The Entrepreneurial University: A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword

Gerlinde Mautner

Gerlinde Mautner

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITY

A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword

The growing orientation of public universities towards the corporate sector has had a significant impact on higher education governance, management, and discourse. The rhetoric of the free market, manifested most tangibly in business-related lexis, is now firmly established in the discursive repertoire employed by academic leaders, politicians, and the media, as well as parts of higher education research. Within this rhetoric, enterprise and enterprising, as well as entrepreneur and entrepreneurial, stand out as keywords carrying significant ideological loads that reflect the colonisation of academia by the market. The organisational and policy-making implications of academic enterprise have received considerable attention from higher education researchers, while discourse analysts have identified general discursive features of the 'marketised' higher education landscape. What the present paper adds to the existing debate is an in-depth study of a set of keywords in which processes of adaptation and appropriation crystallise, thus showing how macro-level social phenomena are mirrored, on the micro-level of linguistic detail, in the collocational behaviour of individual lexical items. The textual data that this paper is based on, gleaned mostly from the Internet, show that entrepreneur, entrepreneurial, enterprise, and enterprising are ambiguous in denotation and rich in connotation, making them susceptible to processes of semantic appropriation to suit particular agendas. Prevailing motifs and representations are identified through a combination of the computer-supported survey of Web-based material and the qualitative analysis of sample texts.

Keywords higher education; entrepreneurialism; marketisation; corpus linguistics applied to critical discourse analysis

A university, like all other human institutions . . . is not outside, but inside the general social fabric of a given era. It is not something apart, something historic, something that yields as little as possible to forces and influences that are more or less new. It is, on the contrary − so I shall assume − an expression of the age, as well as an influence operating upon both present and future.

(Flexner, 1930, p. 3)

The aim of this paper is to chart the discursive territory around a set of keywords that have come to play a central role in higher education (HE). These keywords are *entrepreneurial, entrepreneurship*, and *entrepreneur(s)*, as well as *enterprise* and *enterprising*. The social, political, and educational context in which they have moved centre-stage is a complex mesh of trends including the reduction of government funding, the consequent necessity to raise money from external, frequently corporate, sources, deregulation, increased competition and internationalisation, and the replacement of collegial by managerial (or, as critics would have it, managerialist) governance structures. More detail on this background will be provided in the section headed 'Socio-political context'. The most significant trend for the matter at hand, however, is the changing relationship between academia and business. Once two separate social domains, the two have been moving closer together and are now melding at various points of contact. What better linguistic expression of this than a previously unthinkable adjective-noun combination: *the entrepreneurial university*.

New ties between universities and business are constantly being established, and existing ones strengthened. They are the result of intensified exchange processes between universities and their commercial environment. These exchange processes generally have both a financial dimension, following a 'money-for-expertise' formula, and an interpersonal one, as businesspeople are appointed to positions in university management or on boards of trustees, for example, or as faculty take on consultancy contracts. Exchange invariably leads to new social and discursive practices, such as 'selling', 'advertising', or 'managing'. They are imported into the academic domain, where previously the prevailing norm was characterised by non-utilitarian knowledge creation and consultative, committee-based governance, as well as by its concomitant non-commercial discourse. While it is true that at various times in the past, and in different ways, reality often diverged from this ideal – witness the traditional role of universities in educating professional cadres (Barnett, 1990) – the extent to which business is now making inroads into academe is quite unprecedented. Within universities, 'manager-academics' (Deem, 2003; Deem & Johnson, 2000; Johnson, 2002) are the key drivers of this development. According to Trowler (1998, p. 32), 'it is among senior higher education managers that the managerialist arguments are articulated in their most unalloyed form.' By way of an example, here are recent comments by the current Vice-Chancellor and Chief Executive (as his full title runs) of the University of Surrey. 'Unalloyed' indeed:

> Modern universities are businesses and, like any business, to achieve sound finances they must develop appropriate services and products for which their customers – the government, business, charities, students and the public – should be prepared to pay a fair price.
>
> (Dowling, 2004, paragraph 2)

'Entrepreneurship', both as activity and discourse, is one of those 'imported' practices. As the corpus and textual analysis will demonstrate, it is deployed by academic leaders and administrators as a carrier of key values that they want their external stakeholders to associate with the organisation, and their internal

stakeholders both to believe in and implement. There is no shortage of studies exploring the organisational and policy-making implications of educational entrepreneurialism (Etzkowitz, 1998, 2003; Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt, & Cantisano Terra, 2000; Hay, Butt, & Kirby, 2003; Henkel, 1997; Ozga, 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1994; Wasser, 1990). Likewise, key features of 'marketised' discourse have come under scrutiny from discourse analysts (most notably, and seminally, by Fairclough, 1993). The specific contribution that the present paper is making consists in showing how the social, macro-level phenomena identified by higher education research can be traced at the micro-level of lexis and phraseology, through examining the discursive profile of pivotal expressions in which social structures and processes crystallise.

The organisation of this paper is as follows. I shall begin by outlining the socio-political context in which the concept of the entrepreneurial university is embedded, drawing on and surveying a wide range of higher education literature as I go along. Next, I shall discuss the concept of keywords as well as the data and method used to build the discursive profile of the keywords in question. Having examined key usages of the term, in both prominent academic texts and a large, computerised reference corpus, the paper then moves on to extract the term's semantic prosodies from the results of a search on the World Wide Web. Following an analysis of key motifs and rhetorical devices used in connection with the 'entrepreneurial university' in three texts, the final section integrates the findings from a critical perspective.

Before proceeding, I would like to declare up-front where I stand on this contested terrain, taking, as van Dijk (1993, p. 252) advises critical discourse analysts to do, 'an explicit sociopolitical stance'. Some of the changes effected under the banner of entrepreneurship I would certainly regard as beneficial. Institutional cultures fostering innovation, for example, strike me as a more than welcome change from the hierarchical overbureaucratisation that used to be (and some would claim still is) the hallmark of so many universities. Other developments, such as research being subjected to commercial pressures, I object to because I regard them as a threat to disinterestedness, independence, and objectivity. The blurring of boundaries between universities and the for-profit sector also jeopardises the freedom of the former to criticise the latter: the hand that feeds is less likely to be bitten. I agree with Ronald Barnett's assessment that 'through the ideology of entrepreneurialism the university's particular place as a critical forum is undermined' (2003, p. 73). Like Trowler (2001, p. 197), I see 'the importance of active resistance to what is becoming an increasingly hegemonic discourse located in managerialist structural roots'. Thus, in unpacking educational enterprise discourse I am hoping to make a contribution to universities' emancipation from these discursive hegemonies.

The socio-political context

The significance of keywords derives crucially from the social, cultural, and political environment in which they are embedded. It is imperative, therefore, that this environment be described and drawn upon as an interpretative resource.

There is widespread agreement in the HE literature that in recent decades universities around the globe have been undergoing substantial changes (though

HE researchers disagree in their evaluative stance, an issue I do not have the space to explore further here). These changes have been conceptualised as occurring on three layers, the 'national-structural', 'organizational', and 'professional-subjective' (Parker & Jary, 1995, p. 320). There are repercussions on all elements of the classic triad of teaching, research, and administration, and in various strata of organisational practices. Overarching and elusive concepts like institutional culture, image, professional identities, and academic value systems are affected as much as the more hands-on aspects of governance and financial management. As Barnett puts it, 'all the conceptual and operational underpinnings of the university crumble' (Barnett, 2000, p. 1). Among the various trends and developments that make up this scenario of uncertainty and upheaval (for a succinct overview see Peters & Roberts, 2000, pp. 128–129), the 'incursion by markets' (O'Neill & Solomon, 1996, p. 82) is probably the dominant force. Several interlocking factors combine to make universities more responsive to 'the market'. First, widening access (or, as critics would have it, 'massification') without a matching increase in government funding produces budget shortfalls. Second, because of budgetary constraints, commercial funding streams are becoming more important, whether generated through spin-out companies, consulting contracts, or sponsorship deals, and this leads to 'the spread into universities of norms and institutional forms characteristic of commercial society' (O'Neill & Solomon, 1996, p. 82). Managerialism is one of these norms (Deem, 1998; Trowler, 2001). Though marketisation and managerialism are not the same thing, they tend to be mutually reinforcing phenomena and have, in fact, been referred to as 'twin strategies' (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003, p. 478).

