers Class on Jay Z and Kanye West’s relationship’, Consequence of Sound, 23rd January, 2014.,
<http://consequenceofsound.net/2014/01/university-of-missouri-offers-class-on-jay-z-and-kanye-west-s-relationship/> (Accessed, 13th September, 2016)
- Doherty, B., Meehan, J. and Richards, A. (2015) The business case and barriers for responsible management education in business schools, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp.34-60.
- Draycott, M., and Rae, D. (2011) Enterprise education in schools and the role of competency frameworks, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 17(2), 127 - 145.
- Eisehardt, K., & Graebner, M. (2007) Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.
- Elberse, A., and Stacie Smith, S. (2014). “Beyoncé.” Harvard Business School Case 515-036, August.
- Elberse, A., and Owusu-Kesse, K. (2012) “Droga5: Launching Jay-Z’s Decoded.” Harvard Business School Case 513-032, July 2012.

- Elberse, A. (2014) *Droga5: Launching Jay-Z's Decoded*. Harvard Business School Teaching Note 514-131, June 2014.
- Elenurm, T. (2012) Entrepreneurial orientations of business students and entrepreneurs, *Baltic Journal of Management*, 7(2), 217–231.
- Elliott, C., and Goh, S. C. (2013) Does accreditation promote organisational learning? A multiple case study of Canadian University Business Schools. *Journal of Management Development*, 32(7), 737-755.
- Elton, J. and Fulop, N., (2002), Perception of Partnership: A Documentary Analysis of Health Improvement Programme', *Public Health*, 116, 207-213
- Ennen, E. and Ritcher, A. (2010) The Whole is more than the sum of its parts – or is it? A Review of the Empirical Literature on Complementarities in Organisations, *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 207-233.
- Etzkowitz, H. (2003). Research groups as 'quasi-firms': the invention of the entrepreneurial university. *Research policy*, 32(1), 109-121.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C., & Terra, B. R. C. (2000). The future of the university and the University of the Future: evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm. *Research policy*, 29(2), 313-330.
- Fitzpatrick, M., Davey, J. and Dai, L. (2012) Chinese students' complaining behaviour: hearing the silence, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 24(5), 738-754.
- Foss, L., and Gibson, D (2015a) The entrepreneurial university: Case analysis and implications. In Foss, L., and Gibson, D. (Eds.), *The Entrepreneurial University: Context and institutional change* (New York, NY: Routledge), pp. 249-279.
- Foss, L., and Gibson, D. (2015b) (Eds.), *The Entrepreneurial University: Context and institutional change* (New York, NY: Routledge).
- Gargiulo, N. (2014), 'English 2169: Jay-Z & Kanye West', University Course available, Hollywood 360, 28 January, 2014, <http://montreal.virginradio.ca/hollywood-360/2014/01/28/english-2169-jayz-kanye-west-university-course-available-> (Accessed, 13th September, 2016)
- Garrahan, M., and Bradshaw, T. (*Financial Times*, 29 May 2014) Apple buys Beats Electronics for \$3bn. Retrieved from: <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/4ebce752-e6a3-11e3-9a20-00144feabdc0.html#slide0>
- Gartner, W. (2010) A new path to the waterfall: A narrative on a use of entrepreneurial narrative. *International Small Business Journal* 28(1) 6–19.
- Gartner WB (2007) Entrepreneurial narrative and a science of the imagination. *Journal of Business Venturing* 22: 613–627.

