

Labour Subjectivities for the new world of work: A critique of government policy on the integration of entrepreneurialism in the university curriculum.

Philippa Hall, *Independent Researcher, UK*

Abstract

International debates on the aims and purposes of entrepreneurship education in universities are examined in this paper through the prism of a policy critique of recent English higher education initiatives. The Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) policy to integrate rather than 'add on' enterprise education throughout university courses has been widely implemented. In contrast to the debates about enterprise policy by authors in social psychology, business studies, secondary school education and entrepreneurship, which question the claims of enterprise rhetoric and examine the practicalities of forming start-up companies, policy to integrate entrepreneurship into the curriculum has remained largely uncontested in UK universities. It is argued that policy to integrate enterprise into the humanities and social sciences produces three critical gaps; a limited scope for social theory, ahistorical analysis and the absence of demand-side economics. This critique of BIS policy is set within the wider context of the neo-liberal reconfiguration of the institutional relations between the university, the state and the market that erode university autonomy in the UK and on an international scale.

Keywords: *higher education policy, university autonomy, entrepreneurship, social science, curriculum*

Introduction

Entrepreneurship has been part of the business studies curriculum in American universities throughout the post war period, expanding rapidly in the US¹ (Katz 2003, Vesper 1988, 1993) during the mid-1980s. An overview of international perspectives on entrepreneurship education written two decades later confirmed a strong institutional presence in the USA², Canada and the European Union (Greene and Price 2007). Debates have flourished in the subject area, with authors having written on themes encompassing; the practical contribution of entrepreneurship education to business formation in Finland (Laukkanen 2000) and Sweden (Johannisson, Landstrom and Rosenberg 1998), the impact of enterprise policy interventions in scientific research in Australia (Kenway, Bullen and Robb 2004), establishing university 'start-up' company in England (Birley 2002) and France (Mustar 1997) and strategies to foster entrepreneurship education in India (Raichaudhuri 2005). This article is a critical policy analysis of a new phase of government initiatives on entrepreneurship education identifiable in policy from 2008 onwards in the US and from 2009 onwards in the UK; which aim to apply entrepreneurship education throughout the university curriculum, beyond the confines of the business school. Kuratko's discussion of the 'entrepreneurial perspective' approach (Kuratko 2005 in Greene and Price 2007) is an example of the ideas that are reflected in the new policy, and within neo-liberal marketization policy in higher education (Harvey 2005, Lynch 2006, Ong 2006, Marginson 2008) integrated entrepreneurship education has a congruence with broader government policy aims. The article examines the emergence of the 'entrepreneurial perspective' in policy documents such as the US Kauffman Report (2008) and also in an analysis of UK policy documents produced by the Nesta Policy and Research Unit (1997), the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (2008) and the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (2009 a, 2009 b, 2010, 2013). Policy aims do exert a concomitant influence on pedagogy (Baptiste 2001)

and the article examines ways in which the humanities and social science curriculum can be informed by the 'entrepreneurship perspective'.

A critical analysis of UK policy since 2009 can provide a prism through which to evaluate UK and international debates on enterprise education and the university curriculum. In contrast to the many studies of the incorporation of enterprise into the school curriculum (Deuchar 2007, Ritchie 1991, Smyth 1999) there is very little critical analysis of the content and aim of corresponding policies in higher education initiated by the Department of Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS). This gap is surprising as UK university websites indicate that BIS policy to incorporate enterprise throughout university curricula has been widely implemented. Unlike the debates about enterprise in secondary education, which have aimed to counter balance the emphasis upon enterprise for profit with the study of citizenship and democratic structures and processes in schools (Deuchar 2007, Dobie 1998, Taylor and Johnson 2002), pedagogic discussion of enterprise in universities³ appears to be restricted to two main themes; how best to insert entrepreneurship into the curriculum and the extent of its reach⁴. The starting point for this article is the gulf between debates on enterprise education in schools and the muted discussion on the integration of enterprise in UK university curricula.

Through an examination of government policy documents and university websites, I consider the implications of enterprise education for the social science curriculum in higher education institutions. I set this examination of UK university enterprise policy within the context of the institutional reconfiguration which removed higher education from the Department of Education and Skills in 2007 and brought universities into Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) in 2009⁵. BIS policy from 2009 onwards took a new direction in which enterprise and entrepreneurship, both terms used interchangeably in BIS policy⁶,

was no longer considered an 'add-on' to the curriculum and an intensified policy of embedded integration of enterprise into curriculum began (BIS Report 2013). Overall, as it stands, it could be argued that the critical gaps within BIS policy implementation restrict curriculum content and this article considers whether criticality is lost in the process. The new policy did advocate curriculum and institutional change that has significant negative effects upon education, shrinking the scope of social analysis and indicative of a new political relationship between the university, the state and the market. Indeed a macro-economic analysis of the state sponsorship of university start-up companies is a useful tool to highlight the limitations of the small scale analytical scope of the entrepreneurship education being 'integrated' into the university curriculum and university start-up companies are examined in the article to illustrate this point. I identify three gaps in critical analysis stemming from implementation of enterprise policy in university courses; in social theory and in the historical and economic analysis of enterprise.

The article begins with an overview and analysis of BIS enterprise education policy, followed by a consideration of how the policy is applied in universities based on course descriptions and policy documents found on university websites. The pervasive presence of enterprise in the curriculum as advocated by BIS is facilitated by the broad definition of enterprise used in the literature (Armstrong 2005, Chell 2008, Baron 2012). Such broad definitions explain how enterprise can be disseminated throughout the curriculum as a set of values and an ethos considered applicable to any academic discipline, an approach which advocates of enterprise education deem is necessary for enterprise policy to have a general impact in the university (Kauffman 2008). Broad definitions of enterprise and its general application across disciplines do hamper the scope, criticality and reflexivity of social science and implicitly privilege particular social theories and research design. This comprises the first critical gap.

In section two I examine whether the emphasis upon innovation occurs at the expense of an historical examination of the intensification of enterprise in the university as part of the knowledge economy policy that emerged in western capitalist states with the decline in western productivity since 1960s (Armstrong 2005, Drucker 1959, 1969, 1985, Romer 1990, Freeman *et al* 1982, Freeman 1987). An historical perspective shows how knowledge economy policy occurs within neo-liberal re-configurations of the relationship between the state, education and the market (Harvey 2005, Freeman 1987, Marginson 2008). The state funding of education sustained schools and universities as spheres autonomous from the market, an autonomy which is jeopardized by the ideological frames that business interests necessarily bring to enterprise education (Kogan and Bleikie 2007, Slaughter and Leslie 1997, Barrett 2003). The third critical gap, the marginalization of critical economic theories in enterprise curricula, suggests BIS policy does restrict the scope of analysis. BIS policy tends to reiterate the conventional, ahistorical narrative accounts of business start-ups that pervade the entrepreneurship literature with stories of business successes and failures (Petzinger 1999). Macro-economic factors and demand-side analysis clearly have an impact upon business start-ups but enterprise curricula focus almost wholly on supply side factors, in particular the social psychology of entrepreneurship (Thornton 1999, Baron 2012, Chell 2008). The pedagogic debates in business studies about whether entrepreneurship that results in start-ups can indeed be taught at all (Dainow 1986, Gorman *et al* 1997) appear unacknowledged in university enterprise studies, despite such uncertainties being acknowledged in the 2013 BIS report (2013:34-35).