While there is a trend in higher education towards 'the adoption of a free-market or corporate-business perspective' (Webster, 2003, p. 85), there is a parallel trend in knowledge-intensive industries towards an increased reliance on scientific expertise and 'collegial' forms of organisational control (Kleinman & Vallas, 2001, p. 453). Instead of seeing current changes in the HE/business relationship exclusively as a case of (one-sided) 'colonisation/appropriation' (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 93), they are perhaps more adequately conceptualised, as Kleinman & Vallas (2001) argue, as a process of convergence. However, this convergence is 'asymmetrical . . . because although codes and practices circulate in both directions, industry ultimately appears to have an upper hand in this process' (Kleinman & Vallas, 2001, p. 451).

Another contextual factor that must not be ignored is the part played by governments and the parliaments in which they command majorities. They initiate, support, and sustain change in the HE sector not only through creating the requisite regulatory framework and allocating budgets, but also through promulgating a pro-market educational agenda in parliamentary debates, media appearances, and official policy documents.[1] The apposite keywords appear as central nodes in the argument. Witness, for example, the statement by David Blunkett, then UK Secretary of State for Education and Employment, who said, referring to an earlier comment by Prime Minister Tony Blair, that 'in the knowledge economy, entrepreneurial universities will be as important as entrepreneurial businesses, the one fostering the other. The "do nothing" university will not survive − and it will not be the job of government to bail it out' (Blunkett, 2000, paragraph 87). Note the stark dichotomy: universities

are tagged as either 'entrepreneurial' or 'do nothing', the former good and fit to live, the latter bad and doomed to die.

There are two other facets of the socio-political environment which ought to be touched upon here. First, one needs to recognise the international scale on which academic entrepreneurship is being promoted. The World Wide Web search that provided input to the present study revealed relevant documents not only from Western Europe, North America, and Australia, but also from Eastern Europe and Asia. They included a speech entitled *Towards an Entrepreneurial University* by the President of the National University of Singapore (Shih, 2002) and accounts from Estonia (Aarna, n.d.), Brazil (Scavarda do Carmo, n.d.), China,[2] and the Philippines,[3] as well as an outline describing an EU Tempus Tacis Project designed to develop a strategic plan for the University of Nizhni Novgorod (Russia) under the heading of *Becoming an Entrepreneurial University*,[4] the latter being a prime example of the deliberate dissemination of the concept, in this case from West to East. This confirms Etzkowitz et al.'s (2000, p. 313) claim that 'it appears that the "entrepreneurial university" is a global phenomenon with an isomorphic development path, despite different starting points and modes of expression.'

Second, in addition to being diffused across regions and cultures, the cluster of phenomena comprising marketisation, managerialism, and entrepreneurialism is by no means restricted to higher eduation, but has affected diverse social domains, including art (Wu, 2002), health care (Poole, 2000), and public services generally (Flynn, 2000). This, in turn, needs to be seen in the still wider context of the 'enterprise culture' (Keat & Abercrombie, 1991), which was identified, in the British context, as a 'central motif in the political thought and practice of the Conservative government' (Keat, 1991, p. 1), but has since also been described as a constitutive element of New Labour's 'Third Way' discourse (Fairclough, 2000). In this respect, the entrepreneurial university is indeed, to use Flexner's (1930, p. 3) phrase, 'an expression of the age'.

The profiling of keywords: data and method

The idea of the discursive profile is a response to two of the hardy perennials of discourse analytic methodology: first, the time-honoured question of how to deal with the relationship between macro-level phenomena, both social and discursive, and their micro-level linguistic manifestations, and second, how to square the restrictions imposed by the essentially qualitative toolbox of critical discourse analysis with larger (and thus, one would hope, more representative) corpora. The approach adopted here is outlined in Hardt-Mautner (1995; re-published in revised form as Koller & Mautner, 2004) and applied, for example, in Mautner (2000), Piper (2000a) and Piper (2000b). It draws on Stubbs (1996), in particular Chapter 7 on 'Keywords, Collocations and Culture', and Stubbs (2001), who demonstrates 'how corpus methods can provide systematic evidence about the significance of ... such keywords in English' (2001, p. 145). In both books, Stubbs acknowledges the significance of Raymond Williams's book *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (1976/1983) as well as that of J. R. Firth's work. As early as 1935, Firth called for 'research into the detailed contextual distribution of sociologically

important words, what one might call *focal* or *pivotal* words' (Firth 1935/1957, p. 10, original italics).

Teubert's (2000) work on Eurosceptic discourse (summarised, together with studies in a similar vein, in Hunston, 2002, pp. 109–120) stands in the same tradition. Following Hermanns (1994), Teubert (2000) distinguishes between 'stigma keywords' and 'banner keywords'. Significantly, one and the same term can be a stigma word for one group, and a banner word for another, thus effectively functioning as an indicator of group membership and/or ideological affiliation. *Entrepreneurial*, when applied to universities, certainly falls into that category, polarising as it does supporters and detractors, modernisers and traditionalists.

The fundamental rationale for concentrating on keywords, in previous work and this paper, is that they can be seen as 'nodes around which ideological battles are fought' (Stubbs, 2001, p. 188). Naturally, one must not stop at directing the analytic lens narrowly at the keyword as such; it can only ever provide an entry point to a more wide-angle kind of analysis, as indeed Raymond Williams (1976/1983) acknowledges. He also insists, rightly, that 'the words' must be seen as 'elements of the problems' (Williams, 1976/1983, p. 16), and this is what justifies and in fact necessitates this focus on keywords.

Seeing 'words' as 'elements of problems' is, of course, resonant with a core principle underpinning critical discourse analysis, the view that discourse is both socially constituted and constitutive (Fairclough, 1992, p. 64). Because 'a discourse is not merely talk' but 'actually structures conduct' (Webster, 2003, p. 89), taking issue with discursive practices is one way of influencing conduct.

Data collection for this study followed several interconnected paths. The first step was a search of the World Wide Web, using webcorp (http://www.webcorp.org.uk/), a search engine which also produces concordances. The output for the search words *entrepreneurial university/ies* provided initial evidence of who the key voices are in the debate, of the genres involved, and of the dominant semantic prosodies. Semantic prosody, according to Louw (1993, p. 175), is 'the consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates,' or, as Hunston put it, the 'indication that something is good or bad' (Hunston, 2004, p. 157).[5]

The results of the webcorp search (clickable, with direct links to the original sites, as in google) were then followed up, with texts being downloaded and/or printed out and added to the corpus. In a second step, the 56-million word COBUILD WordbanksOnline corpus (http://www.cobuild.collins.co.uk/) was searched for occurrences of *entrepreneur/s* and *entrepreneurial* in order to establish what collocates the keywords attract outside the specific social domain under investigation, the assumption being that a lexeme's general semantic aura was likely to have some impact on domain-specific usage. To complete the picture, and because quite a few texts turned out to be using *enterprising* and *enterprise* alongside *entrepreneurial*, COBUILD was searched for those terms as well. The third source of data was a systematic trawl through the Web sites of the top 30 British universities, following the ranking published on the Web site of the *Education Guardian* (http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/).

Drawing up the discursive profile, then, involved: (a) cataloguing key usages; (b) examining frequent and salient collocations of the keywords in question (both in the thematically focussed, purpose-built corpus described above and in large

reference corpora), with particular attention being paid to semantic prosody; (c) mapping out the motifs that cluster around the keywords, and (d) identifying the rhetorical devices used to talk the keywords up and down, respectively. The 'motif' is understood as an analytical category capturing content (Mautner, 2000, p. 83). For example, references to a university's contribution to the local economy would constitute a motif, as would independence from state funding. Motifs do evaluative work through their presence/absence and the degree of salience they are awarded in text. Authors signal stance by choosing or foregrounding some motifs while ignoring or backgrounding others. 'Rhetorical device', on the other hand, is used as a cover term to refer to strategic choices among the linguistic forms available on various linguistic levels, from the macro-level of textual organisation to the micro-levels of syntax and lexis, where systems such as modality and transitivity are located and where the persuasive force of semantic 'loads' comes into play.

