

Professor Marek Kwiek
Center for Public Policy Studies, Director
UNESCO Chair in Institutional Research and Higher Education Policy, Chairholder
University of Poznan, Poland
kweekm@amu.edu.pl

The Theory and Practice of Academic Entrepreneurialism: Transborder Polish-German Institutions

Forthcoming in: *Człowiek i społeczeństwo*, Vol. 35 (2013)

1. Introduction

In this paper I discuss academic entrepreneurialism in the empirical context of Polish-German transborder universities. Entrepreneurialism is viewed here, following Michael Shattock (2009a: 3), as “a drive to identify and sustain a distinctive institutional agenda which is institutionally determined, not one [which is] effectively a product of a state funding formula”. Entrepreneurial universities seem to be increasingly important points of reference for international and European-level policy discussions about the future of higher education. The major question of this paper is as follows: how do Polish-German transborder universities respond to the challenges of changing social and economic environments and to what extent they are able to determine their futures?

The Europe University Viadrina in Frankfurt am Oder and the Collegium Polonicum in Słubice (operated jointly by the Viadrina and the University of Poznan) are two innovative types of educational institutions studied in this paper, with various levels of entrepreneurialism involved in their academic and institutional operations. As Heidi Fichter-Wolf shows in more detail in one of her contribution to the present volume (“Collegium Polonicum and Europe University Viadrina – a German-Polish Bridge in Higher Education”), the foundation of the two institutions was closely linked to the bridging of the East-West gap in higher education and to the opening of postcommunist Central and Eastern European higher education to Western Europe and its new studying opportunities. The political and academic rationale behind the opening of the two institutions indeed led to gradual “window opening” of the West to Polish students. Following the 2004 Eastern enlargement of the EU, though, the window-opening was complete and Polish students went to begin or continue

their studies all over Europe, with a substantial institutional impact on the Viadrina and its original mission.

2. Guiding definitions of entrepreneurialism

The context for further analysis of transborder institutions is “academic entrepreneurialism” viewed by Michael Shattock (2009a 4), one of its major theorists, in the following way:

Entrepreneurialism in a university setting is not simply about generating resources – although it is an important element – it is also about generating activities, which may have to be funded in innovative ways either in response to anticipated and / or particular market needs or driven by the energy and imagination of individualism, which cumulatively establish a distinctive institutional profile. Entrepreneurialism is a reflection both of institutional adaptiveness to a changing environment and of the capacity of universities to produce innovation through research and new ideas.

Academic entrepreneurialism thus concerns the generation of activities that define and establish a clear institutional profile (although these actions may “need to be financed in an innovative way”, and that profile can be born in response to the “identifiable and specific market needs”, Shattock and Temple 2006: 1-2). The enterprising university, as theorized by Gareth Williams (2003), is a useful generic name describing a multitude of changes occurring in the mission, management and funding that a number of European universities have been undergoing for twenty years (Williams and Kitaev 2005: 126). Williams describes relationships between entrepreneurialism (including: academic entrepreneurialism), innovation, risk and financial dimension of functioning of the institution as follows:

Entrepreneurialism is fundamentally about innovation and risk taking in the anticipation of subsequent benefits. Neither the innovations and risks nor the expected benefits need necessarily be financial, but it is rare for them to have no economic dimension. Finance is a key indicator and an important driver of entrepreneurial activity. The main link between entrepreneurial activity in universities and the knowledge economy is Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’. Universities are institutions that advance their reputations and their wealth by creating and disseminating

knowledge. If the innovations that they make and the risks that they take accelerate useful knowledge creation and its transfer into social and economic practice, their entrepreneurialism contributes to a knowledge-based society (Williams 2009: 9; “risk-taking” became a crucial element of academic entrepreneurialism for the first time in Williams 2003).

When can academic entrepreneurialism emerge in educational institutions, what favors its emergence, formation, stabilization, and institutionalization, and what, in turn, makes it institutionally hardly conceivable? Empirical research on European universities (Shattock 2009b, Williams 2009, Kwiek 2008, Kwiek 2009b) indicates that, in general, where funding is provided at an adequate level, academic entrepreneurialism occurs rarely: two parallel factors are conducive to it: financial shortfalls and financial opportunities that institutions and individuals can benefit from on a competitive basis; slight underfunding of universities but not large underfunding from basic public sources.

Academic entrepreneurialism involves risk-taking (Shattock 2003, Williams 2003, Williams 2009). In most case studies from the European research literature available, institutions have to deal with a high level of risks on a daily basis; in private institutions, *the* major risk studied is a financial one, related to student number figures (and student fees). But as Shattock explains, in universities “risks may be academic or reputational as well as financial” (Shattock 2005: 19). The risk is closely linked to uncertainty, experienced by all European educational systems in the last decade (and often two decades), and linked to wider social and philosophical uncertainties (Kwiek 1996, Kwiek 1998): for example, the transition from a relatively secure public sector institution to an increasingly autonomous institution of a foundation type, with greater financial autonomy, also means new financial risks and financial responsibilities, and indicates the structural growth of uncertainty. Transformations in the ways universities are viewed (from “institutions” to “organizations”) referred to in the organizational studies as “turning the university into an organizational actor” (Krücken and Meier 2006) or “turning public services into organizations” (Brunsson 2009, Brunsson and Sahlin-Andersson 2000, Brunsson 2006) also substantially increase the level of structural uncertainty among the academic profession (Kwiek 2001, Kwiek 2013a). At the same time, as Williams and Kitaev argue (2005: 126), “uncertainty creates the climate that promotes entrepreneurship and uncertainty and the risk that accompanies it have increased nearly everywhere in the past decade”. One of common denominators of higher education in Europe is its staying in limbo – there are no education systems in Europe in which in the last five to

ten years a major change would not have taken place (in the governance, funding, quality assurance systems etc.). These major changes are referred to as “reforms” but they do not have to be pushed by governments, and Poland is a good example of privatization-related changes not being a part of reform packages in the 1990-2012 period (Kwiek 2009a, Kwiek 2010b, and Kwiek 2013b).

While apparently the most enterprising parts of the traditional academia are in the science and technology fields, in the transborder institutions studied, the range of scientific fields is limited: these institutions are comprising the faculty of Law, the Faculty of Cultural Sciences and the Faculty of Business Administration at the Viadrina; the Collegium Polonicum offers German and Polish Law, Political Science (distance learning), Environmental Protection, Management of Urban Development, German Philology, Polish Philology for International Students and Intercultural Communication Studies. While the most important dimension of academic entrepreneurialism in Western European universities is innovative research (e.g. the type of research leading to the creation of new technologies, patents, spin-offs and spin-outs – most often through an additional, external funding), in both institutions it is usually quite innovative training programs. The research dimension of academic entrepreneurialism in the two institutions is marginal (and therefore marginal is its financial dimension, traditionally studied in academic entrepreneurialism analyses). Shattock (2009a) does not limit academic entrepreneurialism to research activities, although he links it to innovation, as well as to financial and reputational academic risks. He presents a long catalogue of entrepreneurial activities:

We should not see entrepreneurialism simply or even necessarily in relation to research, or in the exploitation of research findings. ... [E]ntrepreneurialism involving innovation and academic and financial risk can be found in regional outreach programmes, in economic regeneration activities, and in distance learning ventures, as well as in investment in spin out companies, the investment of overseas campuses and the creation of holding companies to house different sets of income-generating activities. For many universities, entrepreneurialism can be found in various innovative forms of teaching either to new clientele at home or embodied in programmes for internationalization (themselves often involving both financial and reputational academic risks) (Shattock 2009a: 4-5).