The BIS Report 2013 acknowledgement of the shortcomings of enterprise education in teaching practical skills and producing business start-ups prompts the question; what is the purpose of integrating enterprise throughout the curriculum? In section four I suggest that the entrepreneurial project in the university

curriculum is perhaps best examined in terms of its ideological purposes, the transmission of entrepreneurial 'values' and 'ethos' and not the practical skills resulting in business start-up. This then poses the question of the extent to which market driven changes informing course content impinge upon the reflexivity and criticality fundamental to the university as an autonomous institution. Many authors have noted the impact of knowledge economy policy on university research (Kenway *et al* 2004), in particular the tendency to replace 'curiosity driven research' with targeted and strategic research (Slaughter and Leslie 1997:15, Santiago, Carvalho and Relva 2008) and this article extends this debate to teaching practice by considering whether the scope of the social science curriculum has undergone similar shrinkage under BIS policy.

BIS knowledge economy policy: bringing enterprise into the university curriculum

University websites indicate that BIS enterprise policy is widely implemented across pre and post 1992 institutions⁷ and appears to inform the re-shaping of course structure and content, limiting the scope of social theory and research design. The process of incorporating enterprise within the university appears to be largely unchallenged, in contrast to the many debates on enterprise education that occur in secondary schools (Deuchar 2007, Billet 2004, Davies and Evans 2002, Davies *et al* 2001). The muted responses to enterprise in universities also stands in contrast to more probing analysis of enterprise in social psychology that debate its definition (Baron 2012, Chell 2008) and discussions of the pedagogy of enterprise among authors in business studies (Johannisson *et al* 1998). Even entrepreneurs themselves problematize enterprise and question whether entrepreneurs require education to succeed (Branson 1999, 2012). In contrast, in universities BIS enterprise policy appears largely implemented without debate, and this is significant as the BIS requirement that enterprise be integrated into subject

curricula, rather than 'added on', does seem to inform curriculum decisions. BIS policy aims appear to result in the privileging of particular forms of social theory that are deemed congruent with enterprise, whilst marginalizing social theories that encompass historical and economic analysis.

BIS enterprise policy is not unprecedented. Business initiatives in higher education had existed before, most notably during the 'enterprise culture' initiatives of the Thatcher years (Heelas and Morris 1992, Heelas 1992, Fairclough 1991) and subsequently under the 1997-2010 New Labour government⁸. The Department of Education and Science (DES) policy to foster entrepreneurship set out in the 1985 Green Paper and 1987 White Paper, aimed to 'orient [graduates] positively towards the values of enterprise' (Welch 1996:1), and in Scotland education policy has also prioritized the promotion of entrepreneurial values and attitudes (Logan 2009). However, the change in the pace and reach of policy after 2009 and, in particular, the erosion of critical analysis in the curriculum, is noticeable. Enterprise teaching acquired an intensified purpose; to go beyond the realms of business studies and 'add-ons' to the curriculum, and achieve the 'institutional embedding' of enterprise throughout all university subjects. BIS policy was grounded in UK Government knowledge economy policy, and also UK implementation of the EU Lisbon Strategy (2000-2010), in which the EU Key Competences Framework include the creation of; 'a sense of initiative and entrepreneurship' as shown in the 'individual's ability to turn ideas into action....includes creativity, innovation and risk-taking' (BIS Report 2013:13)⁹. The European policies share features with US enterprise in universities as set out in the Kauffman Report (2008) to embed and integrate the business ethos across all university subjects, in a distinct move for enterprise beyond prior ideas that restricted enterprise to business studies and 'spin out' companies related to marketable scientific research (Birley 2002). Reports produced by BIS in 2010 and 2013 evaluated the impact of the policy by measuring the extent of enterprise teaching within education. The 2013 BIS Report summed up the new post-

2009 policy and documents, and at this point 'enterprise education' is defined more broadly to refer to the 'teaching of entrepreneurial skills, attitudes and competences, enterprise culture and an entrepreneurial mindset', which greatly extended the scope of enterprise beyond the more traditional (and still existing) idea that 'entrepreneurship education' consists of 'teaching of skills etc. required to establish a business' (BIS Report 2013:14). The pitfalls of a policy to integrate enterprise into the curriculum appear to be acknowledged, for example, Lord Young describes government enterprise policy in terms of the addition of enterprise rather than embedding¹⁰, but such a distinction does not appear to be apparent in most university settings where the integration¹¹ of enterprise into the curriculum is the policy and the debate appears to be restricted to how this objective can be implemented.

The requirement that enterprise be integrated not 'added' to the curriculum is a distinction that matters to enterprise education because it underlines the fundamental transformative effect that entrepreneurship asserts. For social science this integration is problematic as it poses pedagogic questions. BIS enterprise policy appears to be largely informed by the literature produced on entrepreneurship by business studies and by entrepreneurs themselves, not by social scientists or economists. This reliance upon entrepreneurs writing produces two issues, firstly the use of a very general definition of enterprise, which spans entrepreneurship business and secondly the use of value laded terms. For example, the literature uses a broad definition of entrepreneurship as a set of ideas and an attitude (Baron 2007, 2012, Shane and Venkataraman 2000, Zhao, Seibert and Lumpkin 2010, Locke and Baum 2007). For Baron, entrepreneurship extends beyond the scope of courses in business studies, and is 'more basic' than finance (2012:4) this conveys the sense that it is fundamental, while also apparently hard to encapsulate, as shown in Baron's definition 'the application of human creativity, ingenuity, knowledge, to the development of something new, useful, - and that creates some

kind of value (social or economic)' (2012:4). For Baron, the definition of entrepreneurship is broad, it is 'a field of business', which 'seeks to understand how opportunities to create something new arise and are discovered or created by specific persons, who then use various means to exploit or develop them' (Shane and Venkataraman 2000 in Baron 2012:5). It is this wide definition of entrepreneurship that extends in scope beyond business studies and finance (Baron 2012:6) that underpins and enables BIS policy and is also used by universities to implement the policy; for it is the broadness of definition that provides the necessary flexibility to carry out the task of integrating enterprise values throughout the curriculum. As a result, entrepreneurship appears to exist within degree courses without apparently requiring a clear definition in debate and also without an acknowledgment that ideas are not value free but constructed and rooted within the theoretical and methodological bounds of a discipline. The broad definition of enterprise, and the entrepreneurial premise that ideas lack value in themselves and are value neutral, and as such provide a form of 'raw material for innovation' (Baron, 2012:34) forestalls debate. Such framing means that it is possible to assert that ideas can be extracted by the entrepreneur as raw data and then applied in new and different combinations to produce value (Gibb and Hannon 2005, NESTA 1997), even though it is difficult to assess this process and wonder why such limitations to the scope and clarity of critique are present.