Entrepreneurial and *enterprising*: key texts and. an overview of usage

The phrase *entrepreneurial university* is generally attributed to Burton R. Clark. His 1998 book, *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, has become the hub of an intertextual network of cross-references. It is mentioned and quoted from frequently in the British, North American, and Australian higher education literatures, and also worldwide. A *google* search for it yielded well over 100 results, showing the book to feature in seminar programmes, policy documents, and on reading lists, with the trail of reception reaching far beyond Anglo-Saxon academia. Clark's picture of the entrepreneurial university is rightly said to have 'achieved iconic status among university models for the twenty-first century' (Shattock, 2003, p. 146). Hindle (2001, p. 5) calls Clark's book 'the bible of the [entrepreneurial university] movement'. Although both concept and phrase have since developed a life of their own, the key position and sustained impact of Clark's book make it an obvious starting point for the discursive profile the present paper aims to draw up.

Clark (1998) begins his account by setting out his understanding of *entrepreneurial*:

> 'Entrepreneurial' is taken in this study as a characteristic of social systems; that is, of entire universities and their internal departments, research centers, faculties, and schools. The concept carries the overtones of 'enterprise' — a willful effort in institution-building that requires much special activity and energy. Taking risks when initiating new practices whose outcome is in doubt is a major factor. An entrepreneurial university, on its own, actively seeks to innovate in how it goes about its business. It seeks to work out a substantial shift in organizational character so as to arrive at a more promising posture for the future. Entrepreneurial universities seek to become 'stand-up' universities that are significant actors on their own terms. Institutional entrepreneurship can be seen as both process and outcome.
>
> (Clark, 1998, pp. 3–4)

He then continues to explain his choice of *entrepreneurial* over *innovative*, conceding that the latter would have been 'gentler in overtone':

> Throughout much of the two years and more of the research, the two terms 'entrepreneurial' and 'innovative' were used as loosely synonymous. The concept of 'innovative university' has much appeal. Gentler in overtone, it also casts a wider net. It avoids the negative connotations that many academics attach to individual entrepreneurs as aggressive business-oriented people seeking to maximize profit. . . . I have chosen 'entrepreneurial' over 'innovative' as the organizing conception for this book because it points more powerfully to deliberate local effort, to actions that lead to change in organizational posture. Under its banner I can more appropriately group some processes by which modern universities measurably change themselves.
>
> (Clark, 1998, p. 4)

In this passage, Clark describes a deliberate process of semantic choice, the result of which, given the success of the book, was to prove momentous. In weighing up the options, he shows full awareness of the negative connotations that *entrepreneurial* would have in some quarters, but decides to go for it all the same. The main reason he gives for doing so is of a rhetorical nature – the term, he feels, 'points more powerfully' to what he wishes to get across. This is a point worth noting in the light of subsequent re-contextualisations of Clark's book. Those who support and adopt his ideas also accept his chosen terminology: the concept and the label have become inextricably linked.

A detailed and very telling semantic argument also stands at the beginning of another key book in this debate, Slaughter and Leslie's (1997) *Academic Capitalism*.[6] The subtitle, significantly, reads *Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Thus, while the *entrepreneurial university* does feature in their title and elsewhere in the book, they choose to overlay it in their main title with another keyword, *capitalism*, which has negative connotations. As a matter of fact, *capitalism* is intended specifically to counteract the persuasive power that *entrepreneurial* is perceived to have:

> We decided to employ *academic capitalism* in part because alternatives – *academic entrepreneurism* or *entrepreneurial activity* – seemed to be euphemisms for *academic capitalism* which failed to capture fully the encroachment of the profit motive into the academy.
>
> (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 9, original italics)

Their choice is of course no less rhetorical than Clark's, and the lexis they use to defend it is also highly charged with emotion: the 'encroachment of the profit motive into the academy' is decidedly negative, with *encroachment* suggesting unwanted and excessive intrusion. The perspective thus conveyed is distinctly different from the 'partnership' discourse that pro-entrepreneurial authors like to activate when describing universities' relationship with the corporate sector.

In these two seminal academic texts as well as in the other sources I shall examine later on, academic entrepreneurship emerges as a complex, multi-layered

concept. Its various meanings fall roughly into three groups: (a) engaging in for-profit activity (i.e., selling goods and services, be they patents, courses, or consulting, at competitive market prices), under the university's own name, through so-called spin-out/spin-off companies, or under contract to for-profit enterprises; (b) restructuring and managing the organisation in ways that facilitate such market-driven behaviour; and (c) aspects of organisational culture, in particular a rallying around values such as efficiency, dynamism, and innovation. Which of these elements are foregrounded in any given text, and what discursive representation they are subjected to, is a function of the ideological stance of the author. Broadly speaking, sceptics foreground (a), marketisation, whereas believers focus on (c), the somewhat elusive psychological and atmospheric aspects of organisational transformation. Later, we shall examine how these positions are articulated.

In actual discourse, the meaning elements identified above are not neatly separated but intertwined and blurred, with many authors exploiting the fuzziness of the word in question, and selecting certain meaning elements to suit particular political agendas. Semantic malleability is characteristic of keywords, and *entrepreneurial* is no exception.[7]

A discursive profile would be incomplete if we ignored the wider universe of discourse that lies beyond the particular social practice being investigated. We may be interested ultimately only in how a particular keyword functions in some type of discourse — political, media, religious, or, in our case, higher education — but this does not mean that other usages in other types of discourse are irrelevant. The chances are that these other usages have some impact on domain-specific usage, and that there is a certain degree of semantic spillover between them, creating, if not a complete transfer of denotative meaning, then at least interference among various associative meanings.

Interestingly, the general collocational profile of *entrepreneurial* as well as of *entrepreneur/s*, as it emerges from the COBUILD reference corpus, is not exclusively positive. This ought to be food for thought for all those eager to take Clark's terminology on board. Certainly, in the COBUILD corpus, *elites* and *farmers* can be seen to be referred to as *entrepreneurial*, but so can *hucksters* and *inmates in our jails*. *Entrepreneurial* is co-ordinated with *flexible, outspoken*, and *innovative*, but also with *free-wheeling, unscrupulous*, and *aggressive*. The noun, *entrepreneur(s)*, has a similarly mixed semantic prosody. Collocates hint at success stories (*entrepreneurs made small fortunes, could help revitalise the economy*, and *have their sleeves up and really make it* [the American economy] *work*), but also speak repeatedly of failure. Adjectives used to refer to *entrepreneur(s)* include, on the one hand, such positively charged items as *persistent, able, bright, great, savvy, successful, wealthy*, and *young*, but also *criminal, dubious, haphazard, opportunist*, and *slimy*. Perhaps the most interesting adjective-noun combination is the *serial entrepreneur*. There may be nothing negative about *serial* as such, but the fact that it collocates chiefly with *killer* and *monogamist* does suggest that it is meant disparagingly when applied to entrepreneurs, too.

Whether positive or negative, there is never any doubt in the general corpus that commercial success is what entrepreneurship is about. Entrepreneurs *are expecting to reap rich rewards, are leaping to make money*, or may be *down to* [their] *last million*. In view of this evidence, attempts to strip *entrepreneurial* of its commercial

connotations, illustrated by one of the texts analysed in the 'Sample analyses' section, are bound to appear rather futile.

Enterprising, by contrast, has an altogether broader semantic range. Like *entrepreneurial*, it can be both positive and negative (*this enterprising and talented little group* vs. *an enterprising slum-trained coward*) and is used to refer to a quality conducive to commercial success (*those enterprising enough to run a business*). However, unlike *entrepreneurial*, there are instances of *enterprising* that come from domains other than business, and refer to more general adventurousness and innovativeness rather than specifically commercial acumen. There are examples from rugby (*The Eagles were more enterprising behind the scrum*) and from high culture (*the London Symphony Orchestra's enterprising Bruckner-Mozart series*). Most telling of all, perhaps, is the fact that *enterprising* can be applied to animals. The concordances included an *enterprising monkey* and an *enterprising starling*. Neither, presumably, would be referred to as *entrepreneurial*.

The entrepreneurial university: dominant semantic prosodies

As explained in the 'Data and method' section, my exploration of the semantic and social territory surrounding the keywords in question began with a Web search using the webcorp search engine.[8] Serving as an entry point to the universe of discourse that orbits around the keywords, the webcorp output revealed, even before complete texts were retrieved, that over half the occurrences (63 out of 121) had a positive semantic prosody, 25 had a negative one, and the remaining 33 could not be classified either way because the 10-word collocational span in those instances happened not to include any evaluative lexis.

