

UNESCO

**UNESCO-CEPES
EUROPEAN CENTRE
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Higher
Education
in Europe**

In this issue:
Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education

Vol. XXIX, No. 2, 2004

Higher Education in Europe

Volume XXIX Number 2 2004

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| From the Editors..... | 173 |
| Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education | |
| Entrepreneurship Studies - An Ascending Academic Discipline in the Twenty-First Century <i>Christine Volkmann</i> | 177 |
| The Entrepreneurial University: A Strategy for Institutional Development <i>Peter Schulte</i> | 187 |
| Institutional and Academic Entrepreneurship: Implications for University Governance and Management <i>Klaus Anderseck</i> | 193 |
| The Implications of Academic Entrepreneurship for University Administration <i>Janusz Teczke and Remigiusz Gawlik</i> | 201 |
| Social and Intellectual Dimensions of Entrepreneurship <i>Stefan Kwiatkowski</i> | 205 |
| “Learning to Do” as a Pillar of Education and Its Links to Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education: European Contexts and Approaches <i>Mircea Miclea</i> | 221 |
| KfW and the Promotion of Entrepreneurship Training in Germany <i>Margarita Tchouvakhina</i> | 233 |
| The <i>Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers</i> <i>Gérard Kuhn</i> | 237 |
| The Gelsenkirchen Declaration on Institutional Entrepreneurial Management and Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education in Europe | 241 |
| Tribune | |
| Private Universities: A Way to Increase Access to University Education in Ontario <i>Billroy Powell</i> | 243 |
| The Contribution of Higher Education to the Development of Objective and Subjective Judgment in Day-to-Day Decision-Making <i>Joseph Klein</i> | 255 |
| Globalization and the Freedom of Knowledge <i>Sylvia van de Bunt-Kokhuis</i> | 269 |
| Book Reviews and Studies | 285 |
| Notes on Contributors | 293 |
| UNESCO-CEPES Publications | 295 |

From the Editors

Five years ago, this review dedicated an issue (Volume 24, Number 1, 1999) to “The Entrepreneurial University: How to Survive and Prosper in an Era of Global Competition”. The ten articles composing the Topic consisted of two general analyses of the question of Entrepreneurship and adaptability in higher education, six institutional case studies, and two thematic studies, all of them much inspired by Ernest Boyer’s four-fold paradigm of scholarship in higher education: the “Scholarship of Discovery”, the “Scholarship of Integration”, the “Scholarship of Application”, and the “Scholarship of Teaching”. The basic question the topic asked and tried to answer was how higher education could best go about undertaking and fulfilling the tasks devolving from Boyer’s paradigm, including all the traditional tasks of universities, to the satisfaction of its stakeholders, while guaranteeing for itself a continued role and place in society, given the increasing costs incurred by traditional universities in an environment in which governments, the main funders of higher education, are cutting back their contributions. In order to survive, it was concluded, universities, would have to become increasingly entrepreneurial and adaptive.

The present issue of Higher Education in Europe, that also concerns itself with the “entrepreneurial university”, comes five years later in a more competitive European higher education environment, that must now contend with the Bologna Process, that is leading to the formation of the European Higher Education Area, and the European Research and Innovation Area, in addition to continued shortfalls in government funding and the increasing need for graduates to be adaptive in facing an uncertain employment market. It thus focuses on the teaching of Entrepreneurship in higher education institutions and presupposes that universities teaching Entrepreneurship will themselves be entrepreneurial, at least to some extent.

The eight articles plus the “Gelsenkirchen Declaration” composing the Topic are drawn from among the papers that were presented at the Institutional Expert Meeting on Institutional Entrepreneurial Management and Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education held at the University of Applied Sciences of Gelsenkirchen (*Fachhochschule Gelsenkirchen*), in Germany, from 4 to 7 December 2003. The Conference, that was jointly organized by *Fachhochschule Gelsenkirchen* and UNESCO-CEPES, benefited from the support of the Association of Universities and other Higher Education Institutions in Germany (*Hochschulrektorenkonferenz - HRK*) and the German Commission for UNESCO. The aim of the conference was to stimulate Entrepreneurship in universities as a means to better meet the goals of the Bologna Process.

The first two articles introduce the subject of Entrepreneurship from varying points of view. The lead article by Professor Christine Volkmann of *Fachhochschule Gelsenkirchen* traces the origins of Entrepreneurship studies in higher education institutions back to their origins in the United States and then describes their flowering in the 1990s, first in the United States, but then in the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany. Although part of the process whereby a university teaches Entrepreneurship should lead it to becoming an entrepreneurial institution, the author’s focus is on the types and the functioning of Entrepreneurship education programmes. These, she points out, can be “focused” – if they are confined to the business or the engineering units of given higher education institutions – or “university-wide”, if they target students in other fields. If so, they can be “magnet” programmes or “radiant” programmes, the one drawing students from various majors

to take courses in the units typically offering Business and Engineering majors; the other, a situation by which courses in Entrepreneurship are offered in the other faculties and departments of the higher education institution in question.