At first sight it seems universities' apparent enthusiasm to embrace enterprise despite policy questions are due to the income that universities can gain through starting up the in house consultancies and 'spin-off' companies that BIS knowledge economy policy promotes¹². However closer examination shows that whilst 'start-ups' and 'spin offs' do happen¹³ in many instances it is the state that provides income to university for business initiatives rather than start-ups being self-sustaining. BIS funding initiatives to serve business needs are based within universities in order to draw upon staff and facilities, for example

the innovation vouchers scheme (Jolly 2011). As a result, the priority placed upon business in research and curriculum decisions reflects the university as a site for access to state funding, rather than the presence of independent campus 'start-ups'. The university enterprise education gains an income from BIS enterprise policy, not new businesses. This makes the request that enterprise be integrated across course curricula policy driven not business driven and it is pervasive. Three quantifiable changes to the curriculum reflect the intensification of BIS enterprise policy. Firstly, the insertion of enterprise is now applied widely in the university curriculum. The BIS Report 2013 documents the rapid increase in enterprise education, with formal provision at 30% of universities, informal provision at 60% and with just 9% of institutions offering no provision (BIS Report 2013:8). Secondly, there are also a range of entrepreneurship competitions and awards between higher education institutions¹⁴. Thirdly subject quality benchmarks exist¹⁵. A search of university websites indicate there is widespread integration of enterprise within social science departments¹⁶ and indeed a search of popular websites that advertise UK courses show that enterprise is a category that is listed as being present within in 55 courses¹⁷.

A fourth area of change is qualitative in that BIS policy to embed rather than 'add-on' enterprise has drawn upon theories of social capital and networks that emanate from entrepreneurship studies and limited the scope of research design¹⁸. Policy literature from the Higher Education Academy and BIS¹⁹, presents 'social capital' as a concrete objective, an approach which draws upon writing on entrepreneurship (Aldrich and Zimmer 1986, Markham and Baron 2003a, 2003b, Carolis and Saporito 2006, Davidsson and Honig 2003, Dubini and Aldraich, 1991). Baron, for example, uses 'social capital' to describe the building of business success and claims entrepreneurship is based upon 'high quality, extensive social networks' used.....'to obtain important benefits' (2012:105). The benefits of social networks are often defined in the literature as access to 'social capital' (Baron 2012:105,

Nahapiet and Ghoshal 1998) which for Putnam consists of 'the social ties entrepreneurs have with others and the benefits they can obtain from these ties' (Putnam 2000 in Baron 2012:105). Thus, entrepreneurship literature tends to be limited to definitions of social capital with an emphasis on its business relevance (Adler and Kwon 2002, Aldrich and Kim 2007). This means that the debates that exist within social science about social capital (Bourdieu 1986, Coleman 1988, Savage 2005) are replaced by an overwhelming emphasis upon Putnam's idea of social capital (1993, 2000) in enterprise education.

The uncritical use of Putnam's social capital in enterprise education has two main effects that impede social analysis; firstly the uncontested concrete reality attributed to social capital and secondly the emphasis is placed upon studying social cohesion not conflict or power, eschewing 'power, conflict, racism, class' (Fine 2010:49). Seeing 'social capital' as a real phenomenon is fundamental to enterprise studies as it supports the claim that concrete 'real world' impact can be produced through enterprise. However a literal interpretation of social capital ignores theoretical debate in the social sciences about the premise of Putnam's work, for example, that Putnam's idea of social capital exists within a particular idea of 'civil society...separated from the economy and the state' (Fine 2010:162). By implicitly adopting the ideas of civil society that inform Putnam's work, enterprise policy is detached from the critical analysis of state and society (Smith and Kulynych 2002 in Fine 2010:163). This policy driven approach to social theory present in BIS policy documents indicates how the project to embed enterprise in the university curriculum reduces the critical scope of social analysis. Rather than examining business and entrepreneurship as objects of analysis within wider socio-economic contexts, social capital in the entrepreneurship and social enterprise literature assumes an uncontested, descriptive category that reflects Putnam's work (Baron 2012). Indeed, Putnam in his role as an OECD policy advisor claims that 'social capital fosters the acquisition of human capital and that in turn education fosters the accumulation of

social capital'....'education can contribute to social capital and thus to social cohesion' (Putnam 2004)²⁰.

Large scale perspectives of state and society are excluded by Putnam's approach to social capital, as are the analysis of power relations and politics that frame research (Bryman 2012, Nader 1972, Gusterson 1997) and this emphasis tends to exclude subjects such as welfare, which require an engagement with state institutions (Fine 2010). The emphasis upon social capital theory in universities to integrate enterprise in the curriculum is accompanied by related emphasis in research methodology and method upon the meso level of research design. In contrast to critiques of enterprise in schools which argue it is necessary to adopt a national perspective to address implicit neo-liberal political interests in enterprise policy (Deuchar 2007:20, Matseleng Allais 2003:307 in Deuchar 2007:21), the enterprise curriculum in universities appears to replicate BIS policy. Research at the meso level tends not to engage with power inequalities important to the sociological research literature such as 'studying up' (Nader 1972, Bryman 2012). Those people and communities that are deemed to 'have social capital' are analysed with an emphasis upon their entrepreneurial aspirations and projects and not the society and state within which they live.

In short, BIS policy privileges theories of social capital and the methods and methodologies relevant to small scale projects, with an emphasis upon the individual and their rational choices within the community. The result of university curriculum content informed by government policy hampers criticality defined as it is by the limited horizons in which only market solutions are proffered to address social problems²¹. The result is that wider areas of debates are dissipated through 'forgetting...the systematic dependence of capitalism upon extraction of profitability' (Fine 2010:200), and social capital is the concept best suited to this aim. The policy demand that enterprise be embedded into the curriculum means that concepts such as

Putnam's social capital become pervasive²² as they provide the necessary conceptual bridge between social sciences and entrepreneurship that courses in 'social enterprise' require.

Authors on secondary school education and entrepreneurship literature have responded to enterprise education more critically. In secondary school education literature authors have analysed the limitations enterprise can pose, the political setting for intervention, its ideological content and have engaged with government policy reports. The enterprise agenda is recognized as an aspect of New Labour policy (Deuchar 2007:15) and to address the potential limitation and political bias that could accompany teaching 'enterprise', teachers introduce themes of individual responsibility within the citizenship curriculum (Davies *et al* 2001). The entrepreneurial in secondary education policy implementation is recognized as ideological, for example, Deuchar notes the policy contains within it a set of ideas advanced by Giddens about, 'a new relationship between society and the individual' (Giddens 1998:65 in Deuchar 2007:25). The secondary education debate about the teaching of enterprise encompasses the political and economic policies and government ideologies within which this occurs (Deuchar 2007:33) and engages with government reports on enterprise and citizenship education²³. Do changes brought by BIS government policy forestall the critical evaluation of the social entrepreneurial thinking and the 'social enterprise' projects it aims to foster? In social psychology (Baron 2012, Chell 2008) and business studies (Johannisson *et al* 1998) there are also pertinent debates about the definition of enterprise and, indeed, whether enterprise can be taught or is an innate talent. In contrast, university enterprise teaching tends to present apparently unquestioningly, the entrepreneurs' inspirational story of business start-up against the odds that is dominant in popular culture²⁴. Yet social psychology debates the 'narrative of the successful entrepreneur' (Baron 2012:14), and Baron claims that the entrepreneurs' representation of their own stories of success lacks objectivity and instead argues for systematic, objective 'evidence-based'

approach to the study of entrepreneurs that replaces reliance upon their accounts of their entrepreneurs' stories (Baron 2012:17).

