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DEDICATION

“Never give up. Never say die.” – The Juicy One

I dedicate this dissertation to the memory of my father, the late Dr. Paul John Tabakian. He was also my teacher, coworker, and best friend who taught me to never retreat into despair. Our relationship was such that I could always share my thoughts, trials, and tribulations with him regardless of the severity of a situation. His advice was always the same. He would look me directly in my eyes, smile, and say, “Never give up. Never say die.”

My father taught me at a very young age to embrace challenges, take chances, and accept responsibility. I was a very wild and rambunctious young man who had a father who gave me carte blanche to do almost anything at a very young age. At age thirteen, my father told me he was going to revise my curfew, “Hey kid, your curfew on school nights, Sunday to Thursday, is to be home to have enough time to take a shower and go back to school.” If it were Sunday evening, I would have to be home early enough on Monday morning to take a shower and go to school. At age sixteen, my father gave me a gas credit card and said, “This is the deal. I will pay for all your gas, insurance and all car repairs. You must promise me to never drink any alcoholic beverage underage and never drive drunk even after you are 21. If you do, then the deal is off.” With freedom comes responsibility. I never broke our agreement.

Dr. Paul John Tabakian was a professor of chemistry and physics who also had a successful career in the private sector. His students gave him two nicknames. The first one was “Dr. T.” The second one was “The Juicy One.” His students gave him multiple gifts emblazoned with “The Juicy One.” These included a Santa Claus hat, lab coats, cartoons,
and stencils of my father. This nickname is the result of my father telling his classes that a particular problem or equation is a “juicy one.” My father did not advertise around the college of his activities outside of the classroom. He was never the campus politician. Never once did he advertise to his peers that he had a hand with helping a particular student secure a job, gain acceptance into a university, graduate school program, etc. His past students would make it a point to visit him to share their good fortune. My father would always say, “Your success is your doing.”

One thing that my father loved to do was to tell stories to his classes. Let me tell you a story he said about his one and only son. My license became “full” on Friday, May 15, 1992. After my birthday party with Mom and Dad at our favorite restaurant near our home in Torrance, California, I drove and drove and drove Friday and Saturday. I woke up early on Sunday, May 17, 1992, showered, and had breakfast with my parents. After breakfast, my father reminded me it was a school night and asked what my plans were. I said, “My heart is set on having prime rib tonight.” He never asked where I would be having my prime rib. To be honest, I did not know either. So off I went in my little car, driving from one road to another, until I got on the freeway and headed to the Barronshire Prime Rib Restaurant in the Las Vegas Hilton!

I could not wait to tell my father! After dinner at 9:00pm, I called my father from the casino lobby of the Las Vegas Hilton. My father asked me if I had my dinner. I replied, yes and it was excellent. He then asked, “Where did you end up? Coco’s? Carrows? Reubens?” I said, “Nope. Barronshire.” The silence on the phone receiver was ice cold. Then all of a sudden my father started to chuckle. He said, “I know of only one Barronshire Restaurant and that is in the Las Vegas Hilton. Are you serious? Are those slot machines I
hear in the background? Don’t forget to be home to have enough time to take a shower and
go back to school!” My father loved telling that story to his students. He liked talking about
my antics more than anything else.

You learn a great deal about a person as they are facing death square in the eyes.

Early one morning on Sunday April 29, 2007, my father suffered from sepsis shock and
cardiogenic shock at the same time and was admitted to Torrance Memorial Medical Center.
He came home from the hospital nine days later, only to return back to Torrance Memorial
Medical Center on June 1, 2007. This began an eleven-month ordeal dealing primarily with
his heart condition that also included receiving care at UCLA Medical Center, Providence of
Little Company of Mary Hospital San Pedro, The Earlwood Care Center in Torrance and
going back again to Providence of Little Company of Mary Hospital San Pedro. My father
then returned home on April 29, 2008. However, it would not last for long. In the morning
of May 13, 2008, I called the paramedics and he was readmitted to Torrance Memorial
Medical Center again. This was his last hospitalization before going to that big laboratory in
the sky on September 2, 2008.

During the course of my father’s treatment, I began to realize that education is my
true career calling. This became apparent after learning that multiple nurses and health care
practitioners who have been caring for my father were in fact his past students. I personally
met many of his nurses who had taken my father’s chemistry classes. I also have to
acknowledge some of the respiratory therapists, physical therapists, lift team members and
one security guard who also had taken my father’s chemistry classes. All of them shared
with me how my father personally took the time to mentor them through their academic
programs. Now many years later they were working on their “Dr. T.” My father was a man
who had great faith in God and loved life with a great deal of passion. He was always positive, alert and kept his sense of humor until the very end. I believe that when he finally passed on September 2, 2008, it was after I realized my true calling and made the decision to pursue a doctorate in education.

This dissertation addresses a topic area that is dear to my father’s heart. Community college students are for the most part nontraditional in the sense that they are older, working either part-time or full-time and may have dependent families. I was a nontraditional college student in the sense that I graduated from high school early and was pursuing interests in the private sector while attending college. Were it not for academic entrepreneurial faculty who took the time to guide me throughout those college years, I would have been a total failure. It is my intent to offer the same assistance to a new generation of wild and rambunctious students.
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Public funding for community colleges has been steadily declining since the peak of funding in the 1970s (Brightman, 1989). Surviving the constant threats of budgetary cuts has been a key motivating factor for community colleges to embrace academic entrepreneurialism. I examined the academic entrepreneurial pursuits of one California Community College (CCC) to understand those factors that encourage community college faculty to pursue academic entrepreneurial solutions.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Specifically, I investigated three categories of factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism: individual, institutional, and environmental. Individual factors include demographic and background characteristics, including age, race, gender, academic training, and previous professional careers. Institutional factors include program offerings available for students, institutional reputation and history, institutional policies and practices, and academic and administrative leadership. Environmental factors relate to the peer influences of a campus that encourages academic entrepreneurial behavior of faculty.
The significance of this study lies in the identification of factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty, ultimately supporting institutional efforts to augment funding. I investigated individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Accordingly, the research questions identify key factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty and explain how they facilitate faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. The research questions that I evaluated in this study are: What individual, institutional, and environmental factors influence community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism? What is the relationship between faculty background, institutional, and environmental characteristics and the frequency and quality of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty?

I found that all three factors are essential elements of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Individual, institutional, and environmental factors consist of people who are all pursuing their self-interest. This follows the tenets of rational choice theory as the study finds that self-interest influences faculty academic entrepreneurialism.

The study argues that changes to institutional policies are the key determining factor to encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Institutional policies determine how a college functions and understands the interrelationship between individual, institutional, and environmental factors. Encouraging academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty requires institutional policies that focus on the fundamental issue: recruiting, retaining, and evaluating community college
faculty. The study offers suggestions for how to influence institutional policies that in turn encourage faculty academic entrepreneurialism by addressing the following areas: faculty job descriptions, faculty job announcements, evaluating faculty levels of academic entrepreneurialism, and offering entrepreneurial faculty financial incentives.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

California Community Colleges (CCCs) have been experiencing dwindling resources since the late 1980s, peaking during the financial economic calamity of 2007 (Scott, 2009). In fact, public funding for CCCs is steadily declining (Greer, 2010). During the same period, community colleges became increasingly dependent on external funding sources to augment a decrease in public support (Lee & Rhoads, 2004). On this point, Brightman (1989) argues that the period of community college expansion seen during the 1960s and early 1970s will not return. Consequently, community colleges have had difficulty maintaining consistent streams of funding to help assure campuses are able to provide essential services to their student population (Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004). For their part, academic leaders on community college campuses are aware of the need to establish alternative funding sources (Glasper, 2009). Meanwhile, community college leaders face increasing criticism over the quality of instruction and lack of student achievement at their community colleges, all while dealing with ever-shrinking public funding (Floyd, Mallsin-Ostrowski, & Hrabak, 2010) and increasing enrollment (Brightman, 1989; Bird & Allen, 1989; Ebbers, Conover, & Samuels, 2010).

Against this backdrop, one way that academic leaders encourage alternative funding sources is academic entrepreneurialism, which has become a vital revenue stream for public institutions of higher learning (Lee & Rhoads, 2004). Academic entrepreneurialism is the application of business principles to author, fund, and maintain marketable and relevant educational programs that further student success (Hess, 2006). In fact, there is an ever-increasing awareness among academic administrators of the need for their institutions to
encourage their faculty to be more entrepreneurial (Goldberg, 1978; Hodgkinson, 1971; Kaplan & Wilson, 1978; Lee & Rhoads, 2004). Understanding what factors encourage academic entrepreneurialism is a vital asset to academic leaders (Goldberg, 1978). In general, government funding encourages academic entrepreneurial ventures vital for college survival (Basham & Mathur, 2010).

Community college campuses exhibiting academic entrepreneurialism rely on expert faculty who articulate which programs can serve their student population (Bird & Allen, 1989). To encourage community college faculty to be academic entrepreneurs requires first understanding what factors encourage the behavior, whether they be primarily institutional climates and/or individual interests, including financial gain (Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004).

All public institutions of higher learning are becoming more dependent on securing additional funding sources as the economic recession of 2007 steadily became worse (Gordon, 2011; Sommer, 2011; York, 2011). At the time of this study, there is discussion among financial analysts that the United States is entering into a double-dip recession (Sommer, 2011). A double-dip recession occurs when a nation’s gross domestic product (GDP) contracts following one or two quarters of growth after a recession. This likelihood places a greater need on community colleges.

The recession of December 2007 to July 2009 laid the groundwork for our nation’s current economic malaise. Inflation, unemployment, a lack of credit, a rising debt ceiling, expanding national debt, and a contracting housing market has a profound impact on consumer confidence along with a corresponding decline of tax revenue (York, 2011). Reversing unemployment during times of economic malaise requires a multifaceted approach that includes job training (Office of the President, 2010). The Obama
Administration sees the economic downturn as both a challenge and an opportunity for creative job training programs that prepare our workforce for emerging technologically advanced fields that include the green and renewable energy industry (2010). Technical skills requiring a minimum of an associate degree will increase at twice the rate of those jobs that require no college experience (2010). Without a workforce possessing the necessary technical skills, companies will have to import labor to fill those jobs that Americans cannot fill.

Community colleges face the daunting task of fueling the education needs of a nation while public funding continues to contract instead of expand. Special onetime funding in the form of state and federal grants, along with private party donations, have been instrumental in assisting community colleges to establish or continue to fund unique programs. While economic uncertainty encourages larger numbers of the population to pursue higher academic training, community colleges are struggling to satisfy the needs of all student applicants (Rivera, 2011). Most disturbing are community colleges that use special onetime funding to maintain a portion of existing programs instead of establishing new high-tech programs necessary for the nation to remain competitive.

**Problem Statement**

I address the lack of research pertaining to individual, institutional, and environmental factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Community colleges have been playing a strong role in higher education since the 1947 Truman Commission Report on higher education. The commission found that community colleges were best in preparing adults for career placement, which in turn would help bolster the national economy (Boone, 1997). Community colleges offer societal
benefits that go beyond academic transfer, vocational certification, and job training. They offer individuals the benefit of lifetime learning, fostering a sense of community that allows all citizens the opportunity to pursue a higher education, regardless of race, color, or creed. The California Community College Chancellor’s Office states the primary missions of community colleges are to offer academic and vocational instruction to foster California’s economy (CA Ed. §66010-66010.8). This belief follows the mandate of the California Master Plan for Higher Education of providing students with an affordable education.