Let us see how the positive semantic prosody is constituted. Adjectival collocates to the left of (*a/the*) *entrepreneurial university/ies* include *strong, modern, dynamic, top, new, innovative, pre-eminent, young, nimble, responsive,* and, indeed, *corporate*. The adverbs that co-occur are *highly, distinctively,* and *truly*.[9] Where the search word functions, syntactically, as a complement, characteristic predicates are *renowned for, is proud of being, show itself off as* ('showing off' is negative, but you can only show something off that you consider an essentially positive quality), *showcases us as, establish a reputation as, we intend to remain, we characterise ourselves as, quality outputs apposite to,* and *the pivotal role of*. To the right of the search word, positively loaded lexis also abounds. The entrepreneurial university is described variously as *active and competitive; of high quality; one of the most self-sufficient in the country; with a long-standing track record of working with local businesses; market-driven in partnership with business; meeting the educational needs of learners world-wide; overflowing with talented students, world-class researchers and excellent teaching staff* (Swinburne University of Technology, n.d., paragraph 12); one *that will attract students, researchers/professors and external research funds* ("Research and Higher Education", paragraph 3); and one *in which the higher quality of its provision for students is nationally and internationally recognised alongside the excellence of its research* (University of East London, 2000, Appendix 1, paragraph 9). It is said to have *quickly become a pioneer in scientific and technological fields* and to be *a place where you can invest in an area and watch it grow*.

Most of these quotes, as one might have guessed from their up-beat promotional tone and the use of *we*, come from universities' own Web sites, from mission statements, vice-chancellors' and presidents' speeches, and so on. There can be no doubt that in those kinds of sources, 'entrepreneurial' is considered a good thing for a university to be, something to aspire to if you aren't, and to hold on to if you are. Even from these restricted textual environments, we can identify key motifs and discursive representations. We can see, among other things, that the university is cast in a 'serving' role, *meeting* and *responding to* needs, rather than actively shaping them, and that the relationship with business is conceptualised as a *partnership*. This foregrounds equality, backgrounds the commercial exchange processes involved, and obfuscates dependence. (It is characteristic of pro-entrepreneurial argumentation that independence from government funding is hailed as 'self-sufficiency', whereas in reality it is more likely to be simply a different form of dependence – one on corporate monies that tend to be more short-term and less reliable than budgets allocated by the state.) The reference to *quality outputs* shows academic activity modelled on industrial production. The language of rapid movement (*dynamic, nimble, active, quickly*) ties in with Barnett's characterisation of the entrepreneurial university as being 'restless' and 'always on the move' (Barnett, 2003, p. 66).

What the extracts given above also reveal is the co-presence of a number of other keywords, motifs, and topoi characteristic of contemporary higher education discourse, such as quality, excellence, meeting needs, internationalism, and a general societal pre-occupation with growth.

As I indicated earlier, the first output from the search engine showed up considerably fewer critical voices. They certainly exist, but their main forum is traditional, paper-based academic writing rather than the Internet (Barnett, 2003; Bok, 2003; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Notable exceptions include Banja (2000) and Robinson and Tormey (2003). It is not a coincidence, therefore, that what criticism of academic entrepreneurialism does appear on the Web is often contained in book reviews, descriptions of books on the Web sites of publishers or Internet bookshops, and abstracts posted on conference Web sites. Still, looking at the concordance lines with negative semantic prosody, one does get some idea of what the main objections are and the rhetoric with which they are expressed. To the left of the search word *entrepreneurial universitiy/ies* we find *challenge to, limitations of, alternatives to,* and *beyond*. The latter, incidentally, is not entirely negative, indicating as it does that the concept is not being rejected outright, but needs to be developed further. There is also an interesting case of *purely* being used as a modifier before *entrepreneurial university*, suggesting, like *limitations of,* that the concept is felt to be too narrow. There are instances of emotive language, such as *pernicious ideologies* (which is a section heading in Barnett, 2003, and was picked up by webcorp on a publisher's Web site), *capitalist regime,* and *entourage of administrators,*[10] which is linked to *further draining of institutional resources.* To the right of the search word, negatively charged co-texts include a reference to *the psychological contract* having been *breached, with serious consequences for staff morale* (Roberts, 2002). The entrepreneurial university is described as being *seriously at risk for institutional conflict of interest* (though in this example there is a distancing matrix clause on the left, namely *Critics have charged, however, that ...*) (Schafer, 2003), and as having been *very rapidly (and quite uncritically) taken up into South African HE policy* (Subotzky, n.d., paragraph 6).

Another source (Banja, 2000) expresses *worries as to how the entrepreneurial research university might violate the 'soul' of academe* and *that the university that insists on charting an entrepreneurial course runs the danger of turning into a business, valuing capital more than talent.* The author then poignantly asserts, *if the university becomes business, then it's no longer a university.*

The concordance output thus gives us an idea of what the argument against the entrepreneurial university rests on: anti-capitalist and anti-bureaucratic critique; concerns about conflicts of interest with traditional academic values; the 'soul' of the university and the profit motive; psychological issues (staff morale); and worries about rash uptake by policy-makers.

Sample analyses: key motifs and rhetorical devices

In this section, I shall examine three texts that show how the motifs that emerged in the analysis of the concordanced Web output are developed in longer stretches of discourse. Although from different national backgrounds (Dutch, British, and Austrian), they share key motifs as well as a self-reflective approach to academic entrepreneurialism. Essentially, echoing one of the distinguishing characteristics identified by Clark, the 'integrated entrepreneurial culture' (Clark, 1998, p. 7), the three sample texts, like many others in the corpus, represent 'going entrepreneurial' as more than just commercialisation. Rather, it is conceptualised as a pervasive institutional transformation targeting staff and students, and aiming to achieve in them not just behavioural, but also cognitive and 'emotional' changes. Texts 1 and 2 were among those picked up by the Web search engine (see 'Data and method' section), with Text 1, significantly, originating from one of the five universities that Clark showcases in his book. The third text is the most overtly self-reflecting of the three, putting into particularly sharp relief how the intricate semantics of *entrepreneurial* are unravelled by a 'manager-academic' (Deem, 2003) in line with his policy agenda.

Example 1

Text 1, from the Web site of the Dutch University of Twente, is an example of a genre familiar on university Web sites on both sides of the Atlantic — the introductory or welcoming message from the Rector/Vice-Chancellor/Dean, etc. Whether framed explicitly as a 'welcome' or, as is the case here, as a less personal introductory statement, one of the functions of such texts is to demonstrate the senior leader's endorsement of institutional values. At the start of a virtual campus tour, the University of Twente's *rector magnificus* (note how the use of the old Latin title affirms academic traditions) describes his university as follows:

1   UT Campus Tour
2   The University of Twente is a university that offers both technological and
3   social study programmes. We characterise ourselves as an *entrepreneurial*
4   *university*, adapting our research efforts *to the benefit of society in general*. The
5   *entrepreneurial attitude permeates* the university: from our students to our
6   professors. It is a *state of mind*, a *mental approach* to science and society, which

7   allows us to respond rapidly to new ideas and challenges. We believe that this
8   approach is *forged* through the nature of our study programmes, in the qualities
9   we seek in appointing new members of staff, and in our research and funding
10   policies.
11   (Prof. Dr. Frans van Vught, rector magnificus)

(van Vught, n.d., paragraph 1 italics added)

The entrepreneurial agenda is metaphorised as a process of material transform-
ation that is all-encompassing (line 5: it *permeates the university*) and requires a good
deal of strength (line 8: *is forged*). It is helpful to remind ourselves of the literal
meaning of *forging* – 'to form (as metal) by heating and hammering' (Merriam
Webster online, http://www.m-w.com) – in order to appreciate the power of
the metaphor in suggesting how much determination is required and how solid
the resulting new entity will be. The depth of the transformation is emphasised
further by psychological vocabulary: being entrepreneurial, we are told (ll. 5–6),
is an *attitude, a state of mind*, and *a mental approach* (with *mental* carrying a nice,
and presumably unintentional, double-entendre, which would no doubt delight
cynical detractors of entrepreneurialism).

The university is positioned in reactive mode, *adapting* and *responding*. It does so
rapidly, of course, adjusting its pace to that of the market economy. What the univer-
sity is shown to respond to in this text, though, is not the market or the economy, but
rather vague – and uncontroversial – *ideas and challenges*. Indeed, one of the text's
significant silences is the absence of any explicit mention of business or the
economy. Instead, it is *society* that research is adapted to (line 4) and that enters
into the definition of the entrepreneurial state of mind (line 6). As a matter of fact,
'society' will frequently confront universities in the shape of businesses – profit-
oriented, market-driven, and competitive – but this is obviously something that
this university prefers to downplay.