I will base my analysis of entrepreneurialism of the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum on Burton Clark's classic formulations. Clark analyzed five (entrepreneurial, innovative, enterprising) European universities in action, transforming themselves over the period of 10 to 15 years, within a common conceptual structure (see a wider context in my two monographs: Kwiek 2010a and Kwiek 2013a).

3. Burton Clark's analytical framework

In brief, according to his *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities* (1998) and *Sustaining Change in Universities* (2004), the entrepreneurial universities studied – universities systematically seeking to transform themselves – show five elements which differ them from others and which form an “irreducible minimum”: a strengthened steering core, an expanded developmental periphery, a diversified funding base, the stimulated academic heartland, and an integrated entrepreneurial culture (Clark 1998: 5).¹ Clark's criteria are organizational characteristics rather than definitions. The five elements, or generalized pathways of university transformations, according to Clark

rise up from the realities of particular institutions to highlight features shared across a set of universities, but at the same time they still allow for local variation. ... Four elements are highly structural: we observe them in tangible offices, budgets, outreach centers, and departments. Only the more ephemeral element of institutional idea, floating in the intangible realm of intention, belief, and culture, is hard to pin down. Emphasizing manifest structures helps greatly in explaining the development of organized social systems. ... Significant change in universities has definite organizational footing (Clark 1998: 128).

¹ Clark's earlier theoretical approaches based on his huge European empirical material, his “work in progress”, referred rather to “innovative universities” and its four essential elements: “an innovative self-defining idea”, “an integrated administrative core”, “a discretionary funding base”, and “an innovative developmental periphery” (1996: 52-61). They are “an ambitious idea, or self-concept; a change-oriented and integrated administrative core; a funding base that enables new orientations and programmes; and a developmental periphery. The elements are interconnected and interactive. The self-concept provides a justification for the other three elements and urges them onward. The three structural components are key means for implementing the institutional idea, and, as an expression of it, become virtually a part of it” (Clark 1996: 60). It is fascinating to see Clark conceptual hesitations, and choices made, in the 1996-2004 period, at least until the publication of the sequel book, *Sustaining Change in Universities. Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts* (Clark 2004).

The structure of subsequent sections of this paper is therefore based on Clark's analytical framework proposal, beginning with the diversified funding base of entrepreneurial universities. There are three streams of income: first, mainline support from government, second, funds from governmental research councils; and third, all other sources lumped together by Clark as "third-stream income" (Clark 2004: 77).

Transformations in funding in public universities in the last twenty years have been towards the second and the third streams of income. In the specific case of European private institutions (as the Viadrina, in a simple public/private distinction), it is crucial to underscore the role of the third stream (all other, largely non-governmental, sources of income), as most of them in Europe (in OECD's typology: "independent private") are either legally, or practically, or both, cut-off from major forms of governmental funding. Private institutions in Europe find it hard to be entrepreneurial, and to have entrepreneurially-minded academics in their ranks – because their faculty and academic units tend not to compete (globally and nationally) for outside research funding. And the role of competition with others – institutions and individual academics alike – is fundamental to the entrepreneurial character of an academic institution. We mean here both internal competition (for research and other development funds) and external competition for external funds (see Kwiek 2013a).

Possible new income sources for entrepreneurial universities in Europe include support from other public agencies, support from large business firms, engagement with small- and medium-sized firms, philanthropic foundations, professional associations, university endowment income, university fund-raising from alumni and willing supporters, student tuition and fees for foreign students, fees from graduate students, continuing education students, etc. In various EU countries, these sources are different, but structurally they are not much different from U.S. sources (the most important exception is the crucial share of private foundations and philanthropy in the financing of higher education and research in the United States, which are absent in Europe, and very low or no fees charged to students in the majority of European systems, with a major exception of the UK and Central European systems where part-time or second-track students tend to pay fees).

Other sources of new income for Clark's entrepreneurial universities included earned income from campus operations, academically-driven research activities plus spin-offs and spin-outs (Wright 2007, Wright, Clarysse, Mustar, and Lockett 2007, Zomer, Jongbloed, and Enders 2010), and self-financing activities and royalty income from patented and licensed inventions and intellectual property. Incentives for staff and academic units to be

entrepreneurial rather than to be traditionalist are crucial – and this is confirmed by numerous examples from European case studies. Incentives do not have to be financial only; they can be reputational (individual distinction), academic career-related and time-related (e.g. smaller teaching loads for those successful in research; just like motivations for technology transfer activities can be “puzzle”, “ribbon” or “gold”, or a combination of them, as Alice Lam 2011 shows).

Thus, in general, one of major dimensions of an entrepreneurial university – that is, having a diversified funding base – does not seem to work in the case of transborder institutions studied, especially in the case of the Collegium Polonicum. Their abilities (and opportunities) to use the “third source” of income, especially (perhaps most welcome) “research-generated” income, are limited, as confirmed by the statistical data available.

4. The strengthened steering core at the Viadrina

The role of the “strengthened steering core” in entrepreneurialism of the Viadrina is very important. Clark’s “notoriously weak capacity to steer themselves”, exhibited by traditional European universities (Clark 1998: 5, see also Aghion et al. 2008, and Mazza, Quattrone and Riccaboni 2008) is not observable there. There does not seem to be the need for balancing influences across multiple institutional levels nor the need to keep a constant balance between particular departments through the intervention of the university center. The role of faculty participation in university’s central councils is reduced. As Clark observed about ambitious universities concerned about their “marginality”, and even “survivability”, they “cannot depend on old habits of weak steering”. They need to become “quicker, more flexible, and especially more focused in reactions to expanding and changing demands”. A strengthened steering core is a necessity – and it is prevalent in the private sector. It is also becoming widespread in various parts of public higher education across Europe (as a consequence of the spread of the New Public Management ideas and public sector reforms, see conceptualization by Jan-Erik Lane, Lane 1990 and Lane 2000).

The change of the legal status by the Viadrina from a state university to a foundation university (public university based on a foundation law) is of key importance. The shift has had significant legal and financial aspects, related closely to the wider “public/private dynamics” theme in higher education. From a long-term policy perspective, what it means to be neither public nor private, and to become a foundation-run institution has both legal and

financial implications not only for the institution as a whole (an array of possible public and private sponsors may appear), but also for academics employed in it. Academics at the Viadrina are no longer state employees, even though the Brandenburg state is still paying their salaries – they are employed by the foundation. It is unclear today how it affects their job security (and how it changes their academic workplace). But as the President of the Viadrina explains,

there is a very decisive difference. You know, we are now free to formulate our own strategic goals for a given period of time, normally five and ten years. And once we had one year, when I came in, we had a discussion for one year to define a strategy, which is not completely new of course, but based on our funding, tax and so on. But we have to take into account, that the environment for the university changes in the next few years, starting with a different demographic developments. And so once you have a strategy you look at the hiring and firing of people and in the next two years, we will lose about half of our professors because of retirement. And so whenever we hire a new professor, we check against our strategy whether the professorship still matches the requirements of the strategy. And, I think most of the cases we have slightly to change the denomination of the chair, so that it fits in our strategy. That we can do all by ourselves, you know, we don't have to ask anybody. And in a way of course, it also facilitates, let us say, getting donations for professorships for example. That is, there I don't need the agreement of the government but just the taking note of agreement by the senate and by the council or by the board of trustees. (Interview 1: 4).