- Gartner WB, and Birley S (2002) Introduction to the special issue on qualitative methods in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing* 17: 387–395.
- Gbadamosi, A. (2015), 'Exploring the Growing Link of Ethnic Entrepreneurship, Markets, and Pentecostalism in London (UK): An Empirical study', *Society and Business Review*, 10(2), 150-169.
- Gbadamosi, A., and Madichie, N. (2014) Demarketing of Higher Education – Thinking out of the box or out of Focus? Refereed research presented at the 37th Annual conference of the Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (ISBE), Manchester, UK, 5-6 November.
- Gbadamosi, A., and Madichie, N. (2010) Adaptive Curriculum for Entrepreneurial Learning: A case study of SME Marketing at UEL. Paper presented at the 33rd ISBE Conference, Grand Connaught Rooms, London, 2-4 November.
- George, A. (2000) The new public relations: integrating marketing and public relations strategies for student recruitment and institutional image building – a case study of the University of Texas at San Antonio, *Journal of Non-profit & Public Sector Marketing*, 7(4), p. 17.
- Goles, T., and Hirschheim, R. (2000) The paradigm is dead, the paradigm is dead... long live the paradigm: the legacy of Burrell and Morgan. *Omega*, 28, 249-268.
- Gummeson (2003) All research is interpretive. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18(6/7), 482-492.
- Gutman, J., and Miaoulis, G. (2003) Communicating a quality position in service delivery: An application in higher education. *Managing Service Quality*, 13, 105-111.
- Hartshorn, C. and Hannon, P. (2005) Paradoxes in entrepreneurship education: talk and chalk or chalk and cheese? *Education & Training*, 47(8/9), 616-627.
- Heinonen, J. and Poikkijoki, S. (2006) An entrepreneurial-directed approach to entrepreneurship education: mission impossible? *Journal of Management Development*, 25(1), 80-94.
- Helgesen, Ø. and Nettet, E. (2007) Images, satisfaction and antecedents: drivers of student loyalty? A case study of a Norwegian University College, *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(1), 38-59.
- Hemsley-Brown, J. and Goonawardana, S. (2007) Brand harmonization in the international higher education market, *Journal of Business Research*, 60(9), 942-948.
- Hemsley-Brown, J. and Oplatka, I. (2006) Universities in a competitive marketplace – a systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19(4), 316-338.
- Hommel, U., Li, W., and Pastwa, A. (2016) The state of risk management in business schools, *Journal of Management Development*, 35(5), 606 - 622.

- Huang, K. and Yu, T. H. (2011) Entrepreneurship, Process Innovation and Value creation by a non-profit SME, *Management Decision*, 49(2), 284-296.
- Huber, M. (2011) The risk university: risk identification at higher education institutions in England, Centre of Analysis of Risk and Regulation, London School of Economics, London.
- Hynes, B., Costin, Y. and Birdthistle, N. (2011) Practice-based learning in entrepreneurship education – a means of connecting knowledge producers and users, *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 1(1), 16-28.
- Hytti, U., and O’Gorman, C. (2004) What is “enterprise education”? An analysis of the objectives and methods of enterprise education programmes in four European countries, *Education + Training*, 46(1), 11 - 23.
- Jevons, C. (2006) Universities: a prime example of branding going wrong, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 15(7), 466 – 467.
- Johnson, D., Craig, J., and Hildebrand, R. (2006) Entrepreneurship education: towards a discipline based framework, *Journal of Management Development*, 25(1), 40 - 54.
- Jones, B., and Iredale, N. (2014) Enterprise and entrepreneurship education: towards a comparative analysis, *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 8(1), 34 – 50.
- Jones, B., and Iredale, N. (2010) Enterprise education as pedagogy, *Education + Training*, 52(1), 7-19.
- Judson, K., Aurand, T., Gorchels, L. and Gordo, G. (2009) Building a university brand from within: university administrators’ perspectives of internal branding, *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 30(1), 54-68.
- Knibbs, K. (*Time Magazine*, 24 January 2014) University of Missouri Now Has a Class on Jay Z and Kanye West’s Relationship. Retrieved from: <http://time.com/1801/kanye-west-jay-z-class-missouri/> [Accessed 17 February 2014]
- Koch, T. (1998) Story telling: is it really research? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 28(6), 1182-1190.
- Kolk, A., and Rivera-Santos, M. (2016) The State of Research on Africa in Business and Management: Insights from a Systematic Review of Key International Journals. *Business & Society*, 1-22. Published online before print. February 8, 2016, doi:10.1177/0007650316629129
- Kraus, S., Kraus, S., Meier, F., Meier, F., Niemand, T., & Niemand, T. (2016). Experimental methods in entrepreneurship research: the status quo. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 22(6), 958-983.
- Lacoste, S. (2016), sustainable value-co-creation in Business networks’, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 52, 151-162.