Example 2

My second example is an extract from a Web site of Sheffield Hallam University
which is headed *University Enterprise*. Under a second, smaller heading (*Enterprising
University*), an eight-paragraph text appears, the first three of which are reproduced
here:

1   Enterprising University...
2   Our Enterprise Centre aims to redefine the concept of enterprise in education.
3   Its mission is to *embed an enterprise culture in everything the University does*,
4   benefiting students, clients and partners in new and unusual ways. Founded in
5   2001, the Enterprise Centre is not just a building, but something much more
6   significant – it represents *a state of mind*.
7   We believe that *enterprise ought to be an integral part of education, like the*
8   *lettering through a stick of rock, and that all our students should be enterprising*
9   *students.*
10   Of course not every student will want to go on to start their own business. *In*
11   *its fullest sense enterprise means being imaginative, innovative and bold.*

12   Contributing to other people's welfare, for example in the public and charitable
13   sectors, is just as valuable a way to apply a spirit of enterprise as more obvious
14   wealth creation.
15   Our service to business and industry clients and partners is all about *applied*
16   *creativity and innovation — business solutions, not ivory towers.* Near-market
17   and high tech research, R&D partnerships and applied consultancy are all great
18   strengths and our social and economic research is no less focused and
19   professional.
                        (Sheffield Hallam University, n.d., paragraphs 1–3, italics added)

In the original, there are two visuals on the page. One, next to the larger headline, shows two coins (one of which, interestingly enough in the British context, is recognisable as a euro cent). No doubt is left in the *visual* mode that 'enterprise' is understood to be about making money. The other image, next to paragraph 2, is a photograph of an unidentified male in front of a computer screen which has some form of map or technical drawing on it.[11]

Example 2 uses keywords deriving from *enterprise* rather than *entrepreneur*, but the message is strikingly similar. Like Example 1, this passage develops the motif of culture (line 3) as well as of psychology (line 6), and it also describes the concept as pervasive (ll. 7–9). Again, the metaphor chosen is one of material transformation, albeit this time not from metal processing but from the production of rock, that quintessentially British sweet. Outlandish though it may seem (and interculturally it would not travel well), the image is a powerful one, depicting enterprise as something that is inextricable from the whole and as a result inescapable. Whichever bit of 'education' offered at that university you 'bite off', it will have *enterprise* in it.

In line 10, an interesting shift occurs. As if to refute a counterargument in an imagined dialogue, *Of course* signals the starting point of an act of clarification and a semantic line of reasoning. Should readers have interpreted *enterprising* to mean 'starting one's own business' — which, given the general usage and political history of the term (see the 'Socio-political context' section), they might be forgiven for doing — they are now told that this is not what Sheffield Hallam University has in mind at all. An act of definition, in categorical mode, follows: *In its fullest sense enterprise means being imaginative, innovative and bold*, and in that sense, the argument continues, it can be applied to a much wider range of activity, including the public and charitable sectors. These are given as examples of *contributing to other people's welfare* and are contrasted with *more obvious wealth creation* (i.e., business).

In the third paragraph, the theme of creativity and innovation is kept up (l. 16), but the argument returns to the domain of *business and industry*. Business buzzwords are piled up (*near-market, high tech, R & D, consultancy*) and are pitted against that most classic and succinct of all denigrations of traditional academe, the *ivory tower*. Following the same strategy as the Education Secretary quoted earlier, this text, too, talks the new 'enterprising' university up by talking the supposedly non-enterprising old university down. The rhetorical device used here is to apply a label (*ivory tower*) which is rich in negative connotations, activating the cliché of academics as otherwordly, unaccountable recluses who pursue interests of no concern or consequence to anyone but themselves.

Although, as a whole, the passage comes over as taking a pro-entrepreneurial stance, we can see how the text oscillates between, on the one hand, a focus on business and money-making — the *obvious wealth creation* that is represented so powerfully by the illustration of the coins at the top of the page — and a more encompassing, non-commercial, and altogether 'softer' interpretation of enterprise on the other, that is, one that includes concepts such as *people's welfare*.

It may be worth stressing at this point that Sheffield Hallam's status as a 'post-1992' university, founded originally as Sheffield City Polytechnic, is quite coincidental to its 'entrepreneurial' ambitions and inconsequential to the analysis presented here. If anything, the oldest and most prestigious universities are more actively engaged in and, because of their prestige, infinitely better placed to pursue entrepreneurial activities. Their self-promotion in this regard follows remarkably similar discursive templates, as the following extract from the University of Oxford's Web site demonstrates. Bar the reference to its 800-year history, the text could easily be slotted into the descriptions of Twente or Sheffield Hallam, and would blend in quite harmoniously:

> Oxford is one of Europe's most innovative and entrepreneurial universities. Drawing on an 800-year tradition of discovery and invention, modern Oxford leads the way in creating jobs, wealth, skills and innovation for the 21st century.
>
> (University of Oxford, n.d., paragraph 1)

Example 3

My third example is a pair of quotes from two speeches given in German by Christoph Badelt, the Rector of Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration (*Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien*).[12] Crucially, in the speech from which (b) is taken, Badelt himself quotes Burton Clark's (1998) book and confirms the equivalence of *entrepreneurial university* with German *unternehmerische Universität* (which is clearly a prerequisite for including in the present analysis sources that were German originally).[13]

(a)

1   The fact that an organisation, in our case a university, acts in an
2   *'entrepreneurial'* manner says nothing about the goals that are pursued by or
3   within it. . . . I stress this because one is easily tempted to *equate the*
4   *'entrepreneurial university' with a 'for-profit university'*, which renounces
5   genuinely educational aims and replaces them with the goal of profit
6   maximisation. *Yet equating the two is simply wrong!*

(Badelt, 2003, italics added)

(b)

1   1. The WU[14] *must become an entrepreneurial university in the best sense of*
2   *the term.*
3   2. At the same time, the WU ought to remain — and continue to evolve as — a
4   place in which teachers and learners engage cooperatively in *free academic debate*,

5 *in order to provide intellectual stimuli for business and society....*
6 *The WU as an 'entrepreneurial university'*
7 The principle of the *entrepreneurial university does not mean commercialising*
8 *the WU.* A university still has primarily a social and educational remit, and it will
9 engage in commercial activities only in relatively restricted fields of activity — such
10 as continuing education ... — and, even then, above all with a view to attaining
11 educational goals.
12 The principle of the *entrepreneurial university*, as I understand it, means
13 acknowledging that **a university is also a place in which services are produced,**
14 and in which a certain *'output'* is created in a multi-stage *production process.* This
15 output manifests itself, for example, in publications, graduates and similar
16 *'products'* and is to be generated in accordance with *the economic principle* — that
17 is, by **maximising productivity.** *Indeed, this idea is to guide the university in all its*
18 decisions. Yet, at the same time, the university is also responsible for the social
19 impact of these *'products'.*

<div align="right">(Badelt, 2004, italics added, bold face in the original)</div>

As in Example 2, the semantics of the keyword loom large, and its contested nature once more becomes apparent. It is the *best sense of the term* (b, ll. 1–2) that the Rector wishes to use as the cornerstone of his change initiative. What the passage that follows aims to accomplish is to take issue with and refute other senses that would be at odds with the agenda the author pursues. His own interpretation needs to be established as authoritative so as to function as a legitimised foundation for the entrepreneurial transformation he wishes the institution to embark on. In (b), there is an act of explicit defining, couched in categorical modality (l. 7: *does not mean*). In line 12, the speaker appears to concede that it is *his* definition of *entrepreneurial* that forms the basis of his argument; he does not claim at this point that this is *the* definition. However, his qualifying, subjectivising insertion (*as I understand it*) is followed by an assertion which, through the semantics of *acknowledge*, is in fact again categorical (l. 13: *acknowledging that a university is also a place at which services are produced*). To say that something needs to be acknowledged amounts to a categorical assertion of the existence of that which is to be acknowledged, and this at least partly cancels out the apparently self-effacing *as I understand it.* Extract (a) is even more confident, referring to the equation of entrepreneurialism with profit maximisation not simply as a position which the speaker does not hold, but as *simply wrong* (l. 6).