A critical social analysis could take the entrepreneur's stories as the starting point for analysis rather than its frame. Instead the entrepreneurial narrative studied in enterprise education shows an over-optimism that overlooks the complexities of the demand-side factors in the wider economy. The inspirational stories of entrepreneurs overlook the history of business empires that are often stories of the weakening of trust and the loss of confidence in social bonds (Armstrong 2005). Thirdly, entrepreneurs' lives show the complexity of access to state-funding, for example, Branson's autobiography contains the story of bankruptcy, rent seeking, public finance, failure and undercutting (Branson 1999, 2012). The stories of Branson (2012) and others (Petzinger 1999) can be analysed in ways that interrogate the rhetoric and established narratives of the entrepreneurial story and so illuminate the complexities and contradictions of the enterprise project.

The lack of critical debate in social science lends enterprise education a circular analytical approach in which entrepreneurial projects are posited as solutions and social and economic problems are attributed to an absence of entrepreneurship (Hjalager 1989 in Armstrong 2005). Enterprise education appears to have muted critical voices (Bagguley and Mann 1992 in Armstrong 2005) not through putting forth counter debate, but by defining 'enterprise' very broadly and focusing on meso scale studies that do not stretch to the historical and sociological analysis of social institutions. That enterprise policy frames and circumscribes debate can be seen in the tendency for course content to reiterate policy terms, such as discussing community development in terms of 'change agents'²⁵ to implement government policy. University websites show that BIS policy to embed enterprise rather than 'add-on' courses is widely

implemented since 2009 and this limits the parameters and scope of the analysis of entrepreneurship and enterprise.

The economic history of BIS enterprise education policy: its purpose and impact

The BIS website states the two main purposes of the policy are the creation of new businesses and the teaching of business values; objectives that are present in BIS policy documents including, 'Knowledge economy' Higher Ambitions: The future of universities in a knowledge economy' (2009a). BIS policy requires 'enterprise thinking' be incorporated into the curriculum, while not including the economic history of the idea and purpose of the 'knowledge economy' which gave rise to it, an ahistorical approach towards enterprise that comprises the second critical gap in the enterprise curriculum. A consideration of economic history problematizes the policy and historical analysis shows the institutional reconfigurations the knowledge economy produces in relation between the state and the market.

Knowledge economy policy was a response to the crisis in post-industrial western capitalism in the post-war era. Worsening terms of trade, falling labour productivity in US and UK, stronger international competition with the west and the end of protected UK colonial markets (Jackson 2009) meant productivity fell and the post war settlement between labour and business dwindled away (Armstrong 2005). Knowledge economy policy aimed to gain a competitive advantage in labour productivity for companies through acquiring a large market share in high technology research and development (Drucker 1959, 1970) and drew upon the human capital theory (Schultz 1963, 1971, 1980, Becker 1964) and Freeman's innovation theory (1982, 1987) that is now echoed in BIS policy. UK government initiatives to open markets were based in universities throughout the 1970s and 1980s²⁶, as western companies recognized that state-supported knowledge

work was a sector where competitive advantage was possible over non-western business in a globalized economy. Just as globalized manufacturing increased productivity by cutting the cost of unskilled labour in 1970s and 1980s, so in the twenty first century globalized knowledge work cuts labour costs and raises productivity in high skilled work and this requires new attitudes among employees that courses on the values of entrepreneurship and employability can convey.

What makes the post 2009 BIS policy distinctive from the UK government enterprise programmes of higher education in the 1980s is that for the first time entrepreneurial ideas are presented as values to be integrated throughout the curriculum. This is significant because the proliferation of enterprise values compromises the status of the university in modern Europe as a social institution with autonomy from the state and the market (Humboldt [1852] Burrows trans.1969, Kenway *et al* 2004). Indeed education is one of the few spheres in which state intervention is judged to be both necessary and justified since Humboldt reviewed Prussian state education [1791-2] to safeguard a national state education sphere that continues to inform UNESCO policy today²⁷. BIS policy to embed enterprise across the curriculum entails a re-configuration of the long established institutional distinction between education and the market in the modern state, in which state support served to maintain the university's autonomy from the market. An historical analysis of knowledge economy policy shows the extent to which BIS policy post 2009 has sought to reconfigure the relationship between the state and education. As such, enterprise education is part of a longer process in which the public sphere is eroded to release the force of enterprise. The goal to 'free' business up confronts a distinctive intellectual and institutional barrier in the role of state funded education to sustain democracy and citizenship not only capital growth. These are recognized when questioned²⁸.

The ahistorical approach to entrepreneurship education also obscures the third critical gap, the pedagogic questions that stem from teaching enterprise and studying its economics. The economic and pedagogical debates about whether enterprise that results in start-ups can indeed be taught (Dainow 1986, Gorman *et al* 1997) are absent. Rather enterprise courses tend to draw upon social psychology²⁹ and supply side economics to focus upon the traits and business narratives of the individual entrepreneur, including central to many an entrepreneur's narrative is the idea that entrepreneurship is a gift that cannot be taught. Macro-economic factors which exert a proven force upon enterprise, such as demand side analysis and capital supply, rarely appear in entrepreneurs' stories (Branson 1999, 2012) and are not considered in the enterprise curriculum. Economic analyses of enterprise are largely absent from the enterprise curriculum. Schumpeter (1961, 1976), whose economics underpins the Lisbon Strategy in knowledge economy (Hartmann 2007), puts forward an argument that is largely absent from the enterprise curriculum. This approach is to examine entrepreneurship in the wider context of the factors of production (Schumpeter 1961:555, Chell 2008:20) and sees entrepreneurs as endogenous forces that are a part of capitalism in crisis. In sharp contrast to the dominant idea of entrepreneur as innovator bringing solutions, Schumpeter's entrepreneur emerges as a by-product of capitalist crisis who profits from the destruction of its anticipated, intermittent crises³⁰. The literature in social psychology and business studies remains undecided as to whether entrepreneurs can be defined by traits, 'idea that there are trait descriptors that individuate an entrepreneur but a lack of any consistent evidence to substantiate such a view' (Chell 2008:140), and whether entrepreneurship traits can be taught³¹. Since enterprise first entered the business schools at the start of the twentieth century authors doing empirical research question have failed to establish whether a direct connection exists between entrepreneurship education and subsequent business start-ups (Dainow 1986, Gorman *et al* 1997).