The California Master Plan specifically envisions a three-tier higher education system that directs public postsecondary populations to one of three sectors: The University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), and California Community Colleges (CCC). The UC is the state’s main research institution that maintains exclusive control over public higher education for doctoral degrees in law, medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine while also providing undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. The CSU provides undergraduate, graduate education up to the master’s degree, including professional and teacher education, doctorates in conjunction with the UC or a private institution and following the 2006 passage of SB724, the Doctorate of Education (Ed.D) in educational leadership in K-12 and community college instruction. The primary mission of CCCs is to provide remedial education, academic associate degrees, assist with academic transfer to a CSU, UC or private institution, vocational certification, job training and lifelong learning opportunities (Johnson, 2010). The majority of CCC students are nontraditional as they are likely to be older, working part-time or full-time and/or have family responsibilities (Hull, 2005; Hull & Hinckley, 2007).
The literature that examines academic entrepreneurialism deals mostly with establishing new student programs and/or attracting new avenues of funding (Ebbers, Conover, & Samuels, 2010). In fact, research that focuses on academic entrepreneurialism largely treats an issue unrelated to faculty: administrative and presidential leadership fundraising techniques (Hearn, 2003). What we know less about and what have not been studied particularly in community college contexts are factors that facilitate faculty engagement in academic entrepreneurial pursuits.

**Research Purpose and Significance**

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Specifically, I investigated three factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism: individual, institutional, and environmental. Individual factors include demographic and background characteristics, including age, race, gender, academic training, and previous professional careers. Institutional factors include program offerings available for students, institutional reputation and history, institutional policies and practices, and academic and administrative leadership. Environmental factors relate to the peer influences of a campus that encourages academic entrepreneurial behavior of faculty.

The significance of this study lies in the identification of factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty that ultimately support institutional efforts to augment funding. Responding to a crisis through entrepreneurialism applies to any type of business, including a community college (Wheatley, 2006). The pursuit of entrepreneurial ventures offers great economic potential. It is also necessary for CCC survival, as there is a need to augment the decline of public funding (Brightman,
The economic recession of 2007-2009 placed community colleges in a precarious situation. While higher education funding models are broken (Greer, 2010), identifying institutional climates that encourage entrepreneurialism along with individual pursuits of faculty, including financial gain, are important to recognize (Amey, 2010). Engaging in entrepreneurialism can also encourage faculty to engage their local market (Lee & Rhoads, 2004). Changing trends in the American economy require higher institutions of learning, including colleges and research universities, to pursue ventures that may fall outside of their research mission (Bird & Allen, 1989).

Research Questions

I investigated individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Accordingly, the research questions identify key factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty and explain how they facilitate faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. The research questions I evaluated are:

1. What individual, institutional, and environmental factors influence community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism?

2. What is the relationship between faculty background, institutional, and environmental characteristics and the frequency and quality of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty?

Conceptual Framework

I used rational choice theory to conceptually examine factors that foster academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Rational choice theory attempts to discern the primary motivation behind individual and group behavior (Lane, 1996).
Rational choice theory has two major areas of focus. While macroeconomics examines decision-making of a single economy whether it is national, regional, or global in scale, microeconomics explains individual behavior of a single group or firm in relation to decisions to allocate limited resources (Green & Shapiro, 1994, 1996). In general, rational choice theory is useful for understanding individual and group behavior within the economic system (Samuelson, 1954). Rational choice theorists compare how supply and demand correlates with individual rationality and self-interest (Green & Shapiro, 1994, 1996).

I used Lane’s conception of rational choice theory, even though he is critical of its adoption among social scientists (Lane, 1996). Lane argues that law and business schools have developed microeconomic theories that are more dependable (1996). He argues that individual self-interest determines all behavior, whether made according to logic or emotion (1996). Lane further adds that it is impossible for any theory to explain human behavior without appreciating all factors that influence the individual. Rational choice theory is the concept of behavior according to individual self-interest that involves conducting a cost benefit analysis. Individuals weigh the cost along with the benefits and then decide to pursue something if the benefits outweigh the costs. My study examines how individual, institutional, and environmental factors work together to encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Existing literature investigating entrepreneurialism in general explores individual, institutional, and environmental factors, but does not look at all as interrelating factors. Lane’s conception of rational choice theory supports the argument that all three variables are interdependent on one another. The individual behavior of one individual can influence institutional and then environmental factors.
Overview of Methodology

This single case study borrows principles of grounded theory to examine factors that influence faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. The study examines the case of Southern California Community College (SCCC), a pseudonym. This college serves a primarily ethnic minority student population in a diverse urban environment in Southern California. SCCC offers certificated trade-vocational programs along with undergraduate courses for associate degrees or transfer to a four-year institution. The case site offers a wide selection of academic and vocational trade majors taught by a number of academic entrepreneurial faculties.

I selected SCCC as a case site for reasons related to its regional reputation of having highly entrepreneurial faculty. A number of faculty have been establishing new degree and certificated programs relating to their discipline that meet market demands for new or emerging careers. The most innovative programs fall under the umbrella of Career Technical Education (CTE) that allow students to secure a certificate along with corresponding associate degrees and the opportunity to continue their education at a four-year university. Examples of dual certificated and degree programs include sustainable energy, restaurant management, hybrid automotive repair, and chemical technology. Other successful achievements of the college’s academic faculty include establishing scholarships, placing students in paid and unpaid internships, and marketing student made products for private sale such as culinary department cake sales to fund scholarships for their department.

I utilized grounded theory, which examines evolving patterns of action and interaction among subjects, events, environments, and occurrences that may or may not be significant and scrutinizes the entire development (Strauss & Corbin, 1997). Schram argues
that grounded theory is a constant comparison that requires the researcher’s “refusal to accept a report at face value” (Schram, 2006, p. 75). I used grounded theory to develop a substantive explanation to understand the factors that encourage community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism.

**Limitations**

Creswell (2007) identifies limitations and delimitations as boundaries that limit the scope of research. Limitations are points of pre-existing weaknesses that can include a lack of literature, data, and research subjects, series or sites (Creswell, 2007). Limitations apply to the two sampling strategies I used to sample research subjects: criterion sampling and chain sampling. One criterion requires that each research subject be either a current or previous principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisor, consultant, or affiliate of a program or pursuit exemplifying academic entrepreneurialism. Some faculty exhibiting academic entrepreneurial traits have never been the sole creator or author of any program or pursuit. These faculty were still selected, because they provided entrepreneurial assistance to a program or pursuit. In addition, the use of this criterion resulted in the inclusion of faculty who are pursuing entrepreneurial pursuits in the private or public sector with no relation to academic entrepreneurialism.

In addition to limitations related to criterion sampling, the use of chain sampling presented limits to the study. Two limitations applied to chain sampling. First, the sampling strategy ran the risk of favoritism from current research subjects recommending friends or colleagues. Second, another limitation involved recommendations from current subjects who based recommendations for the purpose of individual career advancement. To overcome these limitations, I used a combination of criteria from sampling when reviewing all recommendations to assure subject qualifications.
Delimitations

Delimitations are self-imposed confinements to the scope of study (Creswell, 2007). This single case study examines factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. I focused on a single community college offering a range of academic and vocational trade degrees and certification programs serving primarily a population of students of color within a diverse urban environment. Research shows that these factors encourage community college academic entrepreneurialism (Goldberg, 1978). I examined a single community college serving a local community where the majority of residents live at either the lower middle class or poverty level. Research also shows that the challenge of serving lower than middle class populations encourages community colleges to embrace academic entrepreneurialism (Floyd, Masslin-Ostrowski, & Hrabak, 2010).

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout the study:

Academic Advisory Committee: Established committee consisting of individuals who share a common interest with a present or future academic program. Advisory committee members may represent academia, private industry, or any other interest group with a vested interest in a specific program or the types of students that it will attract.

Articulation: Process involving the transfer of a student into a college program that entails assigning credit based upon past courses taken at another institution.

Articulation Agreements: Established agreements between two campuses and/or districts that allow for easy transfer of credits from one college institution and/or district to another college institution and/or district. Articulation involves the transfer of a student into
a college program that entails assigning credit based upon past courses taken at another institution.

Associate of Arts (AA): College degree given after completion of a two-year course of study in the arts.

Associate of Science (AS): College degree given after completion of a two-year course of study in the sciences.

Bachelor of Arts (BA): College degree given after completion of a four-year course of study in the arts.

Bachelor of Science (BS): College degree given after completion of a four-year course of study in the sciences.

California Community College Out Of State Tuition: Level of tuition charged to students who are not residents of the state.

Career Technical Education (CTE): Vocational job training most commonly relating to manual or practical activities that may or may not be academic in nature.

Carnegie Unit: Time based references for the measurement of educational attainment. Also referred to as Credit Hour or Student Hour.

Chemical Technology Program: Certification and degree program that trains students to become chemical technicians who perform chemical testing.

Community College: Publicly funded colleges that typically offer two-year academic programs to students residing locally to the campus. Many also provide vocational/trade programs that can fall under Career Technical Education (CTE). Also referred to as Junior College.
Community College In-State-Tuition: Level of tuition charged to resident community college students of the state.

Contact Hour: Total amount of time a student has with the instructor of record.

Counseling: The intellectual, emotional, social, and cultural development of students by offering a wide range of services relating to course advisement, career development, and educational services. These services help students resolve interpersonal struggles and assist in gaining the skills, abilities, and knowledge that will allow them to fully engage in their college experiences and matriculate.

Credit: Successful completion of course work following Carnegie Hours towards completion of a degree or program. Also referred to as For-Credit.

Credit Hour: Time based references for the measurement of educational attainment. Also referred to as Carnegie Unit or Student Hour.

Doctor of Education (Ed.D.): Graduate degree program that focuses on practical skills to prepare students for management roles in academic organizations.

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.): Postgraduate academic degree that requires typically three years of graduate study that includes coursework and original research in the form of a dissertation.

Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS): Provides special support services that include academic counseling, support counseling, financial assistance, and special educational programs to those students having experienced economic, educational, or social disadvantages.
First Year Experience (FYE): Program offering giving new incoming students the opportunity to enroll in a for-credit program that offers practical advice for academic success.

For-Credit: Successful completion of course work following Carnegie Hours towards completion of a degree or program. Also referred to as Credit.

Hybrid Course Instruction: Students pursuing credit hours in person and online.

Instructor Special Assignment (ISA): Reassignment of a full-time or part-time instructor to a nonteaching position for a specific period of time.

Junior College: Publicly funded colleges that typically offer two-year academic programs to students residing locally to the campus. Many also provide vocational/trade programs that can fall under Career Technical Education (CTE). Also referred to as Community College.

Master of Arts (MA): College degree in the arts that requires additional work beyond the bachelor degree that includes coursework, successful passage of comprehensive examinations, and/or completion of a thesis that involves research.

Master of Science (MS): College degree in the sciences that requires additional work beyond the bachelor degree that includes coursework, successful passage of comprehensive examinations, and/or completion of a thesis that involves research.