A substantial part of (b) is concerned with affirming values that are not associated with the commercial profit motive, such as *free academic debate* and *intellectual stimuli* (ll. 4–5). Both *educational* and *social* goals are foregrounded (l. 8, l. 11, ll. 18–19), even in the context of the one, 'restricted' area that will go commercial, namely continuing education (ll. 9–10). Furthermore, *also* in line 13 (*acknowledging that a university is* also *a place in which services are produced*), emboldened for emphasis in the manuscript (and, presumably, stressed in oral delivery), indicates that the

construction of the university as entrepreneurial is not meant to be exclusive of those other, more traditional, constructions that lines 8–11 elaborate on.

However, in spite of the affirmation that *the principle of the entrepreneurial university does not mean commercialising the WU* (ll. 7–8), that principle is then elaborated exclusively through lexis originating in the economic domain (ll. 12–19), including terms such as *output, production, productivity*, and the *economic principle*. Scare quotes are used as a distancing device, but not consistently; they are around one instance of *output* (l. 14) but not around the other (l. 15), and around *products* (l. 16) but neither around *produced* (l. 13) nor *production process* (l. 14). That the author's own academic specialisation is economics may go some way towards explaining his preference, but it is unlikely to be the whole story. After all, economists can choose when to activate their technical vocabulary (and there are many contexts in which they do not). Whatever the professional socialisation of the author, conceptualising a university in economic terms is invariably also a rhetorical choice.

To sum up, the semantic engineering that (a) and (b) engage in can be seen to accomplish two aims: first, to renounce the 'commercial' and, as the two texts imply, negative connotations of *entrepreneurial*, and second, to substitute a more technical and neutral interpretation, attempting conceptually to divorce entrepreneurial activity from entrepreneurial goals. As an activity, the author contends, it 'simply' means following the economic principle, and this is presented as not necessarily being at variance with educational and social goals.

Summary and critique

In contemporary higher education discourse, the *entrepreneurial university* stands out as an iconic representation of the coming together of business and academia, two hitherto separate but now increasingly intertwined social spheres. That the term is contested can be inferred from the textual residue of controversy over what it means, and how it is to be evaluated. Some (though not all) advocates of the entrepreneurial university reveal that they are aware of the potentially contentious nature of the term, and try to pre-empt resistance by anticipating and refuting counterarguments (along the lines of 'Oh no, it isn't about commercialisation,' or 'Oh yes, we still care about education and society'). Both sides are silent on issues that would not further their cause. Advocates usually disregard the issue of dependence on business, whereas critics tend to ignore the flaws of the traditional university, its inefficiencies, élitist power structures, and lack of accountability.

Thus, *entrepreneurial* and related keywords are focal points around which current discourses of change, both supportive and antagonistic, crystallise. The players on this terrain may not fall neatly into two clearly delineated camps, but there does appear to be a fair degree of polarisation. On the one hand, there is the institutional discourse of self-promotion, which typically supports academic entrepreneurship. On their Web sites, for example, universities flaunt entrepreneurial initiatives as particularly palpable evidence (or so they claim) of the 'real world' relevance of their teaching and research; vice-chancellors integrate *entrepreneurial* and its cognates into leadership discourse in an attempt to encourage staff to 'buy into' changes in organisational culture, and in order to promote an institutional image that is

aligned with corporate models. In the rhetoric of neo-liberal governments, too, the entrepreneurial paradigm is firmly established. Schafer (2003, paragraph 3) argues that 'large-scale "scientific entrepreneurship" has moved, almost in one fell swoop, from being an oxymoron to becoming the prevailing norm on university campuses across North America.' On the basis of both higher education literature, which was drawn upon in the 'Socio-political context' section, and primary textual evidence gathered on the Web and discussed in subsequent sections, a case can be made for affirming Schafer's claim also for the European and indeed world-wide context.

In higher education discourse, *being entrepreneurial* can mean both engaging in commercial activity and being innovative (without necessarily pursuing a profit motive). In everyday usage, as evidence from the COBUILD database shows, *entrepreneur* can have a positive as well as a decidedly negative semantic aura. Faced with this varied semantic profile, authors do rhetorical – and, ultimately, ideological – work by foregrounding whichever meaning and sets of collocations best suit their agenda. Put simply, those in favour of academic entrepreneurship emphasise innovation and the positive connotations of *entrepreneurial*, while those against highlight commercialisation and negative connotations. The symmetry is deceptive, however, because the playing field which the two camps compete on is far from level either socially or discursively. Supporters of academic entrepreneurship tend to be members of university management, holding positions which give them the power to implement entrepreneurial policy as well as promulgate the discourse that goes with it – declaring, for example, that certain connotations of entrepreneurial are the only valid ones (and others 'simply wrong'). By contrast, most sceptical and antagonistic voices tend to come from individual academics who are not in such positions of power as would enable them to translate their anti-entrepreneurial sentiments into transformative action, or promote their preferred selection of connotations. As a result, their polemics are generally as passionate as they are inconsequential, making good reading but poor action plans. By the same token, the critical stance prevalent in the HE research community appears to have no impact outside that community. Article after article and book after book critiquing the 'McUniversity' (Hayes & Wynyard, 2002) and 'academic capitalism' (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) may be published, but the entrepreneurial juggernaut, propelled by its powerful supporters, rolls on.

It seems hard to understand why universities, with hundreds of years of tradition under their belt and a formidable assemblage of intellect under their roofs, should not be able to pursue a reform agenda independently, without playing to the rules set by economically powerful external constituents, and without deliberately appropriating the language of the commercial sector. In this respect, my position is similar to that of Thrupp and Willmott (2003, p. 4), who proclaim in the introduction to their book about school management, 'We are not against management *per se* but against managerialist conceptions of it.' Like them, I believe that it is possible to develop alternatives to current market-oriented orthodoxies, while also being realistic about the context in which organisations operate (by acknowledging new 'facts of life' such as competition, for example).

As corpus evidence shows, *entrepreneurial* and its cognates come with a heavy load of commercial connotations. If those connotations are unwanted, as some sources are

at pains to point out, and increasing commercialisation is not, in fact, the declared aim, then why choose *entrepreneurial* as a central motto and rallying cry? Is it perhaps because, ultimately, this is the sort of language that powerful external constituents – corporate 'partners' and governments – understand and like to hear? Whatever the motive, the dialectic between language and the social needs to be reckoned with, and giving a term such as *entrepreneurial* a salient position in policy and leadership rhetoric will inevitably encourage the modelling of organisational practices, identities, and relationships on commercial templates.

Academic leaders and administrators may well regard some academics' visceral rejection of the entrepreneurial agenda as blinkered and ignorant of economic necessities. Behind the opponents' denigrating rhetoric, however, lie genuine concerns about the future of higher education and very real insecurities and fears about professional roles and identities. The kind of discourse that vice-chancellors, rectors, and deans believe will galvanise faculty into action may in fact alienate them, making it harder to enlist their support, and even harder to garner their active co-operation for institutional reform. It would appear that leaders who want those constituents on board should think twice about borrowing too liberally and naïvely from the linguistic repertoires of the commercial sector. Much as the zeitgeist may seem to dictate discursive alignment with business, it is a strategy that can easily backfire and jeopardise rather than win support.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1 The two most recent examples of such documents in the UK are the White Paper entitled *The Future of Higher Education* (Department for Education and Skills, 2003) and the *Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration*, commissioned by the Treasury (2003).

2 In the *People's Daily Online*, the president of the Directing Group of the OECD Program on Institutional Management is reported as saying, in a review of Chinese universities, 'that he has seen several examples of areas where they already display the characteristics of successful entrepreneurial universities' ("Chinese universities", 2000, paragraph 3).

3 The description that the Philippine Women's University gives of itself on its Web site reads like a compendium of higher education buzzwords:

   Currently serving both men and women from nursery to graduate school in its

Manila, Quezon City, Caliraya and Davao campuses, on its 80th anniversary, the Philippine Women's University System and its Affiliate Schools for Men and Women has laid the foundation for corporate entrepreneurial university [sic], market-driven in partnership with business and industry, government and non-government, fully wired, on-line, on the Net, and experimenting on computer-related, internet-assisted teaching and learning where student competencies and skills are achieved through economically gainful hands-on experiences. Its 80th anniversary them [sic] QUEST (Quality Universal Education, Science and Technology) for the 21st century speaks for itself.