In contrast to the debates in social psychology, business studies and economics, the enterprise integrated in the university curriculum appears restricted to the idea of entrepreneurship as 'ethos' rather than practical skill. This emphasis is evident in the exclusive focus upon the 'supply side' economics of entrepreneurship rather than the demand side (Thornton 1999). The emphasis on supply side analysis obscures the significance of factors such as state subsidies to enterprise (Armstrong 2005), an example would be the ways business gain access to state funding resources through innovation programmes run within universities (Jolly 2011). Enterprise education does also appear to ignore the more nuanced aspects of the supply side we well, for example, Armstrong's analysis of the 'tactical empathy' and transactional relationships explore the unpleasant aspects of the entrepreneurial ethos (Branson 1999 in Armstrong 2005) in which claims that workers forego pay in order to support the common aim of the company obscures the individual interests of the entrepreneur.

Why teach enterprise if entrepreneurship is a 'natural talent' that cannot be taught?

Given academic literature and BIS policy documents such as BIS Report 2013 express uncertainty about whether entrepreneurship that leads to start-ups can in practice be measured or taught what indeed is the purpose of including the enterprise ethos into the curriculum? Whilst the discussion of enterprise in the curriculum is often couched within a familiar language of practical business skills, start-ups and entrepreneurial 'ethos', in practice what is being conveyed in enterprise education are the attitudes and values sympathetic to towards business and the subjectivities. Indeed NCGE policy documents state this, for example, in 'Towards the Entrepreneurial University' Gibb and Hannon claim that teaching entrepreneurship serves to teach students to develop empathy towards the 'life-world' of entrepreneurs as a group (Gibb and Hannon 2005). Broad

definitions of 'enterprise' or 'entrepreneurship' in the curriculum encompass business start-up and also an 'entrepreneurship of the self' which is another name for employability. While deskilled graduate work lowers wages (Spring 2008), uncertainties for workers in the new capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999, Beck 2000) are ameliorated through ensuring workers have empathetic attitudes towards business (Gibb and Honnen 2005). Often the entrepreneur is framed as heroic risk taker; so re-inventing the insecurity of deregulated, non-unionised labour into heroic forms of individualistic struggle, in which the 'individual-centred mindset' (Laukkanen 2000) taught through enterprise acquires its value.

In schools a debate exists over the neo-liberal basis of enterprise that recognizes that the policy is based upon an 'individualistic, business related model' (Deuchar 2007:33), yet universities have apparently extended the entrepreneurial ethos and values into the curriculum without addressing other aspects of the enterprise economy; such as low pay, deregulation and business reliance upon access to state funding. Yet all three factors are examples of the less appealing, or less heroic aspects that are as crucial to entrepreneurial success. Branson's entrepreneurial use of 'tactical empathy' worker acceptance of low pay in order to help the 'cause' of the company is a common element of enterprise ideology (Armstrong 2005), and evident in Branson's discussion of the benefits of low pay and loyalty for entrepreneurs within the creative industries (1999, 2012). Indeed, several authors have argued that it is through the 'transactional model of interpersonal relationships' that entrepreneurship flourishes (Collins, Moore and Unwalla 1964:127-9 in Armstrong 2005:95). The emphasis upon the spirit and culture of entrepreneurial creativity can obscure the significance of economic factors in expansion, such as the role that deregulation and takeovers have had in business building. Such factors increase worker precarity and lack the innovative edge often attributed to wealth creation, but they are equally part of the entrepreneurial story, as Branson's autobiographies attest (1999, 2012). Armstrong notes that entrepreneurialism is part of

the policies that consist of reduced tax, trade union and welfare cuts and asks how 'would cut backs look without the rhetoric of entrepreneurialism'..... (2005:217). Indeed in the last few years after the crash, entrepreneurship has acquired an even greater ideological significance as a narrative that is crucial to austerity policy.

The attitudes that BIS enterprise policy aims to produce a set of 'behaviours and attitudes', what BIS terms 'the mindset, for developing a positive view of entrepreneurship and enterprise' (BIS Report 2013:16), appear to entail a partial analysis of the world of business. These enterprise skills and ideas are intended 'to have an effect on young people's roles and work in paid employment within both large and small businesses where they could be developing new products and business opportunities' (BIS Report 2013:17). BIS policy set out to use enterprise courses to replace the economics courses, which were considered to lack 'focus' by considered economics from range of standpoints, not only business case³². Instead BIS policy replaces economics courses with a focus upon 'education which develops entrepreneurial mindsets, i.e. the willingness and capacity to turn ideas into practice, supported by the necessary skills' (BIS Report 2013:18).

In short, under BIS policy the general study of economics is to be replaced by an emphasis upon enterprise, for the purpose of building up businesses based upon innovation and schooling a workforce in these business values. For example, in the Oxford Student Consultancy student provide free consultancy services to businesses³³. This limitation of the curriculum forms part of a longer term education policy to re-define the role of the state. The restricted scope of enterprise education conveys enterprise as an uncomplicated ethos and taken for granted goal. Many authors argue the causal connection between education and start-ups is unproven and not yet certain (Dainow 1986, Gorman *et al* 1997, Dickson *et al* 2008) and these are confirmed by the

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor at Babson University (Acs *et al* 2004). Laukkanen also notes that authors are cautious about claims that enterprise education has practical effects on business creation, 'published evaluations of high level entrepreneurial education are only indicative, being based on indirect indices such as faculty qualifications, curricula, student scores or institutional resources, not impact on venture creation' (Vesper 1988, Young 1977 in Laukkanen [2000] 2007:508). The pedagogical debate whether entrepreneurs are taught or self-made continues (Greene and Price 2007). Given that entrepreneurial values are already commonly held in western societies, simply having these values does not make business start-ups more likely (Johannisson [1998] 2007:381); other factors are capital investment and low employment protection. Recession increases enterprise, and enterprise education has yet to be proven positively to define enterprise success (Dickson *et al* 2008). Indeed, business start-ups are most prevalent where low mobility exists alongside low employment protection, as in the Italian context argued low employment protection prompts more start-ups than education (Castagnetti and Rosti 2011). There have been uncertainties regarding the extent to which the practical skills of enterprise can be taught, the BIS emphasis upon enterprise ethos and values indicate its ideological purposes.

Conclusion

The aim to integrate entrepreneurship education throughout the university curriculum has shaped higher education policy in many nation-states since 2008. In the UK enterprise policy has been widely implemented within universities and the purpose appears ideological rather than practical. Debate on entrepreneurship in the curriculum remains muted, in contrast to the debates about enterprise in research (Kenway *et al* 2004, Birley 2002); there has been very little discussion of the pedagogic impact of policy to integrate enterprise into the curriculum. In contrast to the debates on enterprise education that have occurred in the

secondary school system (Deuchar 2007), university websites indicate that higher education institutions appear to promote entrepreneurship. This article has indicated that integrating enterprise can marginalize other aspects of the curriculum, in particular when inserted into disciplines in which historical and economic critique are fundamental components, scope and criticality are limited. The use of broad definitions of enterprise necessary in order to meet the policy objective to embed entrepreneurship throughout the subject areas also appears to mute debate, and produces a lack of clarity which forestalls analysis of policy purpose and its real impact.