Matriculation: Process that enables the student to enroll in the California Community College system and complete their program. The goal of matriculation is to complete their courses, pass on to the next academic term, and achieve their educational objectives: transfer, graduation, lifelong learning, and/or securing vocational certification.
Not For-Credit: Pertains to course offerings that do not follow Carnegie Hours and are not applicable towards a degree, but only certification programs.

Online Supplemental Instruction: Supplemental course material made available online for student access.

Process Technology Program: Certification and degree program that trains students to become process technicians who work with instrumentation, electronics, or maintenance to adjust and optimize conditions for the production of large quantities of products.

Retention: Ability of college program to maintain student population numbers.

Student Hour: Time based references for the measurement of educational attainment. Also referred to as the Carnegie Unit or Credit Hour.

Transfer: Student completion of course work at a two-year institution that enables them to enter a four-year college as a junior.

Vocational Trades: Courses that prepare students for a specific career that may or may not be labor intensive. Examples include: diesel mechanic, culinary arts, paralegal, etc. Programs may be for or not for-credit. Courses units can also lead to completion of an associate of arts or associate of science degree.

Dissertation Organization

The organization of this dissertation follows the traditional format beginning with front matter. The first chapter introduces the purpose and focus of the study. It identifies its significance, provides an overview of its methodology, and states how the findings contribute to the field of community college leadership studies. The second chapter presents a literature review explaining the problem statement along with a synopsis of the literature substantiating the study. The third chapter introduces the methodology, along with a rationalization for choosing the approach. Descriptions of research setting, methods of data
collection, and methods of analysis follow. The fourth chapter presents the findings of the study. The fifth chapter concludes with a discussion of the best methods for implementing the findings of this study.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

I examined factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Specifically, I identified individual, institutional, and environmental factors that foster academic entrepreneurialism and the relationship between these factors and entrepreneurial behavior with the intent of assisting community colleges to create and maintain a campus environment that consciously encourages and supports academic entrepreneurialism.

The significance of this study lies in the identification of factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty to support community college leaders in responding to the current fiscal crisis through entrepreneurialism (Wheatley, 2006). The pursuit of entrepreneurialism is necessary for CCC survival, as there is a need to augment the decline of public funding (Brightman, 1989). The economic recession of 2007-2010 placed community colleges in a precarious situation. While higher education funding models are broken (Greer, 2010), identifying institutional climates that encourage entrepreneurialism along with individual pursuits of faculty, including financial gain, are important to recognize (Amey, 2010). Indeed, changing trends in the American economy require higher institutions of learning, including colleges and research universities, to pursue ventures that may fall outside of their research mission (Bird & Allen, 1989).

For purposes of organization, I divide the literature review into four sections. The first section examines the role of academic entrepreneurialism in United States higher education with a focus on the emergence, growth, and recent trends, while the second section shifts focus to academic entrepreneurialism in community colleges. The third
section reviews individual, institutional, and environmental characteristics of academic entrepreneurialism. Finally, the fourth section discusses the conceptual framework of rational choice theory that I used to examine how individual, institutional, and environmental factors foster academic entrepreneurialism.

**Academic Entrepreneurialism in Higher Education**

Public institutions of higher learning face greater competition from private sector institutions that offer similar job training and academic degrees (Murphy, 2004; Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004). This trend applies to all levels of higher education. Slaughter and Rhoads (2004) argue, “... the theory of academic capitalism moves beyond thinking of the student as consumer to considering the institution as marketer” (p. 1). To remain relevant in the marketplace, public institutions of higher learning are copying the business model of private nonprofit and for-profit institutions (Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004). Higher education is increasingly seen as a commodity similar to copper, oil and wheat instead of a public good (Pusser, 2002). There is seemingly little difference in income generating behavior among nonprofit and for-profit institutions of higher education (Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004).

Postsecondary entrepreneurialism has become even more relevant as public sector institutions of higher learning seek additional revenue streams (Stripling, 2010). Mars and Metcalfe (2009) argue that entrepreneurialism has become an institutionalized trend. They define academic entrepreneurialism as “those activities that combine risk, innovation, and opportunity, particularly in times of uncertain resources” (p. 3). However, the authors also proclaim that its pursuit remains controversial.
Academic leaders at these institutions continue to pursue partnerships with leaders in enterprise and government that capitalize on the strengths of their campus. However, some faculty members at these institutions may have issues with some economic development partnerships. Fischer (2006) finds these professors believe it may “distract and detract from their institutions’ core missions of teaching and research” (p. 2). Some proponents of this function of higher education argue there is a necessary component of regional economic success. This is especially the case made for community colleges as they seek enterprising solutions to better serve their customer market. Fischer (2006) identifies a key barrier to college entrepreneurialism being resistant faculty. The fundamental issue is that most tenure and promotion systems fail to encourage entrepreneurialism (Fischer, 2006).

Administrators at higher institutions of learning are increasingly embracing entrepreneurial answers to the dilemma of dwindling public funding (Hill, 1978; Murphy, 2004). Thorp and Goldstein (2010) have written extensively on the importance of entrepreneurial pursuits for institutions of higher learning, whether they may be a public or private institution, community college, or trade school. Their research shows that community colleges and trade schools exemplify what it means to be an entrepreneurial university. These schools quickly adopt methods and values from the commercial world, focusing on big problems, while maintaining the belief that liberal arts education is the fuel for American innovation (Thorp & Goldstein, 2010).

American institutions of higher learning have been instrumental in maintaining their belief in liberal arts education, which has been instrumental in propelling American innovation. Drucker maintains the belief that entrepreneurs innovate (Drucker, 2001). Thorp and Goldstein add that entrepreneurial institutions of higher learning encourage their
faculty and staff to be innovators who look for any beneficial opportunity. This also includes the pursuit of private market partnerships (Thorp & Goldstein, 2010).

Private institutions exist to fill a market need that public institutions are unable or unwilling to offer (Kinser, 2009). By contrast, public and private nonprofit institutions must dedicate the majority of their funds towards educating students. For-profit institutions do not enjoy nonprofit tax exempt status as their principal focus is benefitting their private owners or public shareholders (2009). Quality, access, and adaptable program offerings are just some reasons why a student may elect a college program from a private rather than public institution. Many students are willing to pay and/or accumulate school tuition debt if they believe there is intrinsic value to the educational program (2009). Critics of public institutions argue that there is a neoliberal argument for defending private institutions as they serve a viable market need that the public sector fails to acknowledge (Pusser, 2002).

Private sector pursuits of efficiency and innovation encourage public sector institutions to improve (Rosenbaum, Deil-Amen, & Person, 2006). Those public institutions that are very stable and offer unique programs may not need to be extra vigilant in the pursuit of efficiency and innovation. Though these public institutions of learning may have a profitable business model, there is no guarantee that a private model can never become more successful than a stable public institution (Brightman, 1989; Murphy, 2004; Rosenbaum, Deil-Amen, & Person, 2006).

**Academic Entrepreneurialism in Community Colleges**

Community colleges continue to play a strong role in higher education since the 1947 Truman Commission Report on higher education, which argued for community learning centers to accomplish two primary tasks. The first is to prepare adults for
productive roles in society. Community colleges offer job training and academic degrees to a target market consisting primarily of low and moderate-income residents (Brightman, 1989).

The second task was to encourage life-long learning (Boone, 1997). Community colleges in the United States enroll over 50% of higher education students. Boone (1997) describes the traditional role community colleges play to assist students seeking academic degrees and/or vocational training. The report’s findings maintain validity today with its finding that these institutions should charge little to no tuition as well as serve cultural needs, offer lifelong learning opportunities and give adults the opportunity to pursue academic and technical education. Entrepreneurialism began with community colleges due to their level of collaboration with the private sector. This enables community colleges to better tailor curriculum to meet the present as well as future needs of industry (1997).

Community colleges are capable of adapting their services to new market needs (Hull, 2005). Their ability to adapt quickly is usually a role that community colleges perform better. The natural evolution of community college leadership came from traditional public school bureaucratic models that follow the top-down hierarchical chain of command structure (Cloud, 2010). This model has been consistently evolving in an effort to establish best practices for preparing academic leaders who embrace academic entrepreneurialism.

Community colleges are increasingly realizing that revenue diversification may be a relatively new phenomenon for their institutions, but a common practice in commercial and industrial enterprises (Brightman, 1989). Examples of revenue diversification include the operation of a video arcade, renting out campus facilities and investing college funds into
private business ventures that can include off campus real estate development (1989). Community colleges are embracing entrepreneurialism to persevere and survive in a market system that increasingly identifies all education as the same (Brightman, 1989; Murphy, 2004).

Contract education is another pursuit that is gaining in practice. Community colleges engage in contract education agreements with private entities to provide either non-credit or for-credit instruction at remuneration rates that pays the entire cost of offering a course (Hull, 2005). Brightman (1989) argues that most business organizations are prone to pursue multiple opportunities that may lead their institutions into business ventures having nothing to do with their institution. Brightman (1989) demonstrates that community colleges are like any private or public business in the pursuit of revenue diversification, which he defined as “...a business venture, either developed or acquired, for which the community college or college district is responsible as a result of its ownership for all or a controlling share of the venture. The purpose of the activity is to make a profit that can be used to help support educational and other related activities” (p. 60). Melissa Crawford, the director of the Scheinfeld Center for Entrepreneurship & Innovation at Santa Barbara City College has an issue with loose definitions of the term entrepreneur. She argues that entrepreneurs invent new methods to accomplish old tasks, seeking greater efficiency and innovation, or new ways to satisfy needs that are yet identifiable (Community College Entrepreneurship, 2010).

Finding creative answers to a problem is another example of entrepreneurialism. Brock and Richburg’s study of a Louisiana program assisting low-income parents is an example of community college entrepreneurialism. The program assists low-income parents attending community college by paying for a greater share of relating expenses that include
rent, transportation, and food allowances. Society benefits from its citizens becoming more productive (Brock & Richburg, 2006).

Like their four-year university counterparts, community colleges face competition from private for-profit and private nonprofit colleges. Community colleges can be significantly cheaper than private for-profit and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning. Cost is not the sole factor influencing student choice. For example, veterans are a target for campus recruitment. Field (2008) argues that veterans transitioning back to civilian life are unique, as they especially prefer community colleges and for-profit institutions for their convenience factors. These institutions are more likely to provide specialized services to veteran students. Community colleges are highly effective at offering special services to veteran students. Their lower cost allows veteran students to better stretch their student tuition assistance under the GI Bill (Field, 2008). Community colleges are still relevant in those communities where they remain the only higher education option. There is no guarantee that community colleges can remain relevant when facing greater private institution competition (Murphy, 2004).

Larger numbers of community college presidents believe that campus leaders must fully embrace entrepreneurialism. Training new leaders about this philosophy has become necessary. Campbell, Syed, and Morris (2010) discuss the need to develop a community college leadership program integrating interpersonal competency building encapsulating personality and work-style profiling along with individualized instruction in areas flagged for improvements. Their work does not address gaps in community college leadership development, as there is little focus on encouraging entrepreneurialism. Increasing revenue to satisfy community demands for programs requires greater emphasis on academic
entrepreneurialism. There is a lack of research on how to encourage faculty to pursue entrepreneurial endeavors. Most of the literature does not address the value of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty.