Based on reports from other German foundation universities (as argued by Guy Neave in a Neaman Institute book on privatization, Neave 2008), it is possible that the foundation status may change a lot in both funding levels (although it takes time to find corporate sponsors in relatively poorer areas of Eastern Brandenburgia, with only few big companies located in Frankfurt am Oder) and, especially, it may change a lot in university governance. The policy rationale for the change of the legal status of the Viadrina was to become different from other Brandenburg universities and to have more flexible governance and management modes. The rationale was thus both financial and governance-related. Certainly, the Viadrina became a university with a flat governance structure, with a limited role (as in other German universities but to a higher degree) of traditional academic collegial bodies. While in terms of

funding, the Viadrina does not differ from German (and Polish) public universities (the majority of funding is public), in terms of governance, the differences are significant; its governance modes remind much more those known from the private sector (both for-profit and non-profit), with centralized top-down governance modes and a powerful role of its president. The Viadrina is an example of a much wider processes of the changing public/private dynamics in higher education in which, in some aspects, higher education institutions begin to resemble private sector (educational and non-educational) institutions, although it was never a fully “public” institution, from the very beginning being a somehow mixed type due to its specific character and political rationale at the times of its foundation. The Viadrina became a foundation university in 2008. As the current president of the university describes the rationale behind this legal shift,

it was first of all to get more independence as far as the decision-making process within this university is concerned and also with its relation to the outside world. The second point was that we get more financial independence by having a foundation act, ratified by the Brandenburg Parliament in Potsdam guaranteeing us a certain basic financing and the rest we can do all by ourselves and also in much greater independence. And the third point is, that our, let us say, legal supervision moves from the government to the foundation council ... the government has a lot of clients, actually three universities and six institutions of higher education and we, when we were still a state university, we were just one of these nine clients. Now, of course, our supervisory institution is the [foundation] council (Interview 1: 1).

The power of the university and of its president is much higher than that of other Brandenburg state universities: “we can decide most of the things by ourselves and I decide that within the Präsidium” (Interview 1: 1). From the perspective of this particular aspect of academic entrepreneurialism, the change in the legal status of the Viadrina has certainly led to strengthened power of its management (comparable to the power held in private higher education institutions), despite the continuous existence and important role of the university Senate.

There does not seem to be the need for balancing influences across multiple levels of governance of the Viadrina and there does not seem to be the need to keep a constant balance between particular faculties through the intervention of the university center. The role of faculty participation in central councils seems reduced. In terms of management structures,

the Viadrina has a powerful center: a strong management group comprising its president and a small group of deans and administrators. In decision-making, the role of collegial bodies in general seems reduced. The role of the Senate is officially described by the university in the following way:

The Senate is a key decision-making body at the Viadrina and is comprised of professors, students, faculty and staff. The Senate meets monthly during each semester; additional meetings are held as required. The Senate makes decisions pertaining to instruction and research, the establishment of new and the discontinuation of current academic programs/fields of study; obtains and provides opinions about academic conduct and examination regulations, university bylaws and regulations; receives nominations for members of governing bodies and comments on the conception of the university budget. Except for agenda items addressing personnel matters, meetings are open to the entire university body.

5. The extended developmental periphery at the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum

The third element of entrepreneurial universities in Clark's formulation is their extended developmental periphery, that is units that "more readily than traditional academic departments reach across university boundaries to link up with outside organizations and groups" (Clark 1998: 6). The presence of this element seems quite limited in scope and importance at most traditional universities. In the private sector studied so far (Kwiek 2009b, Kwiek 2010b), academic peripheries also play a very limited role: most case studies do not mention their existence at all.

In entrepreneurial universities generally, there emerges an increasing number of operating units that are not traditional, discipline-centered departments. These units particularly take the form of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research centers focused on a wide range of societal problems. The extended periphery can also be units of teaching outreach, under such labels as continuing education, lifelong education, distance education, and professional development (peripheries consist of a combination of academics and administrators, contributing further to what Gordon and Whitchurch 2010 termed an increasingly "diversifying workforce" in academia). These research and teaching instruments

cross old university boundaries to bring in new students and new kinds of research. Clark (2004) suggests that such base units have natural allies in the steering core – among agents of change located in the center. These new entrepreneurial units may fundamentally change the character of the university, adding new dimensions to traditional (departments – faculties – the center) or newer, flatter structures (departments and the center). They require different management styles as they are often non-permanent, contract-funded units, staffed by non-tenured contracted academics. These styles are more flexible and relationships between the center and peripheral units become much less formal and less bureaucratic – one of the reasons is that these units at the peripheries are often where external research funds are being invested.

The crucial role of these new research centers is overwhelming – and commonly reported in research literature.² Research centers increasingly attract more outside funding in the form of competitive grants and research contracts. Their existence confirms a dual structure of most entrepreneurial institutions: traditional academic departments (and traditional disciplines of teaching and research) and transdisciplinary and non-traditional research centers (and transdisciplinary research; sometimes teaching – but then mostly postgraduate programs and short courses). These academic peripheries can come under the structure of departments, or be accountable directly to the center (as is the case in Poland where most new research centers are accountable academically and financially directly to vice-rectors for research).

² Not surprisingly, a considerable proportion of centers for higher education research in Europe could be classified as academic peripheries: often located between faculties of social sciences, education, and economics; financially unstable and funded through competitive (often European-level) research grants, with non-tenured, contracted staff funded via research projects and working on their PhD dissertations; often with disciplinary problems in terms of academic promotion etc. As Patricia Gumpert gloomily notes in an American context (2012: 18-19), “for all its promise, the study of organizations faces the same challenges as our larger field for the precarious position of higher education research and researchers in today’s academy. Stated simply and starkly, neither the scholarly nor practical legitimacy of higher education research is assured. ... the limited reach of our field beyond our own community remind us that we need to reconsider our intended goals and audiences – not only in writing up our research but also in terms of the questions we consider worthy of study and how we frame them”. Gone are the times when “we had permission to explore ideas that were illuminating. Instead of having to take problems from practice, we were encouraged to identify problems that were just plain interesting” (Gumpert 2012: 23). See in particular in this context such foundational books about the academic and disciplinary status of higher education research as Sadlak and Altbach 1997, Schwarz and Teichler 2000, Teichler and Sadlak 2000, and Begg 2003, all related to the issues of higher education research and practice, the relationship of research to policy and practice, the institutional basis of higher education research, and its social legitimacy.