The reasons why there is very little debate on implementation may rest in the economic imperatives of BIS policy, in particular the government funding that BIS enterprise policy brings into the university in a time of austerity. Debates on knowledge economy policy often focused on university research income from profitable, innovative 'start-ups' (Birley 2002) business parks and commercial consultancies³⁴. Yet while profitable university businesses exist, state-funded initiatives to support business bring in substantial enterprise policy income for universities³⁵. Enterprise culture has entered the university, first as an 'add-on' (Heelas and Morris 1992), to produce spin-off companies and science technology parks, yet an emphasis on income generation obscures the extent to which businesses consider universities as gateways to public funding (Armstrong 2007, Jolly 2011) rather than locations for private investment.

Given that BIS policy researchers and other authors remain uncertain whether teaching entrepreneurialism does result in business formation, government policy to integrate enterprise in the university curriculum is instead concerned with teaching labour subjectivities. The gaps in economic history mean enterprise education does not tend to reflect upon its business claims, which is detrimental to social analysis and indeed for the long-term evaluation of BIS policy, as evident in the uncertainty

about BIS policy outcomes (2013). Absent from enterprise education are practical studies which could encompass the UK business context, for example Johansson's (1998) emphasis on what entrepreneurs do in the market. Instead enterprise education trains the worker in the subjectivities required for work in a precarious economy and forestalls the critical, reflexive analysis of the study and practice of enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Notes

¹ Katz argues the publication of Drucker's *Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (1985) marked the point when the study of entrepreneurship became part of the mainstream business school curriculum (Katz 2003:9 in P.G. Greene and M.P. Price (2007).

² The Academy of Management was changed into the Entrepreneurship Division in 1987 (2007: xiii) and the Academy of Management, Learning and Education produced a special journal edition on entrepreneurship in 2004 (P.G. Greene and M.P. Price 2007: xiii).

³ Entrepreneurship was taught in universities since 1947 within business studies. In the 2000s entrepreneurship grew into a separate field in the USA, through endowed positions funded by 1990s stock market profits. Total subject wealth is US\$440 million, 75% endowed funds since 1987 (Katz [2003] in Greene and Price 2007:11).

⁴ Higher Education Academy, <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk>

⁵ In 2001-7 Higher Education was part of the Department of Education & Skills, Lifelong Learning, Further Education and Higher Education. In 2007-9 Higher Education joined Department of Innovation, Universities & Skills, and in 2009 merged with Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform to form the Department of Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS).

⁶ Lord Young in D. Matthews, 'Undergraduates 'should be taught entrepreneurship' *Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 23rd 2013.

⁷ For example, Southampton University, <http://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/blog/2012/jul/13/best-bits-universities-social-enterprise>, and Cardiff University Enterprise Workshops. Cardiff.ac.uk/cuenterprise/our_workshops and University of Northampton integrates enterprise into all degrees <http://www.northampton.ac.uk/business-and-enterprise/enterprise>.

⁸ Such as the National Centre for Graduate Entrepreneurship in 2004 and New Enterprise Study Training Agency (NESTA).

⁹ The H.E. White Paper 2011 stated universities should promote enterprise, resulting in the National Centre for Entrepreneurship Education (NCEE). Previous initiatives include; National Centre for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE), National Association of College and University Entrepreneurs (NACUE) and New Enterprise Study Training Agency (NESTA).

¹⁰ D Matthews, 'Undergraduates 'should be taught entrepreneurship' *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 23rd March 2013

¹¹<http://www1.plymouth.ac.uk/enterprise/Documents/Embedding%20enterprise%20in%20Higher%20Education.pdf>

¹² An example is the spin-off company at Cambridge; 'Cambridge Consultants: The Firm Behind the Future?' *The Telegraph*. 14 October 2009.

¹³ Birley defines a 'spin out' company as 'created using the intellectual assets of the university but which is neither wholly owned nor managed by the university' (Birley 2002 in Greene and Rice 2007:391).

¹⁴ Initiatives include; the BIS 'Entrepreneurial University of the Year 2010-11', the Global Entrepreneurship Week 2010 and 'Start up Britain' March 2011.

¹⁵ QAA Guidelines (2012) <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Newsroom/PressReleases/Pages/Enterprise-and-entrepreneurship-Equipping-graduates-for-the-twenty-first-century.aspx>

¹⁶ Example include;
<https://www1.plymouth.ac.uk/enterprise/Pages/he.aspx>,<http://www2.uel.ac.uk/iss/undergraduate/sociologysocialenterpriseandinnovationstudies> and www.northampton.ac.uk/business-and-enterprise/enterprise

¹⁷ The website 'Hotcourses' <http://www.hotcourses.com> lists 152 entrepreneurship courses in 35 UK universities.

¹⁸ <http://www1.oecd.org/edu/innovation-education/1825848.pdf>

¹⁹https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/254101/bis-13-1268-benefits-of-higher-education-participation-the-quadrants.pdf

²⁰

<http://scholar.harvard.edu/robertputnam/publications/education-diversity-social-cohesion-and-%E2%80%99social-capital%E2%80%99>

²¹ For example, Plymouth University, BA Social Enterprise, and enterprise courses within social science departments at Northampton University and UEL.

²² <http://socialentrepreneurforum.com/index.php/tag/professor-robert-d-putnam/>

²³ Policy publications include; *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (QCA 1998) and *Excellence in Education* (Department of Education & Employment, 1997), and in Scotland *Education for Citizenship in Scotland* (2002).

²⁴ <http://www.gold.ac.uk/icce/news-activities/headline,27672,en.php>

²⁵ <http://www.soas.ac.uk/enterprise/casestudies/file81909.pdf>

²⁶ These include the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) and later initiatives such as the Enterprise Centre at Durham University and NESTA. In 1985 promotion of 'the entrepreneurial spirit essential for the maintenance of employment, prosperity and public services' (DES 1985:4) was sponsored through the Enterprise Initiative in Higher Education 1988-96 (Welch 1996).

²⁷

<http://www.ibe.unesco.org/publications/ThinkersPdf/humbolde.PDF>

²⁸ *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, David Matthews, 23rd March 2013.

²⁹ Early definitions of entrepreneurship included, Cantillon's idea of entrepreneurship considered as risk rather than demand creation [1755] and Say's idea of entrepreneur as the 'coordinator' of the factors of production (Chell 2008:19).

³⁰ Also human capital theory (Schultz 1980, Becker 1964) underpins knowledge economy theories since 1960s. Schultz's human capital theory defined entrepreneurialism as 'another form of capital' (Chell 2008:36, Schultz 1980) which developed 'an individual's ability to perceive and react to disequilibria' (Chell 2008:37) important in times of economic uncertainty.

³¹ For Chell psychology has a central role in analyzing entrepreneurship, it is not the case that 'anyone can do it' (2008:267).

³² Recently opposed by undergraduate economics students Manchester University,

<http://www.theguardian.com/business/2013/oct/24/students-post-crash-economics>

³³ 'Student consultants help local businesses'
www.ox.ac.uk/media/news_stories/2009/090701_1.html

³⁴

<http://www1.plymouth.ac.uk/enterprisesolutions/Pages/default.aspx>

³⁵ An example being 'kpt online' (NESTA 2007:3).