External circumstances can be either beneficial or detrimental to a community college. Preparing for all external variables is next to impossible. Floyd, Masslin-Ostrowski and Hrabak (2010) examine both the causes and effects of leadership “wounding” as it pertains to the community college presidency. “Wounding” occurs when the legitimacy of a leader is put into question following individual action or inaction to a particular or series of events. A decrease in legitimacy can result in the inability to lead effectively. Educational leaders can either sit on the sidelines or dive into skirmishes that are the product of every campus institution. Not being willing to offer decisive leadership during trying times can cause a mortal wound to a leadership resulting in their termination. Entrepreneurialism is a risky pursuit. A great number of college presidents were once faculty. Though Floyd, Masslin-Ostrowski and Hrabak make no mention of methods to encourage academic entrepreneurialism among faculty, they offer insight into the various pitfalls one may experience.

Community college presidents are no longer the sole representatives and decision makers of their campus. Students have taken advantage of having direct access to board members, trustee meetings and the right to attend campus senate meetings. Decision-making is harder to prevent for a campus president as Hodgkinson (1971) says they are no longer able to state, “He (she) would have to consult the on-campus groups before announcing a recommendation to the board” (p. 369). Situations have not become “real-time” situations with little time to reflect and or consult before making a major decision.
Presidents intend to pursue entrepreneurial endeavors, yet are unable to break the current restrictions society places on their office. Hodgkinson examines the role of college presidents as leaders of their institution. Due to the ability of groups to circumvent the president, it is possible for entrepreneurial agents, including faculty, to carry out a set agenda.

**Characteristics of Academic Entrepreneurialism**

Academic entrepreneurialism can include pursuing business investments, advancing career strategies, and enhancing personal growth. The problem that I addressed is a lack of knowledge about individual, institutional, and environmental factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty and how these factors relate to entrepreneurial behavior among faculty. Most studies examine each individual factor individually without examining how they influence one another. This section investigates the characteristics of individual, institutional, and environmental factors from current literature. Faculty characteristics examine how individual personality traits, belief systems, and leadership traits influence academic entrepreneurial behavior. Institutional characteristics examine the ability of entrepreneurial community colleges to meet community needs with courses and programs that may require external funding, including institutional mission, funding priorities, and curricular offerings. Environmental characteristics examine the peer effects of faculty on entrepreneurial behavior.

**Individual Faculty Characteristics of Academic Entrepreneurialism**

The most important factor determining whether a faculty member is entrepreneurial is their individual characteristics. Faculty entrepreneurs share certain fundamental personality traits. These individuals are usually charismatic, as faculty entrepreneurs are
extroverted instead of introverted (Gergen & Vanourek, 2008). Entrepreneurs also have the urge to take calculated risks (Hackerman & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2002). In fact, once these individuals identify a problem, they will find a creative solution (Floyd & Hrabak, 2010; Goldsmith, 2007). An example of how academic entrepreneurs find solutions to a problem was detailed in a study by Kaplan & Wilson. Their study explored how two entrepreneurial faculty members took it upon themselves to establish a new Independent Human Studies (HIS) program at Schoolcraft College. These two faculty members had come to realize that students can learn by utilizing the same methods as their instructors: from the process of preparing and researching what they teach (Kaplan & Wilson, 1978). Northouse’s examination of the basic aspects of leadership identifies two leadership traditions that academic entrepreneurs are utilizing to reform community colleges. These are transformational and team leadership (Northouse, 2007). Transformational leadership involves convincing people of the necessity of changing themselves in order to improve their overall ability to lead and be led. Team leadership is the realization that leaders are unable to achieve goals without followers. This requires the leader to constantly analyze what the team is doing while offering praise and rewards to encourage participation. These two characteristics are appropriate for identifying those factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism.

Hess (2006) conducted a study of how entrepreneurial leaders are reshaping academia. He reports that new leaders are emerging within faculty ranks and administrators who are willing to incorporate new modern techniques to better prepare students for a more challenging future. With these pursuits come risks, both to the institution, and to the entrepreneurial academic leader (Hess, 2006). The characteristics of these new leaders
match those of effective college presidents, including personality traits, ethnicity, demography and other variables that better identify the development of an entrepreneurial work ethic (Hess, 2006; Fisher & Koch, 2004).

Being entrepreneurial does not require a college education or any special training. Goleman (2000) has made great contributions to the field of emotional and social intelligence. He argues that our typical measurements of IQ do not take into account the ability of a person to effectively deal with peers from the position of having a high degree of emotional and social intelligence. Goleman argues that a person’s overdependence on their technical strengths is a weakness rather than strength (Goleman, 2000). The ability to prevent emotions from overtaking their well-being is more valuable to the successful entrepreneur than a college degree (2000). The ability to establish a rapport is a keen trait of empathy that allows the entrepreneur to succeed (Goleman, 2007).

Goleman identifies emotional intelligence as the ability to have self-control while maintaining stamina in their pursuit of a goal. Individuals have to remain aware that they possess both a rational and emotional mind, which not only influences their personal behavior, but how they understand people (Goleman, 2000). There are five domains of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognizing emotions in others, and handling relationships. Goleman also identifies four components of interpersonal intelligence that correlate to entrepreneurial behavior. These are the abilities to organize groups, negotiate solutions, establish personal connections, and analyze social situations. This determines whether a person has the charm and charisma to achieve social success (2000).
Outside of academia, entrepreneurs can be found in all industries, whether they may be public or private. Gergen and Vanourek (2008) examined various forms of entrepreneurialism that includes business investment strategies, career advancement, and personal growth. They found that money is not the sole purpose for entrepreneurialism. It is instead a drive to make positive contributions to their well-being, whether it is physical, mental, and/or spiritual, along with the feeling that they are making a positive impact on society (Gergen & Vanourek, 2008). Aside from these characteristics of entrepreneurialism, there is a need to reassess your accomplishments to identify barriers preventing future success. Goldsmith identifies this one barrier seldom discussed as self-imposed barriers (Goldsmith, 2007). Entrepreneurs may periodically deal with the frustration of limited personal ability along with institutional and environmental constraints (2007).

People with high emotional and social intelligence are keenly aware of their social surroundings. This in turn allows them to develop their inner voice that can be more dependable than logic alone. Another key benefit is the growth of individual wisdom. Development of their inner voice and the ability to control personal emotions are essential qualities of the successful entrepreneur (Goleman, 2000). Those entrepreneurs who are the most successful are not primarily focusing on wealth accumulation. Their primary goal is to make positive contributions to society (Goleman, 2006).

**Institutional Characteristics of Academic Entrepreneurial Campuses**

In addition to individual faculty entrepreneurial characteristics, institutions exhibit distinct entrepreneurial characteristics. There are two fundamental characteristics of community colleges that tend to be more entrepreneurial. The first is an institutional commitment of community colleges to develop programs that meet the needs of a
community. The second is a shared interest to develop courses meeting community demands even though state funding is not enough to cover the expense (Downey, Pusser, & Turner, 2006).

Academic entrepreneurial campuses seek out external funding sources to supplement lower state funding allowances (Ebbers, Conover, & Samuels, 2010). These courses are often in vocational trade, career technical education, and workforce development.

Academic entrepreneurial campuses exhibit this institutional characteristic by articulating within their mission statements their dedication to student job placement through their vocational trade, career technical education, and workforce development programs (Hearn, 2003).

In addition, an area of interest among more entrepreneurial community colleges is the increasing attention that institutions of higher learning play with neighborhood economic development (Bird & Allen, 1989). Economic downturns can present both a short-term negative impact along with the opportunity to make long-term plans that can benefit a college. There are instances when chaos can encourage leaders to innovate, finding entrepreneurial solutions to problems. The resulting changes can result in the college becoming even more successful than prior to the chaotic moment (Wheatley, 2006).

Responding to a crisis through entrepreneurialism applies to any type of business, including a community college. Institutional prioritization of entrepreneurial endeavors may be more likely as a reaction to chaotic occurrences that include budgetary cutbacks (Brightman, 1989; Wheatley, 2006; Amey, 2010).
Variables that influence the mission statement of a community college can determine its ability to foster academic entrepreneurialism. Hill’s (1978) investigation of these variables found a wide range of educational tasks, including transfer education, terminal education, general education, occupational education, adult education, developmental education, community services, and guidance. Of particular concern is one other variable that is wide in nature, namely that the role of the community college is evolving (Hill, 1978). Community colleges that recognize the need to evolve while being open to community input are more prone to exhibit academic entrepreneurialism. Indeed, these campuses tend not to state their sole reliance on public funding, but instead focus on their fundamental mission of enriching their students, community and nation (Greer, 2010).

Institutional changes are not only a reaction to chaos. They can also occur as a reaction to market needs presently or in the future. The Community College League of California (1993) released a study in 1993 titled “California Community Colleges in 2010: Four Scenarios” that listed four possible scenarios that community colleges may face in the future, along with students, faculty, administrators, and trustees. These scenarios listed future demands of communities resulting from technological advancements, future job trends, and how CCCs can meet these demands (Community College League of California, 1993). Multiple community college districts in the state of California have responded to these needs. These include updates of their college mission along with large capital investments that include facility upgrades, elimination of obsolete courses/programs, and the creation/implementation of new programs and departments. For example, Santa Clarita Community College District is a two-campus district that embraces academic entrepreneurialism as the one key engine for a successful academic institution. Examples of
the district’s academic entrepreneurialism include the ability of students to pursue their bachelor’s degree at College of the Canyons and instituting new courses such as Geographic Information Systems and Environmental Sciences (Hook, 2011).

**Environmental Characteristics of Academic Entrepreneurial Campuses**

Environmental characteristics relate to the peer influences within which a faculty member operates on a campus (Hearn, 2003). Environmental characteristics of academic entrepreneurial campuses develop and reproduce peer influences that encourage faculty to exhibit entrepreneurial behavior (Hess, 2006). The literature identifies faculty as the individuals who harness knowledge and skills to establish viable programs that allow students to become effective learners (Goldberg, 1978). Entrepreneurial faculty influence their peers and the college environment itself. Levels of academic entrepreneurialism vary according to community college departments, whether they are academic or vocational trade programs. The overall level of academic entrepreneurialism at a community college may depend on whether the campus focuses mostly on academic or vocational trade programs (Hull, 2005). In turn, these variables influence the mission statement of a community college (Lattuca & Stark, 2009).

Fostering entrepreneurialism requires a nurturing college environment that encourages and rewards faculty academic entrepreneurialism (Goldberg, 1978; Amey, 2010). Most research on faculty entrepreneurialism predominantly focuses on research university environments and not community colleges. Research university environments are more likely to encourage its faculty to pursue special projects that are dependent on external funding sources. Entrepreneurialism among community college faculty is relevant as
matters of declining government funding encourage entrepreneurial ventures for college survival (Brightman, 1989; Wallin, 2010).

Goldberg (1978) sees college faculty as the entrepreneurial engine within a campus. For example, given that faculty are a major force in promoting an entrepreneurial environment on campus, sometimes a strong or even exclusive focus on entrepreneurial pursuits can create problems (Goldsmith, 2007). Indeed, faculty peers may stress that focusing too greatly on academic entrepreneurial pursuits may negatively affect the teaching ability of faculty at their campus (Lee & Rhoads, 2004).