The next article, by Professor Peter Schulte, the Rector of *Fachhochschule Gelsenkirchen*, is really a case study about the higher education institution in question. It stresses the importance for a higher education institution wishing to prosper, to adopt entrepreneurial structures and an entrepreneurial culture. Schulte cites the example of his own institution in creating a business incubator, an entrepreneurial center, and a technology park, all of which serve to perfect the Entrepreneurship education of students and to earn revenue for the university through the creation of spin-off companies. Even though most graduates will not become independent entrepreneurs, they should all have developed entrepreneurial attitudes, regardless of what they have studied.

The next two articles, the first one by Professor Klaus Anderseck of the FernUniversität of Hagen, Germany, and the second, by Professor Janusz Teczke, Vice-Rector of the Cracow University of Economics, and Remigiusz Gawlik, concentrate on the administrative and governance-related reforms that a university must make if it wishes both to be entrepreneurial itself and to offer Entrepreneurship training.

Professor Anderseck's article reflects the situation of a typical German university that is State operated, autonomous in terms of governance, and practices academic freedom as per the Humboldtian paradigm. Given that traditional structures and mind-sets might constitute barriers to Entrepreneurship, he is concerned as to how best to introduce Entrepreneurship course programmes and indeed an entrepreneurial mentality into such an environment. As Anderseck sees the question, the academic aspects of Entrepreneurship studies will experience little difficulty in being included in such academic fields as Economics even if publications in the field have been criticized as being of low intellectual quality. The introduction of the practical side of the field – internships, business incubators, spin-off companies, and the like - has been less easily accepted – indeed – almost rejected as an activity for a traditional university department.

But practical activities are of crucial importance in Entrepreneurship education. Anderseck outlines three models whereby practical Entrepreneurship structures and activities can be linked to formal instruction in the field: The “Campus-based integrative model”; The “Campus Independent Model”, and the “Campus-Based Dual Model”. The first, as in the case of the University of Wupperthal, integrates all activities under an academic umbrella and is able to fend off all academic criticism of the practical side of the operation by virtue of the impeccable academic reputations of the two senior professors. Thus, the good functioning of this model depends on the reputations of specific faculty members. The other two models underline, to a greater or lesser extent, the distinction made between academic work, on one hand - very much part of the traditional university curriculum - and practical training activities, on the other – offered, as per the second model - by networked non-academic organizations of various kinds, or, as in the case of the third model, by various non-academic subsidiaries of the university offering the academic programme. The latter model is favoured in the United States, as in the case of the Entrepreneurship Programmes at Case Western Reserve University in Ohio and at the University of Texas at Austin

For Janusz Teczke and Remigiusz Gawlik of the Cracow University of Economics, the question of the introduction of Entrepreneurship studies into their

university is a simple matter of responding, on one hand, to student demand that graduates be well equipped with the “tools” that they will need to succeed on the labour market, and, on the other, to the evidence that Entrepreneurship, as a taught subject and a general attitude permeating the institution, will be of benefit to the University. The question then is one of designating facilities and of appointing staff. In the particular case of the Cracow University of Economics, the setting up of a special Entrepreneurship programme for handicapped students, the International Education Center for Students with Motor Disabilities, offers the possibility for it to serve a neglected segment of the student community by preparing its members for specialized business careers.

The two articles that follow move away from considerations of concrete Entrepreneurship programmes in higher education institutions to an analysis of the spirit of Entrepreneurship – particularly in the case of the first article by Professor Stefan Kwiatkowski, Chairholder of the UNESCO-EOLSS Chair of Intellectual Entrepreneurship in the World of Work and Higher Education for Sustainable Development at the Leon Kozminski Academy of Entrepreneurship and Management of Warsaw. Through an analysis of several case studies that he presents in his article and the relevant writings of Joseph Schumpeter and Peter Drucker, Kwiatkowski asserts that successful Entrepreneurship is less the new use of unused resources but the innovative use of resources already being used so as to respond to a perceived and demonstrable opportunity. Important ingredients of success are the injection of social capital that will have to have been accumulated over a long period, prior to any entrepreneurial moment and the capacity to perceive opportunities, no matter how insignificant they may appear at first glance. Most importantly, entrepreneurial qualities of mind and of personality do not depend on the availability of material resources but rather on the development of appropriate attitudes and behaviours – qualities that can be learned in many environments.