References

- Acs, Z. *et al.* (2004) 'How is Entrepreneurship Good for Economic Growth'? *Global Entrepreneur Monitor* Boston: MIT Press.
- Adler, P. and Kwon, S. (2002) 'Social Capital: Prospects for a new concept' *Academy of Management Review*, 27, pp 17-40.
- Aldrich, H.E. and Kim, P.H. (2007) 'Small worlds, infinite possibilities': How social networks affect entrepreneurial formation and search' *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1, 147-166. check
- Aldrich, H. and Zimmer, C. (1986) 'Entrepreneurship through social networks' in D.L. Sexton and R.W. Smilor, (eds.) *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship* Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Armstrong, P. (2005) *Critique of Entrepreneurship: People and Policy* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bagguley, P. and Mann, K. (1992) 'Idle thieving bastards? Scholarly Representations of the Underclass' *Work, Employment and Society*, 6, (1) 113-26.
- Baptiste, I. (2001) 'Educating Lone Wolves: Pedagogical Implications of Human Capital Theory' *Adult Education Quarterly*, 51 (3) 184-201.
- Barrett, R. (2003) *Beyond All Reason: Living with Ideology in the University* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Baron, R. A. and Markham, G. D. (2003a) 'Beyond social capital: the role of entrepreneurs' social competence in their financial success' *Journal of Business Venturing* 18:15-18.
- Baron, R. A. (2007) 'Behavioural and cognitive factors in entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurs as the active element in new venture creation' *Strategies of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1, 167-182.
- Baron, R. A. (2012) *Entrepreneurship: An Evidence Based Guide*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Beck, U. (2000) *The Brave New World of Work* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Becker, G. (1964) *Human Capital* New York: Columbia University Press.

Billett, S. (2004) 'From your business to our business: industry and vocational education in Australia' *Oxford Review of Education*, 30 (1): 13 – 35.

Birley, S. (2002) 'Universities, Academics and Spin Out Companies: Lessons from Imperial' *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 1 (1). In P.G. Greene and M.P. Rice (eds) (2007) *Entrepreneurship Education* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

BIS (2009a) 'Higher Ambitions: the future of universities in a knowledge economy' www.bis.gov.uk/policies/higher-ambitions Accessed 14th January, 2014.

BIS (2009b) 'Entrepreneurial Culture' www.bis.gov.uk/policies/enterprise-and-business-support/entrepreneurial-culture Accessed 14th January, 2014.

BIS Report (2010) www.bis.gov.uk, Accessed 14th January, 2014.

BIS Report (2013) 'Enterprise Education Impact in Higher and Further Education' www.bis.gov.uk Accessed 14th January, 2014.

Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (1999) *The New Spirit of Capitalism* London: Verso.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London: Routledge.

Branson, R. (1999) *Losing My Virginity: the Autobiography* London: Virgin Publishing Ltd.

Branson, R. (2012) *Like A Virgin: Secrets They Won't Tell you at Business School* London: Virgin Books.

Bryman, A. (2012) 'Documents as sources of data' *Social Research Methods* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carolis, D. M. De and Saporito, P. (2006) 'Social capital, cognition and entrepreneurial opportunities: a theoretical framework' *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30:41-56.

Castagnetti, C and Rosti, L. (2011) 'Who skims the cream off the Italian graduate crop?: Wage employment versus self-employment' *Small Business Economics* 36 (2).

Chell, E. (2008) *The Entrepreneurial Personality: A Social Construction* London: Routledge.

Coleman, J. (1988) 'Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital' *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol, 94: 95-120.

Collins, O.F., Moore, D, G. and Unwalla, D. B. (1964) *The Enterprising Man* East Lansing, Michigan, Bureau of State Business and Economic Research, Michigan State University.

Dainow, R. (1986) 'Training and Education for Entrepreneurs: The current state of the literature' *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 3(4):10-23.

Davidsson, P and Honig, B. (2003) 'The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs' *Journal of Business Venturing* 18 301-331.

Davies, I. and Evans, M. (2002) 'Encouraging active citizenship', *Educational Review*, 54 (1):69-78.

Davies, I., Fulop, M., Hutchings, M, Ross, A, and Vari-Szilagyi, I. (2001) 'Enterprising Citizens? Perceptions of citizenship education and enterprise education in England and Hungary', *Educational Review*, 53, (3): 261-269.

Department of Education and Skills (1985) 'The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s', HMSO.

Department of Education and Skills (1987) 'Meeting the Challenge', White Paper, HMSO.

Deuchar, R. (2007) *Citizenship, Enterprise and Learning* Stoke: Trentham Books.

Dickson, P.H., Solomon, G.T., and Weaver, M., K., (2008) 'Entrepreneurial selection and success: does education matter?'

Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 15 (2) 239-258.

Dobie, T. (1998) 'Pupil Councils in primary and secondary schools', in D. Christie, H. Maitles, and J. Halliday, (eds), *Values Education for Democracy and Citizenship* Glasgow: Gordon Cook Foundation/ University of Stirling.

Drucker, P. (1959) *Landmarks of Tomorrow: A report on the new postmodern world* New York: Harper and Brothers.

Drucker, P. (1969) *The Age of Discontinuity* London: Heinemann.

Drucker, P. (1985) *Innovation and Entrepreneurship* London: Heinemann.

Drucker, P. (1970) *Technology, Management and Society* London: Heinemann.

Dubini, P and Aldraich, H. (1991) 'Personal and extended networks are central to the entrepreneurial process' *Journal of Business Venturing* 6: 305-313.

Fairclough, N. (1991) 'What might we mean by Enterprise Discourse?' in R. Keat and N. Abercrombie (eds) 1991 *Enterprise Culture* London: Routledge.

Fine, B. (2010) *Social Capital* London: Verso.

Freeman, C., Clark, J. and Soete, L. (1982) *Unemployment and Technical Innovation: a study of long waves and economic development* London: Pinter.

Freeman, C. (1987) *Technology Policy and Economic Performance: Lessons from Japan* New York: Pinter.

Gibb, A. and Hannon, P. (2005) 'Towards the Entrepreneurial University' NCGE Framework:

Desired Entrepreneurial Outcomes, Annex 2. NGCE Policy Paper 3.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gorman, G., Hanlon, D., and King, W. (1997) 'Some Research Perspectives on Entrepreneurial Education Enterprise Education

and Education for Small Business Management: A Ten Year Literature Review' *International Small Business Journal* 15 (3) in P. G. Greene and M. P. Rice (eds) (2007) *Entrepreneurship Education* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Greene, P.G., & Rice, M.P. (eds) (2007) 'Introduction: Entrepreneurship Education: Moving from 'Whether' to 'What', 'How' and 'Why'' *Entrepreneurship Education* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Gusterson, H, (1997) 'Studying Up Revisited' *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 20 (1).

Hartmann, D. (2007) 'Understanding the Lisbon Strategy and Policies from a Neo-Schumpeterian point of view' *Revista Universitaria Europea*, 7: pp 15-40.

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heelas, P. and Morris, P. (1992) 'Enterprise Culture, Its Values and Value', in P. Heelas and P. Morris (eds) *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate*, London: Routledge.