**Rational Choice as a Conceptual Framework**

Rational choice theory attempts to discern the primary motivation behind individual behavior while attempting to understand group behavior (Lane, 1996). Rational choice theory embraces two schools of economic research: macroeconomics and microeconomics. The theory is primarily useful for understanding individual and group behavior within an economic system. Rational choice theorists attempt to compare how supply and demand correlates with individual rationality and self-interest (Green & Shapiro, 1994, 1996). Rational choice theory is a micro-level explanatory model that focuses on individual behavior.

Rationalists claim that we can expect individuals to act according to their self-interests. When actors make decisions against their self-interests it is likely a result of having imperfect information. It is quite difficult for actors to possess perfect information. Even if information is accurate one day, it can always change the next, thereby leaving actors at a disadvantage (Lane, 1996). This is why institutions can serve to maintain
common knowledge and assure actors that the rules of the game will not change (Katzenstein, Keohane, & Krasner, 1998).

Rational choice theory has a component called the “free rider problem.” The classic free rider problem is relevant to this study as community colleges are societies in themselves. This problem occurs whenever a collective project benefits someone regardless of his or her level of contribution towards its establishment. At issue is how to encourage someone to invest towards something that may or may not benefit him or her directly. The free rider problem can help explain lacking institutional commitment to academic entrepreneurialism as this behavior is not a necessary component to a faculty position.

Rational choice theory also has a component called the “collective goods problem.” People may find it necessary to misrepresent their intentions and/or positions in order to benefit from a collective good while contributing little to no resources towards its establishment (Samuelson, 1954). This issue results with all public or collective goods. It pertains to those faculty members who are not willing to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. They would rather let peers take on extra assignments and tasks while reaping the benefits of a successful endeavor. The collective goods problem can explain why some faculty members are lacking the urge to be academic entrepreneurs. This results in a lack of individual faculty commitment to academic entrepreneurialism that in turn has a direct influence on the campus environment. The overall campus environment either encourages or discourages faculty to pursue academic entrepreneurialism.

Rational choice theory explains how the overall institutional environment determines whether faculty pursue academic entrepreneurialism. This is a classic free rider problem where there is no incentive to contribute if the collective good benefits everybody. No
society or community college wants to be lackluster or poor. Rational choice theory holds that most rational individuals within a community college would rather be rich or successful rather than poor or lackluster. Rational choice theory claims that the route to entrepreneurial prosperity is the same as achieving economic success. Rational choice theory also examines institutional constraints that prevent individuals from seeking prosperity (Bates & Curry, 1992), or in this case, academic entrepreneurialism.

Strategic interaction also comes into play with rational choice theory. This is the implication that indecisions made by one individual are according to decisions made by others, which leads us to game theory. Prisoner’s dilemma is one aspect of strategic interaction. Another factor built into any rational choice argument is the understanding of constraints. There are two types of constraints on decisions: scarcity and institutional constraints. Individuals base their decisions according to what is available. Institutional constraints include the inability to mobilize people, for possessing this option would allow individuals to get things done quickly. Constraints can also consist of laws.

I used rational choice theory to examine factors that foster academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Rational choice theory attempts to discern the primary motivation behind individual and group behavior (Lane, 1996). Rational choice analysis involves conducting a cost benefit analysis that is the basis of self-interest behavior (1996). Individuals weigh the cost along with the benefits and then decide to pursue something if the benefits outweigh the costs. If we assume that people base their actions on self-interest, then we have to come to terms with situations involving actions that are not beneficial. This requires factoring the quality of information that someone has been able to accrue. If the quality of the information is faulty, but that individual still pursues an
agenda resulting in the cost outweighing the benefit, then that person did not possess perfect information. Decision makers rarely have access to perfect information, as they simply do not possess viable access to the information required to make a rational decision. This includes a lack of experience, limited data, lack of education, inability to assess actions of others, lack of knowing future developments, or even just bad luck.

I will use Lane’s conception of rational choice theory even though he is critical of its adoption among social scientists. Lane argues that law and business schools are presently developing microeconomic theories of greater dependability. The fundamental reason is that it is impossible for any theory that attempts to explain human behavior to dismiss the inherent qualities of the individual (Lane, 1996). My study examines individual, institutional, and environmental factors that foster academic entrepreneurialism. This requires a rational choice theory that recognizes the importance of human behavior.

Lane’s conception of rational choice theory emphasizes the inherent qualities of the individual. This results from external environmental variables that include socio-economic standing, societal influences (media, religion, political), and the belief systems of a family. A person’s qualities develop over the course of their childhood into adulthood. This in turn determines the development of their belief systems. It also influences what they deem to be rational behavior.

Rational choice analysis is based on the concept of self-interest behavior that involves conducting a cost benefit analysis. Individuals weigh the cost along with the benefits and then decide to pursue something if the benefits outweigh the costs. If we assume that people base their actions on self-interest, then we have to come to terms with situations involving actions that are not beneficial. Lane argues that this is rectified if we
factor in the quality of information that someone has been able to accrue. Individual behavior is the underlying influence for all factors I examined. Lane’s focus on the inherent qualities of the individual further legitimates his conception of rational choice theory.

The primary function of a theoretical framework is to assist with the explanation of a common phenomenon that exists without explanation. I examined factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. I used a form of rational choice theory that is partially drawn from Lane along with additional concepts that came into being through the data accumulation process using grounded theory. The end result is a unique form of rational choice theory to make the argument that all three factors work together to influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. I seek to add to the realm of knowledge about this important topic to enable community colleges to encourage academic entrepreneurialism among their faculty.

**Conclusion**

The literature on the role of academic entrepreneurialism in the United States makes the argument that private institutions are leading in these pursuits while public institutions try to maintain pace. This is true throughout the entire education system, from K-12 to higher education. Public institutions of higher learning, especially community colleges offering academic and vocational trades programs are capable of quickly adapting to market needs. A review of the literature shows that the majority of these community colleges are more likely to embrace academic entrepreneurialism if they are facing competition from the private sector. Those community colleges operating in areas with little to no private competition are less likely to be academic entrepreneurial pioneers. The literature fails to
address what factors encourage academic entrepreneurialism at those community colleges not facing private market competition.

The literature on institutional and faculty motivation and commitment to academic entrepreneurialism focuses mostly on public and private universities with less attention given to community colleges. Preference is also given to administrative entrepreneurialism with regards to fundraising and private market partnerships instead of faculty academic entrepreneurialism. Another key factor missing from the literature is a lack of study on how individual, institutional, and environmental factors influence each other to foster academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty.

The literature that examines academic entrepreneurialism deals mostly with establishing new student programs and/or attracting new avenues of funding (Ebbers, Conover, & Samuels, 2010). In fact, research that focuses on academic entrepreneurialism largely treats an issue unrelated to faculty: administrative and presidential leadership fundraising techniques (Hearn, 2003). What we know less about and what have not been studied particularly in community college contexts are factors that facilitate faculty engagement in academic pursuits.

**Research Questions**

I sought to identify individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Accordingly, the research questions intend to identify key factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty and explain how they facilitate faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. The research questions that I evaluated are:
1. What individual, institutional, and environmental factors influence community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism?

2. What is the relationship between faculty background, institutional, and environmental characteristics and the frequency and quality of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty?
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Accordingly, the research questions intend to identify key factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty and explain how they facilitate faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. The research questions that I evaluated are:

1. What individual, institutional, and environmental factors influence community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism?
2. What is the relationship between faculty background, institutional, and environmental characteristics and the frequency and quality of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty?

This chapter presents the following sections: research design and tradition, research setting and context, research sample and data sources, instruments and procedures, data collection, data analysis, roles of the researcher, and a summary of information presented in this chapter.

Research Design and Tradition

Case Study

The study utilizes a case study design. Merriam (2009) states that case study approaches were once “catch all” references to grouping subjects of a study according to their common characteristics and how they interact with one another (p. 39). Merriam defines a case study as “… an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (p. 40). According to Merriam, case studies have four elements. The first element of a case
study is the quality of being bounded. This study is bounded as all fourteen subjects were found within the confines of the college. That is, each research subject in this study shares the characteristic of being a faculty member at a single campus. According to Merriam, the second element of a case study is the quality of being particularistic. This means that the case study is looking at a particular situation, behavior, or program. The case itself is essential to understanding the phenomenon and what it demonstrates. Being particularistic is appropriate for addressing questions or to help explain events that arise naturally. This study is particularistic in that it seeks to address questions related to identifying individual, institutional, and environmental factors that promote academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. According to Merriam, the third element of a case study is the quality of being descriptive. This is the end result of a study that presents a rich and thick description of the phenomenon under investigation. I attempted to identify and describe individual, institutional, and environmental factors that promote academic entrepreneurialism. Finally, according to Merriam, the fourth element of a case study is the quality of being heuristic. This quality relates to the readers’ knowledge of the phenomenon and the expansion of their knowledge (Merriam). The goal of this study was to do just that: enhance what we know about academic entrepreneurialism in the community college.

Research Tradition

I used a case study design that borrows principles from grounded theory. As founding thinkers of grounded theory, Strauss and Glaser suggest that collection of data through examination of day-to-day activities of a research subject allows the researcher to generate a theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In addition, grounded theory allows the careful examination of internal factors, or individual belief systems, as well as external factors, or
The goal is to develop a theory that has a direct relation to what the study seeks to explain (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This process involves the researcher to do the following: classify a phenomenon, object, setting, or event; identify concepts, principles, or an occurring phenomenon; justify the collection of data according to the researcher’s understanding of a phenomenon; utilize theoretical sampling with a group of subjects to better understand the phenomenon; and state the rationale for subject selection (1967). Using this process, I used grounded theory in this study to develop a theory to explain what factors facilitate academic entrepreneurial behavior through the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data.

Research Setting and Context

I used Southern California Community College (SCCC) as the case site for examination. SCCC, a pseudonym, has a reputation for possessing highly entrepreneurial faculty. The college lies in the middle of a diverse urban environment within the Southern California region. SCCC is a commuter college that is predominantly Hispanic with African Americans comprising the second largest student group. White non-Hispanics are the smallest minority. Males comprise the majority of all undergraduates. The college offers various trade-vocational, certificated programs along with academic transfer courses and various associate degrees in arts and science.

Glesne emphasizes that the selection of a case study requires the researcher to first examine the individual subjects and/or individuals within a case, prior to selecting a case site (2010). This can include casual data collection activities such as visual or audible observations or utilize more formal protocols to record and analyze the behavior of subjects (Glesne). With this consideration, I conducted a preliminary review of SCCC as a case site.
through an examination of publicly available document and archival data with a focus on three factors: institutional employee recruitment; institutional entrepreneurial success; institutional job placement. This initial, casual review revealed that the most innovative academic entrepreneurial pursuits at SCCC are under the umbrella of career technical education (CTE). Students in a CTE program are able to secure a certificate along with a corresponding associates degree and have the opportunity to continue their education at a four-year university. Examples of dual certificated and degree programs include sustainable energy, restaurant management, hybrid automotive repair, and chemical technology. There is also evidence of academic entrepreneurial faculty within the departments of social and behavioral sciences, language arts, natural sciences, counseling, and physical education that include private partnerships, job placement assistance, private business pursuits, and market advisory committees that influence the establishment of new programs. These pursuits for all major departments go beyond the common understanding of academic entrepreneurialism that normally focuses on fundraising, scholarship creation, and the pursuit of grants.