("About PWU," paragraph 5)

4   The partners in this project are the London Metropolitan University, the University of Nizhni Novgorod, and the Centre for Strategic Management in European Universities (ESMU) in Brussels. See http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/services/london-office/projects/projects_home.cfm and socis.isras.ru/socisarticles/2003_04/grudzinski.doc, a corresponding text originating from the University of Nizhni Novgorod itself.

5   On semantic prosody see also Sinclair (1987, 1998), Stubbs (2001), and Partington (2004).

6   An exact chronology of how these ideas were developed is hard to establish. Although the publication of Slaughter and Leslie's book (1997) predates that of Clark's (1998), one has to bear in mind that, as Clark states in his Acknowledgements (1998, p. xi), he carried out his research between 1994 and 1996, and his preface is dated July 1997. Also, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) quote an earlier paper by Clark (1993), in which he already discusses entrepreneurship at European universities.

7   In both the literature on higher education and in universities' own promotional texts, we find *enterprising* alongside *entrepreneurial*. Marginson and Considine's (2000) study on Australian universities has *Enterprise University* in its title and uses it throughout (though not exclusively), as do two separate papers by Marginson (1999) and Considine (2001), as well as an edited volume of British provenance (Williams, 2003). In those works, both *entrepreneurial* and *enterprising* are used without any discernible difference in meaning. The same is true of Bok (2003), who appears to use the two adjectives interchangeably, as if for stylistic variation (e.g., Bok, 2003, p. 191).

Although varied evidence on usage emerged from different sources – some using only *entrepreneurial*, others only *enterprising*, some using them synonymously, others not – a case can be made for putting *entrepreneurial* at the centre of the investigation; hence the title of my paper and the choice of *entrepreneurial* as the primary search word in the computer-supported part of the analysis. The case rests on two interrelated arguments. First, *entrepreneurial* was the expression of choice in Clark (1998), the sustained intertextual impact of which has ensured continuing endorsement of his terminology. Second, and presumably at least partly because of that, *entrepreneurial university/ies* is the more common expression: google produced well over 3600 hits for it, but only 700 for *enterprising university/ies*. The archive of the *Times Higher Education Supplement* contained 24 articles in which *entrepreneurial university/ies* occurred, but only five with *enterprising university/ies*. All things considered, it was *entrepreneurial* that emerged as the lead actor in this particular scene of higher education drama, with *enterprising* playing an important, though less central, role as a member of the supporting cast.

8   Two output formats were chosen, one with 10 words on either side of the keyword, which produces neat, though truncated and thus often semantically obscure, concordance lines, suitable for a rough overview of usage. Set at its 50-word maximum, on the other hand, the collocational span accessible through webcorp amounts to a fairly extended stretch of text (about seven lines in a 10-point font) which allows a reasonably reliable assessment of the author's evaluative stance (essentially, is he/she supportive or critical of the concept in question?), the motifs in which the keyword is embedded (e.g., references to economic growth, to institutional culture, to change processes), and how they go about arguing their case (for example, by piling on positively or negatively loaded attitudinal lexis).

9   Following standard practice in corpus linguistics, I am not giving individual source references for brief citations when corpora are being explored as aggregates of textual data. Appropriate references to institutional and individual authors will be given for longer passages and in all those cases where an in-depth qualitative analysis of coherent stretches of text is carried out.

10   In *the coming of the capitalist regime brings with it a new entourage of administrators to oversee the entrepreneurial university*, from a review of Slaughter and Leslie (1997) by Michael Ryan (1998, paragraph 5).

11   Judged against the many other Web sites that I accessed during this study, this is a fairly typical visualisation of 'research'. Many forms of research are notoriously intangible, and bringing in artefacts such as computers and, in many other cases, laboratory equipment, helps create that visual appeal which reading, thinking, and writing do not have. This introduces a visual bias in favour of technology and science. In addition, photos show considerably more men than women.

12   The translation is my own, but has been authorised by the speaker.

13   The immediate context in which the speeches were held was the start of the Rector's new term of office, which is typically the time at which long-term strategic plans are set out. The wider context is characterised by far-reaching changes in the legal framework which have given Austrian universities greater independence from the state, more freedom in budgetary allocation (though not bigger budgets), and new organisational structures. The newly created supervisory boards consist exclusively of members recruited from outside the university concerned, and include, significantly, representatives of private-sector organisations.

14   WU is short for *Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien*, the German name of the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration.

References

Aarna, O. (n.d.). *A decade of reforms in higher education management: Estonian case.* Retrieved December 22, 2003, from http://www.cfh.lviv.ua/seminar2/aarna.htm

About PWU. History. Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.pwu.edu.ph/history.htm

Badelt, C. (2003). *Die unternehmerische Universität: Herausforderung oder Widerspruch in sich?* [*The entrepreneurial university: A challenge or a contradiction in terms?*] Public lecture given in Vienna City Hall on November 25, 2003. Retrieved January 10, 2004, from   http://www.wu-wien.ac.at/rektorat/mitarbeiter/mitarbeiter_inhalt/badelt_frame.htm

Badelt, C. (2004). *Inaugural speech.* Given January 21, 2004. German original retrieved January 25, 2004, from http://www.wu-wien.ac.at/rektorat/mitarbeiter/mitarbeiter_inhalt/badelt_frame.htm

Banja, J. (2000). *No conflict, no interest. Ethical considerations in technology transfer.* Retrieved December 22, 2003, from http://www.emory.edu/acad_exchange/2000/febmar/banja.html

Barnett, R. (1990). *The idea of higher education.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of supercomplexity.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Barnett, R. (2003). *Beyond all reason: Living with ideology in the university.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2003). Zealotry or nostalgic regret? Women leaders in technical and further education in Australia: Agents of change, entrepreneurial educators or corporate citizens? *Gender, Work and Organization, 10,* 478–503.

Blunkett, D. (2000), Speech on Higher Education, 15 February 2000 at Maritime Greenwich University. Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://cms1.gre.ac.uk/dfee/

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chinese universities facing management challenges: Expert (2000, April 13). *People's Daily Online.* Retrieved September 22, 2005, From http://fpeng.peopledaily.com.cn/200004/13/print20000413_38860.html

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Clark, B. R. (1993). The problem of complexity in modern higher education. In S. Rothblatt & B. Wittrock (Eds.), *The European and American university since 1880* (pp. 263–279). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Considine, M. (2001). *The enterprise university and its 'new governance' dynamics: A public interest perspective.* Retrieved November 15, 2003, from http://www.fabian.org.au/new%20papers/2001/considin.html

Deem, R. (1998). 'New managerialism' and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 8,* 47–70.

Deem, R. (2003). Gender, organizational cultures and the practices of manager-academics in UK universities. *Gender, Work and Organization, 10,* 239–259.

Deem, R., & Johnson, R. J. (2000). Managerialism and university managers: Building new academic communities or disrupting old ones? In I. McNay (Ed.), *Higher education and its communities* (pp. 65–84). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Department for Education and Skills. (2003). *The future of higher education.* London: HMSO.

Dowling, P. (2004, January 12). Free up our enterprise. *The Times Higher Education Supplement.* Retrieved January 15, 2004, from http://www.thes.co.uk

Etzkowitz, H. (1998). The norms of entrepreneurial science: Cognitive effects of the new university – industry linkages. *Research Policy, 27,* 823–833.

Etzkowitz, H. (2003). Research groups as 'quasi-firms': The invention of the entrepreneurial university. *Research Policy, 32,* 109–121.

Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C., & Cantisano Terra, B. R. (2000). The future of the university and the university of the future: Evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm. *Research Policy*, *29*, 313–330.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse and Society*, *4*, 133–168.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, new language?* London: Routledge.

Firth, J. R. (1957). The technique of semantics. In *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951* (pp. 7–33). London: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1935)

Flexner, A. (1930). *Universities: American, English, German*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Flynn, N. (2000). Managerialism and public services: Some international trends. In J. Clarke, S. Gewirtz, & E. McLaughlin (Eds.), *New managerialism, new welfare?* (pp. 154–184). London: Sage.