The new peripheries take two basic forms: a) new administrative offices, and b) new academic units. The appearance of new specialized administrative offices is closely related to new tasks being undertaken and unknown to the institution in its traditional structures and funding opportunities. New peripheries are focused on Clark's third stream of funding – that is, in fact, on any non-basic sources – state and non-state (regardless of the level of their separation – governmental, ministerial or regional and local). And they are also focused on the second stream of funding, that is, on competitively acquired funding, mostly through state grants for research.³ New offices (and posts) include: grants and contracts offices; research and innovation offices, various offices related to new academic programs, such as “entrepreneurship support programs”. Other new units mentioned by Clark (2004: 86) include the office of industrial relations, the alumni offices, the retail services office, the conference and special events office, the continuing education office, and the capital projects office. They all make sense at entrepreneurial universities where they are closely related to the third stream of university funding. Clark calls their staff “new bureaucrats of change” – who increasingly replace old traditional civil servants in transforming public universities (“just as there are seemingly no limits to the possibilities of extra sources of income, there is virtually no limit on the addition of bureaucratic units and hence on the constant need to reorder and concentrate them”, as he argues). New funding opportunities contribute to the emergence of new peripheral supporting units. The academic structure as reported by case studies on entrepreneurial universities is changing substantially owing to these new peripheries, both academic and administrative. New boundary-spanning academic units (research centers and institutes) link themselves much more easily to the outside world (and outside funding) – as often opposed to the traditional, disciplinary-centered departments. The relationships between academic peripheries and their environments tend to be easier for a combination of administrative, financial, and (institutional) culture-related reasons.

The Collegium Polonicum provides a good example: the newly opened Polish-

³ In systems increasingly based on competition, there is an increasing concentration of resources in ever fewer number of top research institutions. The race for external funding includes only research universities which are often choosing in their institutional strategies specific fields of science in which they excel. In those selected fields, they can count on achieving excellence (for any university, choosing certain strategic areas always means *not* choosing other areas; on a national plane, see *Initiative for Excellence* in Germany, *Centre of Excellence Programme* in Japan, *21st Century Competitiveness Act* in the USA or recent KNOWs (National Leading Research Centers) initiative in Poland, started in 2012. The prize for winning the competitive race is significant in terms of both funding and academic prestige.

German Research Institute (January 2013, Deutsch-Polnisches Forschungsinstitute am Collegium Polonicum in Slubice). It has a chance to become such an important element of academic entrepreneurialism. As its core statement on its website stresses (based on the AMU/ Viadrina founding documents),

the Institute is an interdisciplinary unit involved exclusively in research activities (thus with teaching activities excluded). It will be carrying out research projects and programs, especially in the fields of the European integration, transborder areas and comparative issues from an international and intercultural perspective. To achieve these objectives, the Institute will be trying to become partners in national and international research programs, in particular European Union research programs.

From the managerial point of view, the Institute reminds clearly Clarks' developmental peripheries: academics in the Institute will be grouped into research teams, based on competitive external funding available; academics in the Institute may come from AMU, the Viadrina and other institutions; all working contracts are possible, from employment contracts with social security benefits to short-term contracts without social benefits. The Institute expects academics whose project proposals have a chance to be externally funded and which include both Polish and German academics in prospective research teams. Younger academics are preferred, and both doctoral and postdoctoral (Habilitation) fellowships are expected, to be paid from external funds.

The Institute only begins to operate in 2013 and the legal framework of its operations was defined in the AMU Rector's and the Viadrina University President's joint Regulation (of October 19, 2102) about the foundation of the institution. An important point of the regulation is paragraph 2 which states that "no organizational units are being created to form the Institute's internal organizational structure" which means that its management structure is flat and differs from standard internal structures of departments at AMU. The Institute will thus consist of its Board, its Director and academics working on externally-funded research projects and it will be reporting directly to the AMU Rector and the Viadrina President. Both parent universities will be supporting financially the Institute but its idea is to bring more research funding (especially international) to the Collegium Polonicum.

The current AMU rector strongly believes in the research-driven changes at the Collegium Polonicum and research-driven regional mission of it. Interdisciplinary research conducted at the Collegium Polonicum, and in the Institute in particular, should be funded

not only through European research projects but also should lead to regional analyses useful for the purposes of both Brandenburg and the Lubuskie region (Interview 3: 2). His vision of the future of the Collegium Polonicum is based on research and research-driven funding:

For me, the most important issue is financial independence. Proper financial means need to be invested in the beginning so that the Slubice Institute become strong. The point is that this research unit not only has to survive but it also has to radiate to this part of the region, which is linked to a joint initial financial investment. To make sure that grant applications are successful later on, a certain financial input needs to be assured. Whenever we open a new research unit, we have to entrust it and assist it in the beginning of its research activities (Interview 3: 4).⁴

The Institute at the Collegium Polonicum follows an interdisciplinary tradition present at the Viadrina (and certainly at AMU, with more than a dozen of interdisciplinary research centers in 2013). The institutional future of the Collegium Polonicum from the perspective of the recent (2011) amendment of the law on higher education and ongoing preparations of the new law is through the legal concept of a basic organizational unit of the university: the Collegium Polonicum will be well funded if it has the rights of a university faculty (usually composed of a group of several departments). The current organizational status of an AMU “satellite campus” does not seem to work organizationally anymore. Hence the idea of developing a research institute which would be bringing external funding and employing senior academics, leading to the academic potential of a basic organizational unit in the near future (this is the way the Collegium Europaeum Gnesnense in Gniezno took in the last few years, Interview 4: 3) but a way to become such a unit is very long and requires substantial infrastructural and human resources investments.

Also at the Viadrina there are cross-faculty research institutes: the Heinrich von Kleist Institute for Literature and Politics, the Frankfurt Institute for Transformation Studies, the Interdisciplinary Center of Ethics, the Institute for Transcultural Health Sciences, the Institute for Conflict Management and the new Frankfurt Institute for European Union Law (founded in 2010). They “connect different disciplinary approaches and create an innovative research environment”, as the Viadrina advertizes them.

⁴ Interviews with the current and past AMU management were conducted by Dr. Cezary Kościelniak, for which I am very grateful. Interviews at the Viadrina were conducted by the present author.

6. Spread of entrepreneurialism across institutions

The fourth element of Clark's entrepreneurial universities recognizes that strong universities are built on strong academic departments. The acceptance of change by departments is critical in the change process. As Clark (1998: 7) argues, "for change to take hold, one department and faculty after another needs itself to become an entrepreneurial unit, reaching more strongly to the outside with new programs and relationships and promoting third-stream income". Entrepreneurial universities become based on entrepreneurial departments.

Research centers and institutes proliferate and may change the balance of power at an institution – they have most often more opportunities for outside funding, and are directly related to the university management center (also owing to their successes in attracting funding; this proximity to the center is often informal). But apart from academic peripheries, traditional departments do count, and this is where most teaching and research is reported to be taking place and this is where the vast majority of public funding is going.