I examined SCCC specifically for its strong entrepreneurial faculty in the following major departments: social and behavioral sciences; language arts; natural sciences; counseling; physical education; and vocational trades. I used critical case sampling strategy with my selection of SCCC. Sampling involves two actions in qualitative research. The first involves setting boundaries that define aspects of a case within the timeframe of research. The second requires a researcher to produce a process to help discover the fundamental elements of the study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Critical case sampling allows for making local generalizations that allow for applying information to further cases with the assumption that if it is true for one then it must be true for all (1994). The use of
critical case sampling is appropriate, as the goal of this study was to provide knowledge to academic leaders who seek to encourage their faculty to embrace academic entrepreneurial traits at their respective community college campuses.

**Data Sources and Sample**

I used two sources of data. The primary source of data came from fourteen faculty members representing the following departments: social and behavioral sciences; language arts; natural sciences; counseling; physical education; and vocational trades. A secondary data source was document and archival data related to entrepreneurial pursuits of the fourteen faculty members. I used these sources of data to explain the individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism.

**Faculty Interviews**

Fourteen faculty member interviews served as research subjects and the primary source of data for this study. All research subjects were working on a full-time basis at the case site (SCCC) during the data collection period of this study. An administrator at SCCC sent a campus wide e-mail written by myself to all SCCC faculty members with a campus e-mail address (refer to Appendix C for solicitation e-mail). The purpose of the e-mail was to solicit twelve to fifteen faculty members for my study who were either a current or previous principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisor, consultant, or affiliate of any program or pursuit with the goal of furthering student success. Those selected to participate in a 45 to 60 minute interview received a $20 Starbucks card for their time (refer to Appendix D for acceptance e-mail). I sent a rejection e-mail to those who did not satisfy selection criteria (refer to Appendix E for rejection e-mail).
The diversity of research subjects spans across all major faculty departments at SCCC. Fourteen faculty members comprise the primary data source. As shown in Table 1, three represent social and behavioral sciences, one represents language arts, three represent natural sciences, one represents physical education, one represents counseling, and four represent vocational trades. Table 1 demonstrates the diversity of gender representation. One male and two females represent social and behavioral sciences; one male represents language arts; three males and one female represent natural sciences; one female represents physical education; one female represents counseling; and one male and three females represent vocational trades. The scope of this study would not allow equal representation from all departments within the academic and vocational trade departments.

Table 1
Faculty Representing Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>Vocational Trades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diversity of research subjects also spans across all major faculty departments at SCCC. Table 2 demonstrates the diversity of faculty subjects within the academic, vocational trade and physical education departments. Five males and four females represent the academic departments; one male and three females represent the vocational trade departments; and no males and one female represent the physical education department.
Table 2

Diversity of Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Departments</th>
<th>Vocational Trades</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is little diversity concerning the academic degrees of research subjects, as the majority possesses masters degrees. Table 3 presents the academic degrees of research subjects. Four males and seven females have masters degree and two males and one female have doctorate degrees.

Table 3

Highest Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masters Degree</th>
<th>Doctorate Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis of backgrounds demonstrates the diversity of research subjects. Table 4 breaks down the diversity of research subjects according to their respective discipline in terms of gender, whether they attended community college, whether they attended SCCC, their private industry experience and if they are currently involved in private industry. One male represents the discipline of anthropology. The male participant never attended community college and has private industry experience. Two males represent the discipline of astronomy / physics. Both males attended community college and are currently in private industry. One male represents the discipline of biology. The male never attended community college and has private industry experience. One female
represents the discipline of child development. The female attended community college and has private industry experience.

One female represents the discipline of chemical technology, attended SCCC, and is currently working in private industry. One female represents the discipline of counseling, never attended community college, and is currently working in private industry. One female represents the discipline of history, attended community college, and has private industry experience. One female represents the discipline of mathematics, never attended community college, and has private industry experience. One female represents the discipline of nursing, never attended community college, and has private industry experience. One female represents the discipline of physical education, attended community college, and has private industry experience. One female represents the discipline of psychology, attended community college, and has industry experience. One male represents the discipline of speech, never attended community college, and is currently in private industry. One male represents the discipline of welding, attended SCCC, and is currently in private industry.
Table 4
Faculty Representing Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Attended Community College</th>
<th>Attended SCCC</th>
<th>Private Industry Experience</th>
<th>Currently In Private Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy / Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document and Archival Data

Secondary data consisted of document and archival evidence of factors that support academic entrepreneurialism. In addition, document data consists of institutional sources presenting evidence relating to the individual, institutional, and environmental factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism. Documents and archival data for this study are freely available to the public and do not require any permission for access or utilization. They are accessible via SCCC’s website or available directly from the individual faculty.
member. I required the following types of documents and archival data: committee minutes; grant proposals; campus contracts; official correspondence; job announcements; job descriptions; financial account holdings for special projects; and relevant contracts relating to academic entrepreneurial endeavors.

Academic job descriptions for special assignments falling under instructor special assignment (ISA), classified, or administrative positions are consistent. The district human resources office maintains the job descriptions for these positions. SCCC hiring committees tailor job announcements for these positions according to the district human resources department. Consistency of job announcements and job descriptions apply to those positions falling under ISA, classified, or administrative.

The analysis of job descriptions and job announcements acknowledges that there lacks a consistent hiring practice for academic instruction positions. This realization results in the creation of rubrics in the recommendation section of this study that addresses academic entrepreneurialism as it pertains to: job descriptions, job announcements, and faculty evaluations.

**Sampling Strategy**

I used criterion and chain sampling strategies for participant selection. The first strategy is a criterion sampling of faculty who meet the following criteria below. Criterion sampling strategies requires the setting of the criteria all cases have to meet. Criterion sampling allows for exclusion without any direct influence on its pursuit or participation in academic entrepreneurialism.
Criteria assist in determining whether a potential research subject represents the characteristics of academic entrepreneurialism. Criterion sampling allowed for the selection of fourteen faculty members. The first criterion was that each research subject during the time of study was either currently or previously a principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisor, consultant, or affiliate of a program or pursuit that exemplifies academic entrepreneurialism. This requirement prevented the selection of academic entrepreneurial faculty members without any direct influence with the pursuit. A second criterion for selection required research participants to be working either on a full-time or part-time basis at a community college that serves commuter students in a major urban environment.

Utilizing a criterion sampling strategy required access to lists of full-time and part-time faculty to confirm eligibility. Once a faculty member responded to the e-mail solicitation, confirmation of their eligibility took place using SCCC’s print and online class schedule. No special permission was necessary, as the list was publicly available via the college’s print and online catalog. The online version was preferable as it was more up to date. Full-time faculty members are more likely to be available on campus during normal business hours in comparison to part-time faculty members. This is useful when attempting to schedule their 45 to 60 minute interview. SCCC’s print and online catalog also allowed for determining whether potential subjects meet all of the following criteria in the selection process:

1. Is the faculty member currently employed by SCCC?
2. Is the faculty member either currently or previously a principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisor, consultant, or affiliate of a program or pursuit that exemplifies academic entrepreneurialism?

**Sampling rubric for additional screening.**

Development of a rubric was necessary in order to advance subjects to candidacy for this study (refer to Appendix J for subject qualifications rubric). Following confirmation of the faculty member’s employment status and evidence of entrepreneurial pursuits, research subjects received e-mail notification of their selection. A qualifications rubric assured research subjects met all criteria prior to the interview process.

The subject qualifications rubric assured that all research participants satisfied all ten qualifications. Each individual qualifier was worth one point. All research subjects had to score ten points. The ten areas are as follows:

1. Does the research subject possess a faculty position during the time of study?
2. Does the research subject have an affiliation with one of the following major departments during the time of study: social and behavioral sciences, language arts, natural sciences, counseling, physical education, or vocational trades?
3. Does the research subject hold either a part-time or full-time employment status during the time of study?
4. Does the subject currently or in the past ever been a principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisor, consultant, or affiliate of a program or pursuit exemplifying academic entrepreneurialism?
5. Is there document and archival data available to verify the qualifications of the research subject?
6. Does the research subject’s history demonstrate entrepreneurial traits?
7. Did the research subject receive a study recruitment e-mail?
8. Did the subject send official notification that they want to participate?
9. Did the research subject receive an e-mail notifying their acceptance?
10. Did the subject formally accept to participate in the study?

The second strategy utilized chain sampling. A single case site makes it useful to take advantage of internal networks existing on campus (Merriam, 2009). Utilizing the personal networks of a research subject provides rich information about other potential research subjects who also exemplify traits of academic entrepreneurialism. Chain sampling helps to identify potential new research subjects not commonly known. In addition, the strategy prevents the need to establish relationships with gatekeepers to access new potential research subjects, which would prove to be more of a distinct challenge. Both criterion and chain sampling strategies complement each other effectively (Glesne, 2010).

**Instruments and Procedures**

I used interviews as the primary data collection procedure. The interview structure used similar questions for each research subject. Accordingly, interview questions were standardized, but flexible enough to adapt to each individual interviewee to encourage research subjects to offer any amount of information they wished, while also enabling the researcher to further probe using follow-up questions. This allowed research subjects to offer their opinions and experiences (Creswell, 2007). Using a structured approach allowed me to collect specific background information from all research subjects.

I relied on three data collection instruments. These were the informed consent form, the research invitation, and the research protocol. Informed consent forms state the purpose of this study along with rights of research subjects who willingly participate. Research
subjects had to read and sign the consent form indicating they are in agreement with their responsibilities for being a participant. The form consisted of a brief introduction of the research agent and their faculty sponsor. Contact information of the researcher, faculty, and the office of IRB were available to research subjects, as well as knowledge that interviews would last approximately 45 to 60 minutes.

The research invitations included an introduction of the researcher, purpose of the study and the purpose of selecting a particular research subject. The goal of the invitation was to acquire a pool of research subjects who are faculty members who demonstrate high levels of academic entrepreneurialism. The final data collection instrument was the interview protocol. Interview questions focused on the research subject’s background and experiences. The primary purpose for these interviews was to collect information on key factors that encourage this pursuit (refer to Appendices A and B for data collection instruments).

**Data Collection**

**Interviews**

I conducted fourteen in-person interviews at SCCC from October 15, 2011 to October 27, 2011. Interviews of three faculty members without private offices took place in a conference room located in the technology building. I interviewed the remaining eleven faculty members in their private offices. All interviews were recorded using a high fidelity digital audio recorder. Audio files were then uploaded to a personal computer located at my residence. The computer was not accessible through the Internet. I then personally transcribed all interviews on a separate computer. Transcriptions were made verbatim, including laughter, sighs, coughs, and other sounds as they represented valuable
information. I altered all information that could be used to identify research subjects. Pseudonyms were assigned for all research subjects, the case site, and any identifying information for individuals, and industry partners that came forth during the interview.

**Document Data**

I collected document and archival data primarily through public sources. These documents included committee minutes; grant proposals; campus contracts; official correspondence; financial account holdings for special projects; and relevant contracts relating to academic entrepreneurial endeavors. The majority of these documents were accessible through the SCCC website. Documents that were not accessible via the campus website were available directly from the individual faculty member.