Hardt-Mautner, G. (1995). *Only connect: Critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics* (Technical Papers No 6). Lancaster, UK: Lancaster University, Unit for Computer Research on the English Language. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/computing/research/ucrel/papers/techpaper/vol6.pdf

Hay, D. B., Butt, F., & Kirby D. A. (2003). Academics as entrepreneurs in a UK university. In G. Williams (Ed.), *The enterprising university: Reform, excellence and equity* (pp. 132–187). Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Hayes, D., & Wynyard, R. (Eds.). (2002). *The McDonaldization of higher education*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Henkel, M. (1997). Academic values and the university as corporate enterprise. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *51*, 134–143.

Hermanns, F. (1994). *Schlüssel-, Schlag- und Fahnenwörter: Zur Begrifflichkeit und Theorie der lexikalischen "politischen Semantik"* [Keywords and buzzwords. On the terminology and theory of a lexical "political semantics"] (Arbeiten aus dem Sonderforschungsbereich 245, Sprache und Situation, Bericht Nr. 81). Heidelberg: Universität Heidelberg.

Hindle, K. G. (2001). Entrepreneurship education at university: The Plus-Zone challenge. *Small Enterprise Research*, *9*, 3–16. Retrieved January 4, 2004, from http://www.swin.edu.au/agse/publications/hindle/educ_pluszone.pdf

Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, S. (2004). Counting the uncountable: Problems of identifying evaluation in a text and in a corpus. In A. Partington, J. Morley, & L. Haarman (Eds.), *Corpora and discourse* (pp. 157–188). Bern: Peter Lang.

Johnson, R. (2002). Learning to manage the university: Tales of training and experience. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *56*, 33–51.

Keat, R. (1991). Introduction. Starship Britain or universal enterprise? In R. Keat & N. Abercrombie (Eds.), *Enterprise culture* (pp. 1–17). London: Routledge.

Keat, R., & Abercrombie, N. (Eds.). (1991). *Enterprise culture*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kleinman, D. L., & Vallas, S. P. (2001). Science, capitalism, and the rise of the 'knowledge worker': The changing structure of knowledge production in the United States. *Theory and Society*, *30*, 451–492.

Koller, V., & Mautner, G. (2004). Computer applications in critical discourse analysis. In C. Coffin, A. Hewings, & K. A. O'Halloran (Eds.), *Applying English grammar: Functional and corpus approaches* (pp. 216–228). London: Hodder Arnold.

Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration. (2003). London: HM Treasury. Retrieved January 2, 2004, from http://www.lambertreview.org.uk

Louw, B. (1993). Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? – The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 157–176). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Marginson, S. (1999). *The enterprise university comes to Australia.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Australian Association for Research in Education. Retrieved November 15, 2003, from http://www.aare.edu.au/99pap/mar99470.htm

Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mautner, G. (2000). *Der britische Europa-Diskurs: Methodenreflexion und Fallstudien zur Berichterstattung in der Tagespresse* [British discourse on Europe: Reflections on methodology and case studies from daily newspapers]. Vienna: Passagenverlag.

O'Neill, J., & Solomon, Y. (1996). Education, élitism and the market. In B. Brecher, O. Fleischman & J. Halliday (Eds.), *The university in a liberal state* (pp. 82–95). Aldershot, UK: Avebury.

Ozga, J. (1998). The entrepreneurial researcher: Re-formations of identity in the research marketplace. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 8*, 143–153.

Parker, M., & Jary, D. (1995). The McUniversity: Organization, management and academic subjectivity. *Organization, 2*, 319–338.

Partington, A. (2004). Utterly content in each other's company: Semantic prosody and semantic preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 9*, 131–156.

Peters, M., & Roberts, P. (2000). Universities, futurology and globalisation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 21*, 125–139.

Piper, A. (2000a). Lifelong learning, human capital, and the soundbite. *Text, 20*, 109–146.

Piper, A. (2000b). Some have credit cards and others have giro cheques: 'Individuals' and 'people' as lifelong learners in late modernity. *Discourse and Society, 11*, 515–542.

Poole, L. (2000). Health care: New Labour's NHS. In J. Clarke, S. Gewirtz, & E. McLaughlin (Eds.), *New managerialism, new welfare?* (pp. 102–121). London: Sage.

Research and higher education (n.d.). Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.electrum.se/artikel/84/013002/en

Roberts, P. (2002). *The virtual university and ethical problems in downsizing.* Abstract for paper at Ethicomp 2002, Lisbon, Portugal. Retrieved November 24, 2003, from http://www.ccsr.cse.dmu.ac.uk/conferences/ethicomp2002/abstracts/49.html

Robinson, A., & Tormey, S. (2003). *New Labour's neoliberal Gleichschaltung: The case of higher education.* Retrieved January 15, 2004, from http://homepage.ntlworld.com/simon.tormey/articles/new%20labour%20he%20white%20paper.pdf

Ryan, Michael (1998). [Review of the book *Academic capitalism: politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*]. *College and Research Libraries, 59*(3). Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlpubs/crljournal/backissues1998b/may98/slaughterbook.htm

Scavarda do Carmo, L. C. (n.d.). *The entrepreneurial engineer: A new paradigm for the reform of engineering education.* Retrieved December 22, 2003, from http://www.siu.edu/~coalctr/paper131.htm

Schafer, A. (2003). *My word!* Retrieved December 5, 2003, from http://www.umanitoba.ca/faculties/arts/deans_office/news/features_articles/Schafer/html

Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing successful universities.* Maidenhead, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Sheffield Hallam University (n.d.). *University Enterprise.* Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.shu.ac.uk/university/enterprise.html

Shih, C. F. (2002). Re-making NUS: Fostering a new organizational culture. Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.nus.edu.sg/president/speeches/soua2002f.htm

Sinclair, J. (1987). *Looking up.* London: Collins.

Sinclair, J. (1998). The lexical item. In E. Weigand (Ed.), *Contrastive lexical semantics* (pp. 1–24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1994). Entrepreneurial science and intellectual property in Australian universities. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Academic work: The changing labour process in higher education* (pp. 112–128). Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and corpus analysis: Computer-assisted studies of language and culture.* Oxford, UK & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and phrases. Corpus studies of lexical semantics.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Subotzky, G. (n.d.). Globalisation and higher education. Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.chet.org.za/oldsite/debates/SanLameer/subotzky.html

Swinburne University of Technology. (n.d.). *Being an entrepreneurial university. The Swinburne expo.* Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.swinke.com/2003/articles/0015swinexpo.htm

Teubert, W. (2000). A province of a federal superstate, ruled by an unelected bureaucracy: Keywords of the Eurosceptic discourse in Britain. In A. Musolff, C. Good, P. Points, & R. Wittlinger (Eds.), *Attitudes towards Europe: Language in the unification process* (pp. 45–86). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Thrupp, M., & Willmott, R. (2003). *Education management in managerialist times: Beyond the textual apologists.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Trowler, P. R. (1998). *Academics responding to change: New higher education frameworks and academic cultures.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Trowler, P. R. (2001). Captured by the discourse? The socially constitutive power of new higher education discourse in the UK. *Organization, 8,* 183–201.

University of East London (2000). *Quality audit report.* Retrieved September 22, 2005, http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/reports/institutional/eastlondon/eastlondon.asp

University of Oxford. (n.d.). *Innovation.* Retrieved September 22, 2005, from http://www.ox.ac.uk/innovation/

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society, 4,* 249–283.

van Vught, F. (n.d.). *UT campus tour*. Retrieved December 19, 2003, from http://www.ieo.edte.utwente.nl/pre-module/utcampustour.htm

Wasser, H. (1990). Changes in the European university: From traditional to entrepreneurial. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *44*, 110–122.

Webster, G. (2003, April). Corporate discourse and the academy. A polemic. *Industry and Higher Education*, 85–90.

Williams, G. (Ed.). (2003). *The enterprising university: Reform, excellence and equity*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Williams, R. (1983). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (2nd ed.). London: Fontana. (Original work published 1976)

Wu, C.-T. (2002). *Privatising culture: Corporate art intervention since the 1980s*. London: Verso Books.

Gerlinde Mautner is Professor of Business Communication at Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration). A graduate of the University of Vienna, she has also spent a year each in the linguistic departments of the universities of Birmingham (UK), Lancaster, and, most recently, Cardiff. Combining critical discourse analysis with corpus linguistic methodology, her research focuses on corporate and marketing communications, as well as on the discourse of the public and nonprofit sectors. [email: gerlinde.mautner@wu-wien.ac.at]