Both Clark's case studies (Clark 1998 and Clark 2004) and other European case studies of entrepreneurial universities (Shattock 2009b) show that there is uneven spread of entrepreneurialism within an institution, with various rates of change, most often depending on external opportunities. While in Western Europe and the USA, apparently the most enterprising parts of traditional academia ("academic heartland") are in the science and technology areas, in most European transition countries, Poland included, the most entrepreneurially minded units, departments and institutions, as well as academics, are those in "soft" areas. These are areas in which the largest part of private sector institutions operate, and in which public sector runs its most enterprising study programs for fee-paying part-time students (see Kwiek 2013b). In transition economies, "soft" disciplines, including especially economics and business and social sciences, tended to be more easily externally fundable ("hard" disciplines having a much more secure funding base from recurrent core public funding), and consequently tended to be more powerful agents of entrepreneurial changes in academic institutions (with one reservation, though: academic entrepreneurialism in "soft" disciplines is fundamentally teaching-related, while academic entrepreneurialism in "entrepreneurial islands" in "hard" disciplines is clearly research-related, and therefore closer to the traditional sense of the term as derived from Clark).

In the case of the transborder institutions studied, the number of both academic

disciplines represented and teaching courses offered is limited due to the very nature of these institutions: by their design and from the very beginning, they are involved in teaching (and research) in “soft disciplines” which do not require large-scale infrastructural investments. These are also disciplines most popular in the Polish private sector and in fee-based part-time studies in the public sector.

7. Entrepreneurial culture and innovative ideas at the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum

The last element of the entrepreneurial university within Clark’s analytical framework is the “entrepreneurial culture”. “Enterprising universities ... develop a work culture that embraces change”, as Clark argues (1998: 7). Organizational culture, seen as the realm of ideas, beliefs, and asserted values, is the symbolic side of the material components featured in the first four elements. It may start as a (relatively simple) institutional idea which is later elaborated into a set of beliefs, and finally becomes the culture of the institution (the role of norms, values and beliefs in transformations of universities has been stressed throughout the last three decades by normative institutionalism in organizational theory, especially as developed by James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, see Brunsson and Olsen 1998, March and Olsen 1989, March and Olsen 1995, Cohen and March 1986, Egberg and Lægveid 1999, March and Olsen 2006a, March and Olsen 2006b, Olsen 2007 – for whom institutions, including universities, are collections of rules and practices. The application of normative institutionalism to higher education research is a promising approach, see Maassen and Olsen 2007 on the four major “stylized visions” of the European university and Kwiek 2012 on the deinstitutionalization and the reinstitutionalization of the research mission in Polish universities).

It is hard to develop research-based entrepreneurialism in non-research intensive universities, for many reasons, including those related to academic infrastructure and those related directly to prevailing academic cultures. This is the case of both the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum. As Shattock (2009a: 41) notes,

in research-intensive universities, research is driven by organizational culture and by internal competition and is facilitated by external reputation. Research-intensive universities have a research infrastructure that speeds up research outcomes and

attracts large numbers of doctoral students and research manpower that can be deployed to create research teams. ... These advantages are not so likely to be available at non-research-intensive universities, thereby making it more difficult for individual academics to get research off the ground and to sustain it. Another inhibition may be the constraints, financial and otherwise, imposed in non-research-active academic departments on individuals who want to be “intrapreneurs” but who need support outside the usual conventions or regulations to progress their projects. Such individuals may want to engage in a mix of activities – research, consultancy, and short courses – which do not fit into standard financial arrangements and which appear to conflict with bureaucratic procedures.

The entrepreneurial culture is a crucial component for entrepreneurial transformations, the first four elements being merely the means. Also in research on entrepreneurship in a broad sense – not only in the sense of “academic entrepreneurialism” – the role of “enterprise culture” or “positive entrepreneurial climate” is crucial, alongside two other important factors – favorable regulatory conditions and well-designed government programs:

Entrepreneurship is the result of three dimensions working together: conducive framework conditions, well-designed government programmes and supportive cultural attitudes. ... Supportive cultural attitudes also complement framework conditions. For instance, other things being equal, an environment in which entrepreneurship is esteemed, and in which stigma does not attach to business failure resulting from reasonable risk-taking, will almost certainly be conducive to entrepreneurship (OECD 1998: 12-13).

High levels of entrepreneurial activity are often ascribed to “cultural attributes”: a near unanimous view held by analysts of entrepreneurship is that “culture plays a critical role in determining the level of entrepreneurship. It is also a common view among practitioners and analysts dealing with entrepreneurship that cultural factors are important” (OECD 1998: 50). What happens when institutional culture is not favorable to academic entrepreneurialism, or legal frameworks are too restrictive, or university traditions do not encourage entrepreneurialism? Mora, Detmer and Vieira (2010: 98-99) highlight two responses on the part of universities which they term entrepreneurialism “through satellites” and entrepreneurialism “through individuals”. The former refers to universities which do not

change their core but create satellites around it; the latter refers to entrepreneurialism at the level of academics and small research units they create.

In the case studies analyzed earlier in the EUERЕК research project (see Shattock 2009a, Kwiek 2010a, Kwiek 2013a), there were several founding ideas (or “innovative self-defining ideas”, Clark 1996: 53-54) which subsequently led to the development of institution-wide entrepreneurial cultures.⁵ Examples include “the earned income” idea as conceived at the University of Warwick after the Thatcher financial cuts in the 1980s (conceptualized in particular by Michael Shattock, its registrar at that time). Another example are the ideas of “the valorization of research results” which originated at first in an unclear form in the 1990s at Twente University in Enschede in the Netherlands, when its rector was Frans van Vught. Such a founding idea was also the idea of the institutional commitment to “innovation” going back to the 1980s at the Chalmers University of Technology in Sweden (and its decision to opt-out of the Swedish state system in 1994). Other examples are the idea of following “Northern issues” at Lapland University in Finland, at a typical regional university located in the far north of the country and the idea of rejecting state funds (and state bureaucracy) at the foundation of Buckingham University in the 1970s in England.

Not surprisingly, both the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum are clear examples of such innovative, founding ideas: the rationale behind creating the Viadrina was to develop an internationally-focused (especially in terms of students) institution in the German-Polish border, open to students from Poland and other Central and Eastern European countries. The rationale behind creating the Collegium Polonicum was clearly political: to have an institution focused specifically on the transborder cooperation with the Viadrina and to provide new study opportunities to students from Polish-German border areas at the moment when it was clear that a bi-national university would not be created for structural (mostly legal) reasons. As a former AMU rector put it,

the Collegium Polonicum became a laboratory in which in practice two educational systems clashed, beginning from the recruitment procedures. These systems are

⁵ As Clark (1996: 54) explains the role of innovative self-defining ideas in reform processes, “at the level of visions or ideas, we can speak of deliberately constructing a ‘climate for change’, or of generating ‘aspirations beyond current capability’, or of stimulating ‘enthusiasm for change’, or of creating a change-oriented ‘mythology’. ... My choice ... is to conceptualize change-oriented purpose as an innovative self-referring idea – an idea of the institution offering a distinctive self that is change-oriented. The idea is a claim upon distinction”.

incompatible and therefore the Collegium Polonicum is a kind of verification of theoretical statements leading to the unification of higher education systems, which is currently going on through the Bologna Process (Interview 2: 2).