**Data Analysis**

**Preliminary Data Analysis**

I conducted data analysis throughout the data collection process. Straus and Glaser argue that grounded theory requires the researcher to examine data through the daily activities of the research subject. This approach allows the researcher to generate a theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1997). In addition, this approach requires the researcher to utilize preliminary data analysis, which occurs through data tracking. Data tracking throughout the data collection process can include transcriptions of interviews, review of documentation, and written observations from the researcher. This process enables the researcher to identify areas of interest that may be relevant to this study (Gerbich, 2007). By identifying areas of interest, I was able to cross-reference additional research subject characteristics through the data collection process to determine whether certain key variables were interdependent on one another. This required assigning codes to allow the grouping of similar concepts.
identifying research subjects during the data collection process (Glaser & Straus, 1967). The end result was a unique form of rational choice theory to make the argument that all three factors work together to influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty.

**Thematic Data Analysis**

After preliminary data analysis, thematic data analysis commenced. Reducing the amount of data required filtering information. Thematic analysis was applied to omit all nonverbal sounds, including laughter, sighs, coughs, um’s and ah’s. Upon completion of the data collection stage, I used ATLAS.ti, a qualitative data analysis software program, to gain a clear understanding of concepts that are relevant for analysis. Thematic analysis allows for the elimination of nonessential factors, while keeping data relevant and/or central to the study itself (Grbich, 2007).

Thematic analysis is an individualistic process requiring the researcher to search accumulated data for repeated words or phrases, including references to the research questions. Influences for theme development can be the result of reviewing literature, personal life experiences, along with other external and internal factors (Grbich, 2007). The further compression of data into grouped themes was done using the block and file approach, enabling large portions of data to remain intact (2007).

**Roles of the Researcher**

**Researcher Roles**

I maintained dual roles as a researcher and an instructor throughout the research study. My role as researcher was to examine factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among faculty. To do so, I conducted interviews of entrepreneurial faculty from the vantage point of an instructor. My role as an instructor at the case site was
to participate in a wide range of campus activities that included teaching, participation with committee assignments, and attending meetings dealing with academic issues. Since I teach part-time at the research site, I interacted with faculty, staff, and students as an active member of the campus community.

**Researcher Bias**

Identifying inherent biases requires the researcher to fully disclose how their beliefs may influence the case study. Researcher bias can include being unaware that their study may have a negative impact within the field, case-site, and research subjects (Schwandt, 2007). As an instructor at the site, I had three main biases. The first bias is a belief in entrepreneurialism. This is due to my professional pursuits in the private sector. I have a bias towards those who engage in entrepreneurial endeavors independently without seeking permission. The second bias is a belief that rational choice theory offers the most realistic explanation for individual behavior. The third bias regards my affection for the case site both as a former student and as a current employee who was conducting research.

**Strategies to Mitigate Researcher Bias**

A strategy to mitigate researcher bias provides a guide for the researcher to prevent inherent biases from influencing the case study. Spending a large degree of time within the field allows time to establish trusting relationships while learning about the culture (Creswell, 2007). I had to follow interview protocols with all interviewees to prevent the preferential treatment of research subjects (2007). In addition, the use of an external audit to examine the overall research process and data was done through the peer review process.

I utilized more than one approach throughout the case study process to further mitigate researcher bias and to maintain the validity of this study. Utilizing different data
sources and data collection techniques supported the use of a triangulation strategy. This served to minimize false impressions by utilizing procedures that include redundancy of data collection while explaining the challenges of gathering information (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008). Using a triangulation strategy assured validation of data along with increasing my understanding as a researcher (2008). I used data triangulation and methodological triangulation. Data triangulation is the gathering of data using multiple sampling strategies. This allows for the collection of data at multiple periods of time and multiple situations, from different people (Denzin, 2010).

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to examine three specific influential factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty: individual, institutional, and environmental. The intent of this study is to provide guidance to community college leaders seeking to increase their respective levels of academic entrepreneurialism. I interviewed fourteen faculty members at a single case site representing the following major departments: social and behavioral sciences; language arts; natural sciences; counseling; physical education; and vocational trades. Interview questions were structured and followed a standard format of formal questions asked per individual subject. Analyses of transcripts were performed using ATLAS.ti to identify those characteristics exemplifying key influences for academic entrepreneurialism using thematic analysis.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

My primary source of data for this study came from fourteen SCCC faculty members. I used a case study design that borrows principles of grounded theory to develop an explanatory model of what factors facilitate academic entrepreneurial behavior of fourteen research subjects through examination of their individualism. Academic entrepreneurialism is the application of business principles to author, fund, and maintain marketable and relevant educational programs that further student success (Hess, 2006). Examples of faculty exhibiting academic entrepreneurial behavior includes, but is not limited to, establishing private industry partnerships, student employment assistance, serving on market advisory committees, fundraising, scholarship creation, and the pursuit of grants. To that end, chapter four begins with faculty profiles that detail their academic discipline, professional pursuits, and relevant personal qualities. The next section of the chapter examines emerging themes from data. Chapter four concludes with a summary of information.

Faculty Profiles

Grounded theory is an inductive methodology that allows for the systematic generation of a theory during the research process. Determining the individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism required me to take into account the overall background and qualities of all research subjects. I took into consideration the following biographical descriptions of each research subject and their direct influence over the results found. I collected the following biographical descriptions...
during the interview process of each research subject, which constituted a fundamental source of data for this study.

**Brian Merrill**

Brian Merrill (pseudonym) is associate professor of speech communications who has been working at SCCC for over five years. His birthplace is near the campus within the same county. Brian holds undergraduate and graduate degrees in communication, which in turn led to careers in the private industry relating to his major. He later made the decision to pursue a career in higher education, teaching part-time at multiple campuses before accepting SCCC’s tenure track position.

**Christine Lane**

Christine Lane (pseudonym) is professor of mathematics who has been teaching full-time for close to twenty years at SCCC. She has always had a passion for mathematics since “numbers never lie.” Her home country outside of the United States gave her the opportunity to earn a bachelor’s and master’s degree in mathematics. Prior to teaching, Christine began her professional career in industry balancing books and managing accounts for private companies and public bureaucracies. Upon arrival in the United States, she began to teach part-time at various community colleges as well as private universities until her full-time appointment at SCCC.

**Franklin Patterson**

Franklin Patterson (pseudonym) is professor of physics and astronomy at SCCC where he has taught since the early 1980s. Born in South America, he immigrated to the United States with his family at a young age. He is a product of the California community college system and received his bachelor’s, master’s and doctorate degrees in physics from
the University of California. His career began in the private sector as a scientist for a
government space agency, later carrying over to consultant positions within the public and
private sector.

**Harold Stearns**

Harold Stearns (pseudonym) is associate professor of welding and an alumnus of
SCCC who was born and raised near the campus. A product of the community college
system, Harold majored in welding then went on to earning his undergraduate degree at
California State University in occupational studies with an emphasis on corporate training,
later earning his master’s degree in occupational studies with an emphasis in curriculum
development at California State University. His passion is entrepreneurial pursuits relating
to his welding trade, all while bringing industry knowledge directly to the classroom.

**Hillary Mathews**

Hillary Mathews (pseudonym) is associate professor of nursing who has been
working at SCCC on a full-time basis for over five years. She has a bachelors and masters
in nursing from the University of California and a doctorate in psychology from a private
university outside of the state. The health care industry has had a profound influence over
her course instruction. Her experience working as a nurse, having her own practice as a
psychiatric nurse, among other career pursuits had a direct influence over her teaching
philosophy.

**Jennifer Young**

Jennifer Young (pseudonym) is professor of health and physical education who has
taught at SCCC on a full-time basis for over ten years. She majored in physical education
and kinesiology at a community college within the state, later earning her bachelors and
masters in the same major from California State University. Jennifer had a full scholarship to a private academy to study technology prior to her enrollment in physical education and kinesiology. Most interesting is that her private industry experience does not correlate to her academic field of instruction. She also consults with community colleges to help them implement new distance education technologies as well as train faculty with their utilization.

Jessica Sanchez

Jessica Sanchez (pseudonym) is assistant professor of child development who has taught full-time at SCCC for over five years. She was born in a Latin American country, immigrating to the United States with her family at five years old and attended California public schools. Jessica is a product of California community colleges who then transferred to the California State University system where she earned her bachelor’s degree in psychology. Thirteen years later, she returned to the California State University system to earn her master’s degree with emphasis on early childhood education.

Jim Kwok

Jim Kwok (pseudonym) is professor of biology who has taught full-time at SCCC for twenty years. Born in Asia, he and his family immigrated to the United States. Jim earned his bachelor’s in biology from a public university in Hawaii and a master’s degree in biology from California State University. His private industry experience outside of the classroom has been solely government research. Jim is very proud that, “Since high school, I have always worked for the government.”

Lisa Jamison

Lisa Jamison (pseudonym) is professor of psychology who has been working full-time at SCCC for close to one year, but has been working at the institution on a part-time
basis for over seven years. She is a product of the state’s community college system, later earning her bachelor’s degree from California State University and then her master’s in psychology from the same institution. Coming from the corporate world gives Lisa “structure” that gave her the stability to become a clinical social worker where she discovered “my love for psychology.”

**Paul Rutsky**

Paul Rutsky (pseudonym) is assistant professor of anthropology who has taught at SCCC for over ten years who received his bachelor’s and master’s degrees in anthropology from California State University. He is one of those academic instructors who began his professional career working within his field of study. This was primarily working for museums where he was able to put his studies to work. The work was exciting, but ended years later due to budget cuts and his subsequent layoff. To make ends meet, Paul sought part-time teaching positions in the community college system. He later began to realize that teaching was his true calling.

**Peter Banfield**

Peter Banfield (pseudonym) is professor of physics and astronomy who has taught full-time at SCCC for over thirty years. He is a product of California community colleges who went on to earn his bachelor’s and master’s degree from the University of California. Peter has extensive experience in the private sector that is unknown to most of the college. This is due partly to his personality as “a very quiet person who keeps his worlds separate.” Positions in the private sector include employment for aerospace, defense and a nonprofit agency dealing with nondestructive testing of military ordinance. All of these positions led Peter to a career in teaching, as instruction became part of his industry responsibilities.
**Stephanie Hayden**

Stephanie Hayden (pseudonym) is professor of counseling who has been at SCCC for over thirty years. She earned her bachelor’s degree in Sociology and public administration along with her master’s degree in counseling and psychology from California State University. Previous industry experience includes government appointments to conduct training for professional counselors as well as currently engaging in fundraising activities for the nonprofit sector.

**Theresa Nielsen**

Theresa Nielsen (pseudonym) is associate professor of chemical technology who has been working full-time at SCCC for over fifteen years. She is a product of the California community colleges and an alumnus of SCCC where she earned her associate’s in chemical technology. Her bachelor’s degree is in occupational health with an emphasis in environmental science from California State University. Theresa also has a master’s degree in curriculum and development from California State University.