Lee, J., Miloch, K., Kraft, P., and Tatum, L. (2008) Building the brand: A case study of Troy university. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 17, 178-182.

Leitch, C., and Harrison, R. (1999) A process model for entrepreneurship education and development, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 5(3), 83 - 109.

Lewis, Heidi R. (2014) An Examination of Kanye West's Higher Education Trilogy. In: Bailey, J. (Ed.) *The Cultural Impact of Kanye West*. Chapter 5, pp. 65-77.

Lee, N., and Brown, S. (2013) Occupy Academia! A dialectic dialogue. *Social Business*, 3(3), 225-242.

Lindeman, A (2015) Kymenlaakso University of Applied Sciences, Finland: In search of university-wide entrepreneurial action, In Foss, L., and Gibson, D. (Eds.), *The Entrepreneurial University: Context and institutional change* (New York, NY: Routledge), pp. 167-189.

Madichie, N., and Kolo, J. (2013). An exploratory enquiry into the internationalisation of higher education in the United Arab Emirates. *The Marketing Review*, 13(1), 83-99.

Mpinganjira, M. (2011) Retaining Africa's talent: the role of Africa's higher education. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 6(2), 168-179.

Madichie, N. (2014) Unintentional Demarketing in Higher Education. In: N., Bradley and J., Blythe (Eds.) *De-marketing*. London: Routledge. (Chapter 13), pp. 198-211.

Madichie, N. (2007) *SME Marketing: A Reader*. Harlow, Harlow: FT/ Prentice Hall.

Madichie, N., and Kolo, J. (2013) An exploratory enquiry into the internationalisation of higher education in the United Arab Emirates. *The Marketing Review*, 13(1), 83-99.

Madichie, N., and Madichie, E. (2013) Nigerian Students and the 'Allure' of Foreign (UK) Education: A Curious Reflection. *African Journal of Business and Economic Research*, 8(2&3), 101-118.

Matheson, B. (2006) A culture of creativity: design education and the creative industries, *Journal of Management Development*, 25(1), 55 - 64.

Mazzarol, T. and Soutar, G. (2012) Revisiting the global market for higher education, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 24(5), 717-737.

McGraw, C. and Drennan, V. M. (2014), 'Evaluation of The Suitability of Root Cause Analysis Framework for the Investigation of Community-Acquired Pressure Ulcers: Review and Documentary Analysis', *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 24, 536-545.

Moore, H. (*The Guardian*, 28 May 2014) Apple buys Dr. Dre's Beats for \$3bn as company returns to music industry. Retrieved from: <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/may/28/apple-buys-beats-dr-dre-music-streaming>