Heelas, P. (1992) 'Reforming the Self: Enterprise and the characters of Thatcherism', in P. Heelas and P. Morris eds. (1992) *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate* London: Routledge.

Hjalager, A-M. (1989) 'Why No Entrepreneurs?': Lifemodes, Everyday Life and Unemployment Strategies in an Undeveloped Region', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol 1 (1): 85-97.

Humboldt, W. [1852] (1969) *The Limits of State Action* translation by J. W. Burrow London: Cambridge University Press.

Jackson, I. (2009) 'Economic Developments in Western and Eastern Europe Since 1945' in K. Larres *A Companion to Europe Since 1945* Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Johannisson, B., Landstrom, H. and Rosenberg, J. (1998) 'University Training for Entrepreneurship – an action frame of

reference' *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 23 (4). In P.G. Greene and M.P. Rice (eds) (2007) *Entrepreneurship Education* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jolly, A. (2011) *Working With Universities: How Businesses and Universities Can Work Together Profitably* Richmond: Crimson Publishing.

Katz, J.A. (2003) 'The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education 1876-1999', *Journal of Business Venturing* Vol 18 pp 283-300. In P. G. Greene and M. P. Rice (eds) (2007) *Entrepreneurship Education* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kauffman Foundation (2008) 'Entrepreneurship in American Higher Education' A Report from the Kauffman Panel on Entrepreneurship Curriculum in Higher Education.

Kenway, J., Bullen, E. and Robb, S. (2004) 'The Knowledge Economy, the Techno-preneur and the Problematic Future of the University' *Policy Futures in Education*, 2 (2).

Kogan, M. and Bleikie, I. (2007) 'Organisation and Governance of Universities' UNESCO portal Unesco education, accessed February 21st 2014.

Kuratko, D. F. (2005) 'The Emergence of Entrepreneurship Education: Development, Trends and Challenges' *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29 (5). In P.G. Greene and M.P. Rice (eds) (2007) *Entrepreneurship Education* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Laukkanen, M. (2000) 'Exploring alternative approaches in high-level entrepreneurship education: creating micro-mechanisms for endogenous regional growth' in P. Greene and M. Rice (eds) (2007) *Entrepreneurship Education* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Locke, E.A. and Baum, J.R. (2007) 'Entrepreneurial Motivation' in J.R. Baum, M. Frese and R.A. Baron (eds) *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship* Mahweh: Erlbaum.

Logan, O. (2009) 'The Progress of Creeping Fascism' Issue 35, *Variante*.

Lynch, K. (2006) 'Neo-liberalism and Marketisation: the implications for higher education' *European Educational Research Journal*, 5 (1).

Marginson, S. (2008) 'Academic Creativity Under New Public Management: Foundations For An Investigation' *Educational Theory* 58 (3).

Markham, G.D. and Baron, R.A. (2003b) 'Person-entrepreneurship fit: Why some persons are more successful entrepreneurs than others' *Human Resource Management Review* (13), 281-302.

Matthews, D. (2013) 'Undergraduates 'should be taught entrepreneurship' *Times Higher Education Supplement* March 23rd.

Mateseleng Allais, S. (2003) 'The National Qualifications Framework in South Africa: a democratic project trapped in a neo-liberal paradigm?' *Journal of Education and Work*, 16 (3):305-324.

Mustar, P. (1997) 'Spinoff enterprises: How French academics create high-tech companies; the conditions for success and failure' *Science and Public Policy* 24 (1) 37-43.

Nader, L. (1972) 'Up the Anthropologist – Perspectives gained in studying up' in D. Hymes *Reinventing Anthropology*, New York: Pantheon.

Nahapiet, J. and Ghoshal, S. (1998) 'Social capital, intellectual capital and the organizational advantage' *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 242-266.

National Entrepreneurship STA (1997) Policy briefing, Nesta Policy and Research Unit, London www.nesta.org.uk Accessed 14th January, 2014.

National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (2008) 'Developing Entrepreneurial Graduates: Putting entrepreneurship at the centre of higher education', www.cihe.co.uk/category/knowledge/publication. Accessed 14th January, 2014.

- Ong, A. (2006) *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations of Citizenship and Sovereignty* Durham: Duke University Press.
- Petzinger, T. (1999) *The New Pioneers* New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, R. (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R. (2004) 'Education, Diversity, Social Cohesion and "Social Capital"', Meeting of OECD Education Ministers, Dublin.
- Raichaudhuri, A. (2005) 'Issues in Entrepreneurship Education' *Decision* 32 (2) 73-84.
- Ritchie, J. (1991) Chasing Shadows: enterprise culture as an educational phenomenon', *Journal of Educational Policy*, 6 (3):315-325.
- Romer, P. (1990) Endogenous Technological Change, *Journal of Political Economy* 98 (5).
- Santiago, R, Carvalho T. and Relva, R. (2008) 'Research and the Universities' Image' *European Journal of Education* 43 (4) pp 495-512.
- Savage, M. et al (2005) 'Social Capital and Social Trust in Britain', *European Sociological Review*, 21 (2), pp 109-23.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1961) *History of Economic Analysis* (ed. E. Body) London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1976) *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* London: Allen and Unwin.
- Schultz, T. W. (1963) *The Economic Value of Education* Columbia University Press: New York.
- Schultz, T.W. (1971) *Investment in human capital: the role of education and research* New York Free Press: London.
- Schultz, T.W. (1980) 'Investment in Entrepreneurial Ability', *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 82:437-448.

Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000) 'The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research' *Academy of Management Review*, 25, pp 217-226.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997) *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, S. and Kulynych, J. (2002) 'It may Social, but why is it Capital? The Social Construction of Social Capital and the Politics of Language' *Politics & Society*, 30 (1):149-86.

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

Spring, J. (2008) 'Research on Globalisation and Education', *Review of Educational Research*, 28 (2) 330-363.

Taylor, M.J. and Johnson, R. (2002) *Schools Councils: Their Role in Citizenship and Personal and Social Education* Berkshire: NFER.

Thornton, P. (1999) 'The Sociology of Entrepreneurship' *American Review of Sociology* 25: 19-46.

Vesper, K. H. 1988 Entrepreneurial academics – How can we tell when the field is getting somewhere' *Journal of Business Venturing*, 3: 1-10

Vesper, K.H. 1993 *Entrepreneurship Education* 1993 Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies.

Welch, P. (1996) 'What skills do students learn on Politics courses? An introduction to the workshop' <http://pers-www.wlv.ac.uk/~le1810/skills1x.htm>

Young, J.E. 1977 'Entrepreneurship education and learning for university students and practising entrepreneurs', in Sexon, D.L. and Smilor, R.W. (eds) *Entrepreneurship 2000* Chicago: Upstart Publishing Company.

Zhao, H., Seibert, S.E., and Lumpkin, G.T. (2010) 'The relationship of personality to entrepreneurial intentions and

performance: A meta-analytic review, *Journal of Management*, 36, pp 381-404.

Author details Philippa Hall is an independent researcher who writes on marketization, enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Correspondence details philippa197@btinternet.com