According to the second author, Professor Mircea Miclea, of Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca of Romania and Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in Governance and Management of Higher Education at that university, higher education is and should be a crucial venue for the acquisition of the qualities of an entrepreneur. Much as the articles in the earlier issue of Higher Education in Europe on “The Entrepreneurial University...”, were linked to Ernest Boyer’s four-fold paradigm of scholarship in higher education cited above, Professor Miclea has linked his discourse to the four pillars of learning of the Jacques Delors Report, Learning: The Treasure Within (1996): (i) “Learning to Know”; (ii) “Learning to Do”; (iii) “Learning to Be”; and (iv) “Learning to Live Together” - particularly the “Learning to Do” pillar, and its three aspects: the acquisition of relevant job-skills; the learning of social skills; and becoming an agent of change. This pillar and its aspects are all linked to the qualities of mind required of a would-be entrepreneur and as such should be taught as well as practiced in higher education institutions. Professor Miclea then proceeds to explain the ways in which Entrepreneurship education at higher education level can be applied and how they respond to the various higher education-linked directives of the European Union and the requirements of the Bologna Process. Of particular importance is the promotion of intellectual entrepreneurship.

One characteristic of Entrepreneurship education, including the need to nurture entrepreneurial skills in graduates in all fields, is the need for outside support, material and instructional, and of reciprocal relations between given programmes and institutes, as well as their graduates, and the providers of support. The two articles that

follow offer examples of such support: financial, in the first case, and educational, in the second.

In the first article, Margarita Tchouvakhina outlines the ways in which the major German investment bank that employs her, *Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau* – KfW – has, since 1998, invested in and supported the start-up of a number of professorial chairs in various German higher education institutions. The effort has been crowned with success so that as of this writing (April 2004), forty Entrepreneurship chairs, that have benefited from subsidies by KfW, are in operation in German universities, and ten more are in the process of being created. Bank-sponsorship is limited to five to ten years, after which the chairs must be able to survive on their own, which they will do partly by being supported by their home institutions but more importantly through the incubator and networking activities that they will have initiated.

In the second article, Professor Gérard Kuhn, Director for Research and International Relations of the National Conservatory of Industrial Arts and Trades [*Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers*] of Paris, France, outlines the ways in which this national organization assists businesses in France through life-long learning programmes, technological research, and the dissemination of scientific and technical culture. In particular, the *Conservatoire* operates a distinct National Center for Entrepreneurship [*Centre National de l'Entrepreneuriat*] that offers training and retraining possibilities to small entrepreneurs and consultation services for small and very small businesses.

The “Topic” ends with the “Gelsenkirchen Declaration on Institutional Entrepreneurial Management and Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education in Europe”, which was adopted on 6 December 2003 by the participants in the Conference in which the articles of the topic were originally presented. The Declaration calls for greater Entrepreneurship in the management of European universities and greater emphasis on Entrepreneurship studies in them, this to assist them in meeting the goals of the Bologna Process and the establishment of the European Higher Education Area by 2010. The Declaration also calls for the support of UNESCO-CEPES in the setting up of UNESCO Chairs in Entrepreneurship in the universities of the Europe Region of UNESCO.

The three “Tribune” articles that follow, although on diverse subjects, nevertheless evoke Entrepreneurship, however obliquely, as it is taught in higher education institutions and as it is practiced by higher education institutions and graduates.

The first article, by Billroy Powell of Canada, presents arguments for and against authorizing the founding and operation of private degree-granting universities in the Province of Ontario. His argument is that the public authorities are unable, owing to insufficient financial resources, to provide sufficient places in the public universities of the province to satisfy demand for higher education. Private universities, if founded, would need to be innovative – entrepreneurial – to attract students and would have to offer value for money by offering new and innovative course programmes.

Joseph Klein of Israel examines the question of how higher education imparts in graduates the ability to make sound objective and subjective judgments in day-to-day decision-making. Such an ability is an important part of Entrepreneurship.

Finally, however, Sylvia van de Bunt-Kokhuis, in her study of the effects of globalization on the freedom of knowledge, calls attention to the risks of the over-commercialization of knowledge production, including that undertaken in universities.

She warns that too much Entrepreneurship runs the risk of deviating the university from its humanistic, cultural, and scientific mission – a danger hinted at by several of the authors composing the “Topic” section.

We conclude the issue with book studies by Professors Eric Gilder and Laura Savage of Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania. The next issue of Higher Education in Europe will take up the question of “Brain Drain and the Academic and the Intellectual Labour Market in South East Europe”.