- Momeni, P, Jirwe, M. and Emami, A. (2008), 'Enabling Nursing students to become Culturally Competent – A Documentary Analysis of Curricula in all Swedish Nursing Programs', Nordic College of Caring Science'
- MU News Bureau (2014), Daily Clips Packet', February, 6 2014
- Murray, C. D., & Sixsmith, J. (2002). Qualitative health research via the Internet: practical and methodological issues. *Health Informatics Journal*, 8(1), 47-53.
- O'Neill, L. (CBC News, 27 January 2014) University offers course on Jay Z and Kanye West's relationship. Retrieved from:
<http://www.cbc.ca/newsblogs/yourcommunity/2014/01/university-offers-course-on-jay-z-and-kanye-wests-relationship.html> [Accessed 17 February 2014]
- Opoku, R., Abratt, R. and Pitt, L. (2006) Communicating brand personality: are the websites doing the talking for the top South African business schools? *Brand Management*, 14(1/2), 20-39.
- O'Regan, N. (2012) Entrepreneurship and Innovation: Overview, *Strategic Change*, 21, 193-198.
- Palacio, A., Meneses, G. and Pedro, J. (2002) The configuration of the university image and its relationship with the satisfaction of students, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 486-505.
- Paswan, A., and Ganesh, G. (2009) Higher education institutions: satisfaction and loyalty among international students, *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 19(1), 65-84.
- Paul, S., and Hill, M. (2013). Responding to Self-Harm: A documentary Analysis of Agency Policy and Procedure. *Children & Society*, 27(3), 184-196.
- Pentland BT (1999) Building process theory with narrative. From description to explanation. *Academy of Management Review* 24: 711–724.
- Phillips N (1995) Telling organizational tales: On the role of narrative fiction in the study of organizations. *Organization Studies* 16: 625–649.
- Price, A. (2004) Institute for Enterprise CETL Stage 2 Bid, HEFCE, Leeds Metropolitan University, Leeds, United Kingdom.
- Pucci, T. (2016) Academic entrepreneurial orientation: Empirical evidence from life sciences. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 12(2/3), 193-217.
- Rae, D. (2010) Universities and enterprise education: responding to the challenges of the new era, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 17(4), 591-606.
- Rae, D. (2007) Connecting enterprise and graduate employability: Challenges to the higher education culture and curriculum? *Education + Training*, 49(8/9), 605-619.

- Refai, D., Klapper, R. G., and Thompson, J. (2015) A holistic social constructionist perspective to enterprise education. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 21(3), 316-337.
- Rice, M. P., Fettes, M. L., and Greene, P. G. (2014) University-based entrepreneurship ecosystems: a global study of six educational institutions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 18(5/6), 481-501.
- Rogers, E. (1995), 'Diffusion of Innovation, 4th Edition. New York: Free Press.
- Rutherford, J. (2005) Cultural Studies in the Corporate University. *Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 297-317.
- Sevier, R. (1994) Image is everything: strategies for measuring, changing, and maintaining your institution's image, *College and University*, 69(2), 60-75.
- Sexton, D. (2011) Trump University Branding 101: How to Build the Most Valuable Asset of Any Business (November). Chapter 1.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781118258293.ch1/pdf>
- Skinner, H., and Blackey, H. (2010) Globalisation of business education – a British course or a British educational experience? Comparisons from a UK university, *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 2(2), 22–32.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stanworth, J., and Gray, C. (1992) Enterprise Education: Action-Based Research with Training Policy Implications. *International Small Business Journal*, 10(2), 11-23.
- Sultan, P. and Wong, H. (2012) Service quality in a higher education context: an integrated model, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 24(5), 755-784.
- Thomas, H. (2009) Business schools: positioning, rankings, research and futures, *Management Decision*, 47(9), 1392-1395.
- Thomas, H. and Peters, K. (2012), "A sustainable model for business schools", *Journal of Management Development*, 31(4), 377-385.
- Tufano, P. (2011), "Managing risk in higher education", Forum Futures (Forum for the Future of Higher Education), Cambridge, MA, pp. 54-58.
- Toler, L. (2014), 'University of Missouri English Class Teaches the Poetry of Jay-Z, Kanye West', Riverfront Times, 27th January, 2014
<http://www.riverfronttimes.com/newsblog/2014/01/27/university-of-missouri-english-class-teaches-the-poetry-of-jay-z-kanye-west> (Accessed on 12th Sept., 2016).
- Van de Ven, A. H. (1996) Central Problems in the Management of Innovation, *Management Science*, 32(5), 590-607.

Viswambharan, A. P., and Priya, K. R. (2016). Documentary analysis as a qualitative methodology to explore disaster mental health: insights from analysing a documentary on communal riots. *Qualitative Research*, 16(1), 43-59.

Warwick, P. (2014) The internal business of higher education – A managerial perspective on the internationalisation of UK universities. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12, 91-103.