The cooperation between the two universities (the Collegium Polonicum as a satellite unit of AMU) meant also the cooperation between the two border cities, as well as the opening of AMU to students from the far-western regions of Poland. The project of a bi-national university was political but the level at which higher education is governed in two countries (the national level in Poland and the Länder level of Brandenburg in Germany) seems to have precluded a bi-national agreement about the creation of a truly international university. Consequently, the Viadrina was based on the law of Brandenburg and the Collegium Polonicum was based on the Polish law which enables universities to open satellite campuses (and, in legal terms, the Collegium Polonicum is jointly funded by the Polish and the German side). Infrastructural expenses of the Collegium Polonicum are covered by the Polish side and its employment costs of 12 professors are covered by the German side. Some financial asymmetry is mentioned in interviews as infrastructural costs seem to be higher and growing. As the Viadrina summarizes the role of the Collegium Polonicum:

The Collegium Polonicum is a cross-border, academic institution which was jointly brought into being and is being maintained by the European University Viadrina and the Adam Mickiewicz University. Against the background of an expanding Europe, it will develop into an academic and cultural meeting place between Poland and Germany open to teachers and students from all over Europe. ... Through the Collegium Polonicum, Ślubice (17.000 inhabitants), and Frankfurt-on-Oder (59.000 inhabitants), the German “Gateway to the East” will move even closer together.

The composition of the Collegium Polonicum student body is the following: in 2010, the majority of students were female (about 60 percent, compared with about 66 percent at AMU), the share of students older than 25 was limited (5.5 percent), and the share of Polish students was almost 90 percent (the remaining 10 percent being international students: 3.5 percent German, 3.3 percent Ukrainian, 2.8 percent Belarusian, and 1.0 percent Russian). Where exactly do Collegium Polonicum students come from? This is an important question from the perspective of the regional university mission. In a student survey conducted in 2010 at a population of about 500 (with about 400 returned surveys, see Pytlas and

Wojciechowski 2010: 3), 41.2 percent of students originated from the Lubuskie region, 14.1 percent from the Wielkopolskie region, 7.3 percent from the Zachodniopomorskie region, 4.8 percent from the Dolnośląskie region, and small percentages came from other Polish regions (Mazowieckie 3.0 percent, Małopolskie 2.3 percent, Podkarpackie and Śląskie 2.0 percent each, and other regions below 1.0 percent). Students were asked, among other things, about reasons for their studies at the Collegium Polonicum. To the question “what was the role of the following aspects in your decision about studying at the CP?” (from a closed list of items), the combined answers “very important” and “important” were the following: geographical location (at the Polish-German border) 71.2 percent, the comfort of studies (modern buildings etc.) 54.1 percent, the contact with the international community) 50 percent, the proximity of a home town 43.4 percent, low subsistence costs 41.9 percent, the offer of intensive study of foreign languages 37.8 percent, the educational offer based on ranking lists 31.8 percent, size (e.g. a cosy atmosphere) 31.1 percent, as well as the image of the Collegium Polonicum in the region of origin (23.7 percent) and in Poland (22.2 percent).

8. The “European Enlargement effect”

In the history of the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum, the year 2004 (or the date of the first European Enlargement to the East) plays a powerful role and determines changes in the Viadrina’s overall strategy. The changes are caused by the “European Enlargement effect”. While in the early years of its existence, the Viadrina was fully focused on Polish students (and they constituted about 30 percent of its student body), following the Enlargement, the share of Polish students have been steadily declining. There seem to be three obvious reasons of the decline; the first is that Polish secondary-school graduates gained the right to study (generally for free) in all European systems, and many of them moved to Germany, Ireland and the UK to start their studies. Until 2004, as a former AMU rector put it,

the studies at the Viadrina were an open window to the West. ... Since Poland entered the European Union, Polish students can study at any EU university. Consequently, the attractiveness of the Collegium Polonicum and the Viadrina has decreased. While in the past, students were coming from Poland, today they come from Slubice (Interview 2: 1-2).

Or as one of AMU vice-rectors pointed out,

before 2004, we had at the Collegium Polonicum youth from all over Poland; after 2004, they were no longer interested, Frankfurt was no longer an open window to the West, and it is a depopulated city anyway, and for us it became a much less attractive place. Absolutely, this is the deepest cause of the current decrease (Interview 4: 2).

New opportunities in Germany and other countries were accompanied by changes in DAAD's fellowship policies which favored non-EU students. The second reason is that Polish universities were being substantially reformed in the last ten years and their educational offer was incomparable to the offer of the 1990s or the early 2000s. Better educational offer in Poland was also combined with gradual demographic changes across Polish higher education system, both its public and private sectors. Since 2006, the number of students have been decreasing in Poland, and it became relatively easier to study in both sectors (with vast differences between study fields and with a highly competitive access to traditionally prestigious fields leading to prestigious occupations, such as medicine and law in top public universities). And, finally, the third reason was that the initial rationale of providing a unique opportunity to bridge Western and Eastern (Central) European systems no longer worked: the German-Polish border following 2004 was no longer the outward border of the European Union. The Neisse-Oder region became a part of the European Union. As the Viadrina stresses in its documents,

the word river has a very special meaning for the Viadrina. Firstly, this is due to the river on the banks of which the university lies. Just like neighboring Poland, the river is in our immediate area. This, in turn, has helped to develop a close German-Polish connection; because of this, the Viadrina is transforming itself into a German-Polish, European university.

The overall orientation of the Viadrina had to refocus and the notion of Europe and European integration was becoming ever more important to the institution. The focus on Poland and Polish students was gradually being replaced with the focus on Central Europe and Central European (and much further to the east – Eastern European) students. The change of focus is shown by the change in the composition of the student body by nationality. While in 2003 (the peak year), the number of Polish students was about 1,500, in 2010 it was only about

800. At the same time, the number of other (non-Polish) foreigners was increasing steadily, from about 100 in 1997 to about 200 in 2000, 500 in 2003 and more than 600 in 2010. In more details, the 2010 composition of the student body at the Viadrina was the following: Germany 4,578, Poland 813, Europe (without Germany and Poland) 454, Asia 90, South America 29, North America 24, Africa 21 and Australia 4. All geographical parts of Europe are represented, with students coming from 35 European countries. As university documents explain,

One of the main objectives which was assigned to the Viadrina when it was re-established is its bridge function between Western and Central-Eastern Europe. With its research activities, the Viadrina today serves this bridge function, thus being an important link within the process of the European integration. For the Viadrina, Central-Eastern Europe is not only a core object of scientific interest, but a very relevant cooperation partner for teaching and research as well.

From the very beginning, Europe (especially Central Europe) and European integration was at the core of the Viadrina political rationale. The Viadrina has developed an international research profile involving its three faculties – the Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences, the Faculty of Business Administration and Economics and the Faculty of Law – with distinct research foci:

Each of the three faculties provide specific expertise on Europe, with Central-Eastern Europe being an integral area of research at the Viadrina. The shared focus e.g. shows in the joint Master programme in European Studies which is borne by all faculties as well as in the main research and teaching focus of the social and cultural sciences on Europe and Central-Eastern Europe, the intense economic research on international economic relations and European integration and on investment and taxation in Central-Eastern Europe, the jurisprudential research foci on various aspects of European law.

From the perspectives of Polish current and former rectors and vice-rectors interviewed, the cooperation between the Viadrina and AMU through the Collegium Polonicum was very good in the teaching dimension and lagged behind in the research dimension. Therefore, it is the priority of the current AMU rector to develop the research mission at the Collegium

Polonicum, especially through a newly established Polish-German Research Institute. As he stresses, “on the basis of stronger research activities, we will be creating a joint Polish-German teaching offer. ... In short, we are planning changes through the development of research” (Interview 3: 1).