Whelan, R., and Kratochvil, D. (2011) University of Wollongong in Dubai: creating a private university in the public interest. *Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies*, 1(4), 1-13.

Yin, R. K. (1981) The Case Study Crisis: Some Answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 58-65.

Notes

ⁱ In our general review, it is a mixture of all three elements that we think defines the entrepreneurial university, which is focused on the “third mission.”

ⁱⁱ See the Department of Trade and Industry, DTI (2001) White Paper on Enterprise, Skills and Innovation. Retrieved from www.dti.gov.uk

ⁱⁱⁱ *Financial Times* (10 April 2015) Haas dean confidently predicts demise of business schools. Retrieved from: <https://www.ft.com/content/9bd8a722-df7e-11e4-b6da-00144feab7de>

^{iv} It is worth recounting the opening segment of a book chapter in Bailey’s edited 2014 book, where Heidi Lewis, in chapter 5, reported that Kanye was no stranger to academia as his mother was “Dr. Donda West [...] Professor of English at Clark Atlanta University and Chair of the English Department at Chicago State University before retiring to serve as his (Kanye’s) manager.” (see Lewis, 2014: 65).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1. Selection of methodological considerations in Higher Education research

Authors	Methodology	Main Highlights
Kraus, Meier, and Niemand (2016)	Experiments	Discusses the potential and disadvantages of experimental methods while arguing for experiments as the method of choice for answering causality questions.
Tipu and Ryan (2016)	Survey, 309 questionnaires.	The study explores the current debate on value intention link by hitherto unexplored relation between multidimensional work ethic profile and entrepreneurial intentions in a bid to offer specific insight into the work values of UAE national youth and their entrepreneurial quest.
Kwong and Thompson (2016)	Survey of UK business students.	Those intending to enter entrepreneurship right away place less emphasis on avoiding stress and responsibility, seeing themselves as natural leaders. They were also confident of succeeding, but not because superior knowledge.
Pucci (2016)	Quantitative study.	The results show a trade-off between scientific reputation and university-industry relationships. The achievement of a certain level of scientific quality initially favours the performance of commercial activities (consulting, patenting, and spin-off creation), but beyond a certain threshold scientists begin to focus primarily on research and their engagement with industry decreases.
Kolk and Rivera-Santos, M. (2016)	Literature review.	An in-depth analysis of the 139 Africa-focused articles shows an important imbalance in terms of publication patterns, topics covered, theoretical groundings, types of contributions, approaches to the African contexts, and empirics (p. 1).
Lindeman (2015)	Single case study.	The case study that points towards the reinvented identity of Kyamk. It shows how the discourse on entrepreneurship has changed from a disciplinary discussion to a conversation about how to deliver higher education with an entrepreneurial twist regardless of discipline (p. 185).
Foss and Gibson (2015a)	Case analyses.	The entrepreneurial university is [...] an emerging organisational form that in many instances has yet to be legitimized and institutionalised (p. 249).
Refai, Klapper and Thompson (2015)	Qualitative empirical study/ semi-structured interviews	This paper offers a holistic conceptual framework of Social Constructionism that draws on the “Gestalt Approach”, and highlights the harmony between the ontological, epistemological and methodological underpinnings of social constructionism [...] as a suitable underlying philosophical paradigm [...] which adopts relative realism ontology, transactional epistemology, and Gadamer’s hermeneutic phenomenology, offers a relevant, multi-perspectival philosophical foundation for [entrepreneurship education] research, supporting transactional relationships within contexts of multiple possibilities.
Jones and Iredale (2014)	Literature review.	The study draws on the literature around enterprise and entrepreneurship education. It argues that comparative analysis of enterprise education is an important methodological tool that can enrich, deepen and inform research processes, findings and outcomes. Comparative analysis can take a number of forms and can include within country, cross-country, historical, temporal, longitudinal, spatial, pedagogical, policy or other types of comparison.
Rice, Feters and Greene (2014)	Case study	The study highlights seven key success factors that enable each of the six universities investigated to achieve a sustainable and high-impact entrepreneurial ecosystem.
Casidy (2014)	Survey – 258 questionnaires for undergraduate students in	The study finds that students’ perception of a university’s brand orientation significantly moderates the relationship between service quality, loyalty, and WOM communication behaviour.