9. Conclusions

Both institutions studied both play a powerful regional role (which I am studying in more detail for the Polish case in a paper “Universities, Regions, and Economic Growth” in this volume) and refer to it in its guiding principles and rationales. The location of the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum determines their current and projected research, teaching, and third mission activities. The regional role is played with reference to Brandenburg, the Lubuskie region and the integration of the latter with the European Union. “Europe” and “Central and Eastern Europe” have provided and still provide a powerful rationale for all three types of university activities.

While both institutions are evolving (especially, although not exclusively, following what we have termed here the “European Enlargement effect” after 2004), also their mutual relationships are evolving. Various institutional models have been used, either intuitively or based on institutional strategies, in the last two decades of cooperation. The core of the Collegium Polonicum may be changing due to the changing rationale of its existence, both in legal terms (shifts in the Polish law on higher education) and in financial terms. While in the beginning, a close transborder cooperation was assumed, after some time of more relaxed cooperation in the 2000s, a new impetus can be found to cooperate closer in both teaching and research: a new research institute has been just opened at the Collegium Polonicum (following clearly best practices of entrepreneurial universities in Europe) and a new *Excellence Initiative* grant application at the Viadrina involves closer cooperation with the Polish universities in Poznań and Wrocław. New ideas for teaching at the Collegium Polonicum expressed at the AMU management level increasingly stress its links with future research conducted at the Collegium Polonicum and show links between research and the regional needs of the transborder area. The possible future strengthening of the Collegium Polonicum in terms of a larger number of academics employed, fuelled by the idea that it should be able to be treated in legal terms in the future as an AMU “basic organizational unit” – may clearly lead to the strengthening of its research capacities. The academically

stronger Collegium Polonicum, in turn, would be a stronger partner in research cooperation with the Viadrina. Institutional change processes are usually long-term and embedded in institutional cultures, values and norms. Also their directions cannot be taken for granted, not only at the level of planning but also, perhaps especially, at the level of implementation.

The case study institutions (both the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum but also Neisse University, see a text by Heidi Fichter-Wolf in this volume) generally view themselves as less entrepreneurial than major metropolitan universities in both Poland and Germany, especially than universities in Poznan and Berlin. The major reason is that their access to research funds – which most often determines the appearance of the entrepreneurial culture – is still, despite noticeable progress at both institutions, limited. While the Viadrina, in accordance with a German tradition of the unity of research and teaching, has access to both block grant funds and competitive funds, the Collegium Polonicum does not seem to have access to competitive research funds at the moment (especially from a new national research agency, the NCN or the National Research Council). The research institute is planned to increase the Collegium Polonicum's access to research funds substantially. Academic risks associated with research (such as frontier research, known from most entrepreneurial institutions) are rarely being taken by either staff or institutions, although both the Excellence Initiative at the Viadrina and the opening of the research institute at the Collegium Polonicum show a possible direction of changes. Compared with metropolitan universities in Poznan and Berlin, few examples of the development of new knowledge from entrepreneurial activities are reported; perhaps especially because the disciplinary areas of both institutions are social sciences rather than natural sciences and engineering. Consequently, a limited number of mechanisms from a long catalogue of various knowledge transfer/knowledge exploitation channels are reported (Kwiek 2013a). Inhibitors to entrepreneurialism in general have also clearly national dimensions (different history and tradition, historical reasons to found both institutions, national funding regimes and national and regional laws on higher education and on research funding which increasingly de-favor smaller, less research-intensive institutions). Also neither German regional nor Polish national systems seem to have well-established mechanisms to fund regional university missions.

In general, diversified funding bases do not seem to work for the institutions studied. Their abilities (and opportunities) to use the “third source” of income, especially (perhaps most welcome) “university-generated” income, are limited. In general, they are not able in practice to compete with top universities where national and international research funds are

being increasingly concentrated (and the *Excellence Initiative* open to the Viadrina in its recent round is a state-supported counter-example to this tendency; it clearly shows that there is a possibility to find a balance between excellence and regional relevance: the application to the German federal government was for the International Graduate School *Dynamic Multimodal Communication* and for the cluster of excellence *B/Orders in Motion*, with a bundle of interrelated questions: space – border – mobility; orders in motion; language – media – communication; identity – alterity). The Viadrina seems to have had good incentive policies to support their staff in seeking non-core sources of income, and the Collegium Polonicum seems to be introducing such policies in its new research institute. Case study institutions have access to government funds and to private sources (such as business firms and philanthropic or research foundations). The share of their income from alumni fund-raising, research contracts, patents, endowments or earned income from campus operations is small (they receive substantial funding from the Polish-German Research Foundation, though).

The institutions studied are not heavily involved in research at the moment although there are clear signs that their research involvement is increasing. They are relatively small institutions and the number of their senior academic staff is small (8 professors holding 8 chairs at the Collegium Polonicum, compared with several hundreds in major AMU faculties; and 69 professors at the Viadrina, compared with several hundreds at both the Humboldts and Free Universities in Berlin). At the same time, their original missions were unique and not specifically research-focused.⁶

The Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum play a powerful regional role: they bring higher education, mostly at very high or high levels, to the youth of the Polish-German border area. They exert long-term civilizational, cultural, social, and economic influence on the region in which they are embedded. Although founded in different national educational traditions, based on incompatible higher education national and regional laws, and funded through incompatible funding formulas, they seem to be similarly positive in their regional impact. Balancing between regional and European rationales for their operation, they have been able to maintain their fundamentally unique character. If more intensive, research-based

⁶ What a former rector of AMU recalls as a “golden age” of the research mission of the Collegium Polonicum was the mid-2000s when it received about 4 million euro for 70 doctoral and postdoctoral fellowships funded for three years for academics from Poland, Germany and other countries. Eighty percent of them led to completed PhD and Habilitation degrees and many professors from both AMU and the Viadrina were supervisors of dissertations (Interview 2: 2).

cooperation between the Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum is expected, best practices of intercultural learning from the past two decades need to be rethought, and new long-term institutional strategies developed and applied. Only with new, probably more competitive, external funding, the challenge of the “European Enlargement effect” exerted on both institutions can be overcome in the future.⁷

References:

- Aghion, Philippe, Mathias Dewatripont, Caroline Hoxby, Andreu Mas-Colell, André Sapir (2008). *Higher aspirations: An agenda for reforming European universities*. Brussels: Bruegel.
- Begg, Roddy, ed. (2003). *The Dialogue between Higher Education Research and Practice*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Brunsson, Nils (2009). *Reform as Routine: Organizational Change and Stability in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brunsson, Nils (2006). *Mechanisms of Hope: Maintaining the Dream of the Rational Organization*. Liber: Universitetsforlaget.
- Brunsson, Nils, Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson (2000). “Constructing Organizations: The Example of Public Sector Reform”. *Organization Studies*. Vol. 21. No. 4. 721-746.
- Brunsson, Nils, Johan P. Olsen, eds. (1998). *Organizing Organizations*. Bergen-Sandviken: Fagbokforlaget.
- Clark, Burton R. (2004). *Sustaining change in universities. Continuities in case studies and concepts*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Clark, Burton R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities. Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Clark, Burton R. (1996). “Case Studies of Innovative Universities: A Progress Report”. *Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 2. No. 1. 52-61.
- Gordon, George, Celia Whitchurch, eds. (2010). *Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce*. New York: Routledge.
- Gumport, Patricia J. (2012). Strategic Thinking in Higher Education Research. In: Michael N. Bastedo (ed.), *The Organization of Higher Education: Managing Colleges for a New Era*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press. 18-41.
- Krücken, Georg, Frank Meier (2006). “Turning the University into an Organizational Actor”. In: Drori, G. S., J. W. Meyer and H. Hwang, eds., *Globalization and Organization. World Society and Organizational Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kwiek, Marek (1996). *Nie pytajcie mnie, kim jestem. Michel Foucault dzisiaj*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe IF UAM (in Polish).
- Kwiek, Marek (1998). *Dylematy tożsamości. Wokół autowizerunku filozofa w powojennej myśli francuskiej*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe IF UAM (in Polish).
- Kwiek, Marek (2001). “The Internationalization and Globalization of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe”. *Society for Research into Higher Education International News*, No. 47. 3-5.
- Kwiek, Marek (2008). “Academic Entrepreneurship vs. Changing Governance and Institutional Management Structures at European Universities”. *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 6. No. 6. 757-770.

⁷ The publication of this paper would not be possible without the support of the National Research Council (NCN) through its MAESTRO grant (DEC-2011/02/A/HS6/00183) which the author gratefully acknowledges.

- Kwiek, Marek (2009a). "The Two Decades of Privatization in Polish Higher Education: Cost-Sharing, Equity and Access." In: *Financing Access and Equity in Higher Education*, ed. J. Knight, Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense. 149-168.
- Kwiek, Marek (2009b). "Entrepreneurialism and Private Higher Education in Europe". In: Michael Shattock, ed., *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. 100-120.
- Kwiek, Marek (2010a). *Transformacje uniwersytetu. Zmiany instytucjonalne i ewolucje polityki edukacyjnej w Europie*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Kwiek, Marek (2010b). "Creeping Marketization: Where Polish Private and Public Higher Education Sectors Meet" In: *Higher Education and the Market*, ed. R. Brown. New York: Routledge.
- Kwiek, Marek (2011). "Universities and Knowledge Production in Central Europe. In *Universities in the Knowledge Economy: Higher Education Organisation and Global Change*, ed. P. Temple. New York: Routledge.
- Kwiek, Marek (2012). "Changing Higher Education Policies: From the Deinstitutionalization to the Reinstitutionalization of the Research Mission in Polish Universities." *Science and Public Policy*. 39 (October): 641-654.
- Kwiek, Marek (2013a). *Knowledge Production in European Universities: States, Markets, and Academic Entrepreneurialism*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt and New York.
- Kwiek, Marek (2013b). "From System Expansion to System Contraction: Access to Higher Education in Poland". *Comparative Education Review*. Vol. 57. No. 3 (Fall). 553-576.
- Lane, Jan-Erik (1990). *Institutional Reform: A Public Policy Perspective*. Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Lane, Jan-Erik (2000). *The Public Sector: Concepts, Models and Approaches*. London: SAGE.
- Lam, Alice (2011). "What motivates academic scientists to engage in research commercialization: 'Gold', 'ribbon' or 'puzzle'?" *Research Policy*. Vol. 40. 1354-1368.
- Maassen, P. and J. P. Olsen, eds. (2007). *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- March, James G., Johan P. Olsen (2006a). "Elaborating the 'New Institutionalism'". In: R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah A. Binder, Bert A. Rockman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 3-20.
- March, James G., Johan P. Olsen (2006b). The Logic of Appropriateness. In: Michael Moran, Martin Rein, Robert E. Goodin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press. 689-708.
- Mazza, Carmelo, Paolo Quattrone, Angelo Riccaboni, eds. (2008). *European Universities in Transition: Issues, Models and Cases*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Mora, Jose-Gines, Andrea Detmer and Maria-Jose Vieira, eds. (2010). *Good Practices in University-Enterprise Partnerships GOODUEP*. CEGES: Valencia.
- Neave, Guy (2008). "Now You See It, Now You Don't: Privatization as the Will O' the Wisp in the Higher Education Policies of Western Europe". In: *Proceedings of the International Conference: Privatization in Higher Education*. The Samuel Neaman Institute, Haifa, Israel, January 7-8, 2008.
- OECD (1998). *Fostering Entrepreneurship. The OECD Jobs Strategy*. Paris. OECD.
- Olsen, Johan P. (2007). *Europe in Search of Political Order. An institutional perspective on unity/diversity, citizens/their helpers, democratic design/historical drift, and the co-existence of orders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pytlas, Bartek and Krzysztof Wojciechowski (2010). *A Survey Study of Collegium Polonicum Students in the summer term 2010. The analysis of Results*. Frankfurt am Oder (mimeo).
- Sadlak, Jan, Philip G. Altbach, eds. (1997). *Higher Education Research at the Turn of the New Century: Structures, Issues, and Trends*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Schwarz, Stefanie, Ulrich Teichler (2000). *The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research: Experience and Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Shattock, Michael (2009a). "Entrepreneurialism and organizational change in higher education". In: M. Shattock (ed.), *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy: Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*. Berkshire: SRHE & Open University Press. 1-8
- Shattock, Michael (2009b). *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy*.

- Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press and SRHE.
- Shattock, Michael (2005). "European Universities for Entrepreneurship: Their Role in the Europe of Knowledge: The Theoretical Context". *Higher Education Management and Policy*. Vol. 17. No. 3. 13-25.
- Shattock, Michael (2003). *Managing Successful Universities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Shattock, Michael and Paul Temple (2006). "Entrepreneurialism and the Knowledge Society: some conclusions from cross national studies", a paper presented at the EAIR Forum, Rome.
- Teichler, Ulrich, Jan Sadlak, eds. (2000). *Higher Education Research: Its Relationship to Policy and Practice*. Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.
- Williams, Gareth (2009). "Finance and Entrepreneurial Activity in Higher Education in a Knowledge Society". In: M. Shattock (ed.), *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy: Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*. Berkshire: SRHE & Open University Press. 8-32
- Williams, Gareth, Igor Kitaev (2005). "Overview of National Policy Context for Entrepreneurialism in Higher Education Institutions". *Higher Education Management and Policy*. Vol. 17. No. 3. 125-141.
- Williams, Gareth, ed. (2003). *The Enterprising University: Reform, Excellence and Equity*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Wright, Mike (2007). "University-Industry Links: Regional Policies and Initiatives in the United Kingdom." In: Shahid Yusuf, Kaoru Nabeshima (eds.), *How Universities Promote Economic Growth*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. 151-162.
- Wright, Mike, Bart Clarysse, Philippe Mustar, Andy Lockett (2007). *Academic Entrepreneurship in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Zomer, Arend H., Ben W.A. Jongbloed, Jürgen Enders (2010). "Do Spin-Offs Make the Academics' Heads Spin? The Impacts of Spin-Off Companies on Their Parent Research Organisation". *Minerva*. Vol. 48. 331-353.