	the Faculty of Business in Australia.	
Warwick (2014)	Literature review/ Multiple case study (four cases of UK universities, p. 96).	Contemporary universities are international businesses and as such should give more serious consideration to how their internationalisation strategy is managed. UK universities need to pay more attention to their internationalisation strategies.
Madichie and Kolo (2013)	Personal observations and informal conversations.	Observations suggest that the franchise model may be more appropriate internationalisation strategy into the “crowded” UAE HE market (see p. 96).
Lee and Brown (2013)	Qualitative research/ dialogue.	The authors fail to agree, let alone to disagree, on marketing scholarship in a social business-steeped setting. “We can do a better job at this than we do currently, whether you believe the role of academia is to simply create knowledge, to directly respond to practitioner needs, or even a bit of both [it] is not doing a great job at any of these.” (p. 239).
Elliott and Goh (2013)	Qualitative, multiple case study	Sought to explore the potential consequences of AACSB accreditation as perceived by administrators and faculty members at four Canadian university business schools. Results indicate that AACSB accreditation facilitated organizational learning in three of the four schools. By using a qualitative multiple case study method, the research provided a unique opportunity to focus more keenly on context and its role in influencing the potential learning consequences of accreditations.
Mpinganjira (2011)	Focus group discussions, in-depth interviews and an online structured questionnaire	Conditions in both the students’ countries of origin and in the possible hosting countries contribute to the decision to study abroad.
Rae (2010)	Practitioner-based educational enquiry, reflective practice and research, education and participation with groups of universities, educators, students, entrepreneurs and other groups	The paper explores the changing influences on entrepreneurship education and learning, what is the new era in entrepreneurship, the consequences of changing economic, social and cultural movements, and how entrepreneurship education and learning can respond to these challenges. The paper proposes that the nature of entrepreneurship is changing in response to social and cultural movements in the new economic era. Ethical and environmental concerns are creating a discourse of responsible entrepreneurship informed by social entrepreneurship.
Jevons (2006)	Literature Review	The purpose of this paper is to present a call to action for universities to practice what they preach in developing and communicating differentiated brands.
Rutherford (2005)	Qualitative research/ Essay	As the global corporate demand for educational services increases, universities are becoming more like businesses. The trend toward a corporate style university can be seen in the way that its educational mission is being subordinated to the criteria of the flexible labour market. Argues that we need to revisit Cultural Studies’ early rejection of humanism and work out a new kind of humanism without guarantees [...] to restore cultural studies as a critical and engaged practice.
Binsardi & Ekwulugo (2003)	Surveys (62 questionnaires) and in-depth interviews	The study shows that UK competitors achieved a remarkable growth of their international students’ enrolment while the UK achieves only a marginal growth with declining market penetration abroad. For many years, the UK universities have enjoyed a high reputation and have benefited in accelerating its market penetration worldwide. Unfortunately, this superiority has begun to decline. Other countries are strongly emerging with their quality education.
Gummeson (2003)	Qualitative research/ Interpretivism	Recognize that interpretive elements are influential and present in all types of research and see them as an asset rather than a cross to bear. Get familiar and practice the paradigm represented by

		hermeneutics and interactive research, as well as the accompanying methods and techniques. Evaluate the research on its own terms with adequate criteria and not on the terms of mainstream quantitative research (see p. 492).
Goles and Hirschheim (2000)	Literature review.	Methods and perspectives are important. They provide standards on which to judge the rigour and relevance of a piece of research. But they are secondary to the contributions of ideas. This is where the true value of research diversity becomes apparent (p. 264).