**Tracy Seymour**

Tracy Seymour (pseudonym) is professor of history at SCCC who has worked at the college on a full-time basis for over ten years. Though she has little experience in the private sector, she has held managerial positions in the public sector. Working behind the scenes in a managerial role rather than an advocate is her preferred method of operation. Tracy enjoys working with committees and taking the time to work with fellow faculty on their projects rather than starting her own.
Emerging Themes

Following the fourteen interviews, transcription, coding, and analysis, six dominant themes specific to faculty academic entrepreneurialism emerged: using extrovert characteristics to pursue goals, faculty self-development for personal gain benefits the individual and the community college, improving the local environment that the community college serves, commitment to student success, connecting entrepreneurial pursuits to instruction, and risks of faculty academic entrepreneurialism. Descriptions of these six themes emerged through analysis of research subject transcripts following the interview process. Each major theme includes supporting quotes from research subjects, personal observations, references to related literature and, in some cases, document data.

Using Extrovert Characteristics to Pursue Goals

Using extrovert characteristics to pursue goals is the first theme. The majority of research subjects stated that they are extroverts who embrace their outgoing personalities to pursue professional goals. They also argued that the majority of academic entrepreneurial faculty display outgoing personalities throughout their daily dealings with faculty peers. For example, Jessica stated, “I am like most of the entrepreneurial faculty who is extremely extrovert when going after a goal, especially if it is a passion of mine that includes student success.” The research subjects that this study identified as extrovert display these characteristics as their intuition encourages them to pursue additional goals. There are four subthemes related to using extrovert characteristics to pursue goals: favoring extrovert personality traits in most situations, passionate pursuit of personal and professional goals, willingness to pursue goals with little to no support, and basing decisions on personal intuition rather than logic.
Favoring extrovert personality traits in most situations.

All but one of the research subjects made the case that faculty members with extrovert personalities express themselves in a direct manner that leads to proactive rather than reactive behavior. Research subjects with extrovert personalities use their outgoing personalities to promote their agenda by seeking alliances with faculty and industry peers. Stephanie, Tracy, and Lisa contended that extrovert faculty are more willing to seek faculty and industry partnerships with little to no prodding from administration. Tracy found that her key motivation comes when she sees “a student need that requires addressing and there is no time to waste waiting for permission from those powers above (administration).” Extroverts have little to no inhibition expressing themselves with high levels of self-confidence (Goleman, 2007). Interview transcripts demonstrate that extrovert faculty are able to draw themselves to either extrovert or introvert personalities. All research subjects claimed the majority of academic entrepreneurial faculty possess this personality trait, while a minority are introvert.

Extrovert faculty are more likely to assume additional responsibilities that may not be part of their college job description. Analysis of interviews found that the encouraging factor is trying to develop or grow programs that positively influence the lives of students. Entrepreneurial faculty are likely to work together on multiple projects. Peter stated that faculty who are extrovert are more likely to attract opportunities that “just fall in their lap.” Faculty who have entrepreneurial ideas are likely to seek extrovert peers for support. Peter found that as an extrovert he attracts opportunities as, “I may have never even looked for these opportunities since they just came to me.”
Not all entrepreneurial faculty are extrovert. Theresa argued that some introverts, “May be more comfortable doing things independently, but there is no way they can be successful being totally independent.” Introvert entrepreneurs still need to sell their ideas. Christine found that this requires “introvert faculty to partner with extrovert faculty.” All research subjects claimed that the majority of faculty are extroverts in the classroom even if they are introverts outside. Their outgoing personalities make it easier for them to pursue agendas with little to no support. Jennifer was one of the minority research subjects who argued that she shifts “back and forth from extrovert to introvert depending on the situation and who I am dealing with at that time.” Jim agreed with Jennifer when he stated, “I shift between introvert and extrovert in response to the energy of another person or environment.”

Jim was one of those minority introvert entrepreneurial faculty members. Even though he was never a principal investigator for a grant, Jim has overseen natural science faculty as well as serving as coordinator over the application process. He found that his personality traits are more in line with working behind the scenes rather than taking charge. At the same time, he stated that, “Working behind the scenes requires me to seek faculty support and put myself out there.” There is a definite need for institutional support of faculty, who as Franklin stated, “... put themselves out there.” Jim argued that faculty who are willing to pursue entrepreneurial agendas should be given greater institutional assistance, which Tracy claimed that, “It is far easier for extroverts to get what they want.”

**Passionate pursuit of personal and professional goals.**

Interview data indicated that for many faculty, the pursuit of goals is one motivating factor for their entrepreneurial pursuits. Theresa was adamant that she is never satisfied with her achievements and that she will “immediately pursue one goal after another.”
A cademic entrepreneurial faculty are also, according to Harold, “M ore likely to juggle multiple goals at the same time.” All research subjects who teach in the vocational trades argued that their goal driven pursuit of curriculum modernization to prepare students for specific industry careers is a never-ending goal driven process. Harold agreed with Franklin that academic entrepreneurialism is a necessary tool for academics to “find out the skill sets that students need to know to be successful and incorporate them into the classroom.” Harold found that institutional constraints prevent instructors, particularly in the vocational trades, from reacting quickly to market changes and that it is sometimes necessary “not to wait for curriculum committee approval, but instead incorporating industry standards into the classroom as soon as possible.”

There was general agreement among research subjects that faculty who passionately pursue goals are valuable assets of a community college. While working at SCCC, Christine began to make small investments in stocks, not primarily for the pursuit of wealth, but to “pursue my passion.” She also saw the value of sharing her passions with the class as a way to keep classes interesting. Christine found that, “I choose things that I have an interest with, everyday stuff, like comparing the value of the dollar with foreign currencies, or how to use statistics to compare the rise or fall of a stock’s value. Students have more interest if their instructor shows a passion for the subject.”

Another element of being goal driven is taking the initiative to think of creative new solutions to problems. Hillary stated, “This the thrill of achievement that every academic entrepreneurial faculty member feels.” Franklin was one of the key orchestrators of a program allowing SCCC students to attend science courses at prestigious universities at a community college tuition rate per unit. A cademic entrepreneurialism is a requirement for
any successful instructor. Entrepreneurial pursuits require establishing a clear plan with clear objectives. Franklin stated this requires, “Talking to people and have them participate in those plans, while allowing all participants to share in the credit. Sharing the credit is necessary to encourage peers to participate so I think I have a significant ability to persuade people or sell a particular plan, a business plan, for example, with something similar for academics.” Jim stressed that, “The college should encourage this behavior by seeking faculty who are not just rooted in the academics, but also have some degree of industry experience.” Franklin also made the case that those faculty who have the ability to “convince people and persuade people and so on, whether it is a business plan or academic subject, are most likely to have had some private industry experience.”

The creation of new courses is another example of being goal driven. Paul demonstrated that he had been actively creating new courses following his hiring at SCCC. He was also the first instructor to teach online anthropology courses. The college does not offer a major in anthropology. Most of the students who take these courses are doing so to complete their transfer requirements. A minority of students intend to major in the discipline following their transfer. Paul’s greatest passion is to “solve problems, both big and small.” Academic entrepreneurialism to Paul is to solve problems by thinking outside of the box. One way to increase student retention is to make the class interesting through the use of models, videos, and even humor. It is also important to keep in mind that a few of your students may want to major in the field. Paul believes that taking the time to mentor students can have a profound impact over their academic career and that, “I will always pursue goals even though the time spent pursuing them is beyond what the college pays me for.”
Individuals who are goal driven have the ability to find creative ways to solve dilemmas. All research subjects saw a significant challenge their institution faces with the large numbers of students lacking in basic skills. Paul for one sees a never-ending challenge of keeping his own motivation throughout the years. Doing so requires making constant goals that he can achieve, since solving the issue of a lack of basic skills is a daunting task. Paul has consistently been part of grant writing committees to bring in additional funds for his anthropology program. He said that, “I secure funding for monkey and dinosaur models that make the students talk and make their minds work.” Most of the research subjects expressed their belief in the importance of what Jessica terms, “Creating new methods while keeping things in perspective.” She went on to say, “I build programs that achieve goals that I can see so that it motivates me to do more.”

Vocational trade departments consistently tailor their programs to remain relevant. There is a majority consensus among research participants that academic entrepreneurialism applies more so to the vocational trade departments. For example, Tracy argued that, “This applies to those students who are trying to get their certificates are going to go straight into industry for the most part, whether it is fashion, automotive or whatever.” Harold recognizes individual academic faculty members who have been instrumental in securing grant funding and/or creating new innovative programs. Tracy stressed that many in the academics believed that, “The institution does not encourage academic faculty to be as entrepreneurial as the vocational trades.”

The pursuit of goals for the sake of learning from the experience is as Lisa stated “a passion for learning that never stops.” All interview subjects agreed that academic entrepreneurial faculty view goals as another opportunity for self-improvement. Brian
stated, “It is vital for the person to state the objective and then know firsthand how they are going to accomplish that goal and for what purpose.” For some faculty like Lisa, this purpose is recognition for achieving their goals that relate to improving society. She stated, “It is amazing when I think back about the things that I have done and won awards for.” Interviews indicate that achieving goals relating to academic entrepreneurialism improves student success and in turn encourages them to invest in their self-development.

**Willingness to pursue goals with little to no support.**

Individuals may decide to pursue goals without support if doing so is in their best interest (Green & Shapiro, 1994, 1996; Lane, 1996). Extroverts do not feel that they need to secure permission from their peers when deciding whether to pursue an agenda (Goleman, 2000). In fact, academic entrepreneurial faculty are willing to pursue agendas without peer or institutional support, if they believe the pursuit will further student success. Jessica strongly believes in furthering student success, even if it requires her to act alone. This pertains to independently formulating academic entrepreneurial strategies even without institutional knowledge. Institutional support more so in the form of guidance would be “appreciated” yet sometimes administration may be “too busy with other things, like the budget for the overall campus.” Though faculty like Jessica are willing to “go at it alone,” it is important to realize that support from administration as well as from other departments is “essential.” She further argued, “We need to support one another.”

Interview subjects assert that campus departments can only support one another if all areas know what the entire campus needs. Jennifer argued that, “Faculty, departments and administration need to understand that our success as a college depends on everyone working together.” Theresa argued that being able to pursue her academic entrepreneurial
pursuits requires not only support from faculty peers, but also institutional support on behalf of the administration. There are logistical concerns that require the attention of administrative experts, which “is not my area of expertise.” She went on to state, “I am a builder, not a manager.” In this case, the interview data demonstrate that faculty who are willing to pursue agendas with little to no support are more intuitive overall.

**Basing decisions according to personal intuition rather than logic.**

Individuals who demonstrate a willingness to act independently are more likely to favor their instinct when making decisions (Goleman, 2000). Extrovert faculty are more likely to favor their intuition rather than logic. Individuals who rely more on their gut instinct rather than logic demonstrate greater levels of emotional and social intelligence (Goleman, 2007). The majority of research subjects made the case that extrovert faculty are more willing to take risks, depend more on their intuition than logic, and are more willing to seek academic entrepreneurial goals. The data showed that extrovert faculty are willing to take risks that can potentially jeopardize their professional career. They embrace their reputation at the campus of being a risk taker. Some handholding may be necessary to give students hope. Christine stated, “Logic dictates that students need to purchase mandatory textbooks. I try to use my knowledge to help the student and if I can for example... if I can lend them my book... I never keep my book in my office or at home. I lend them and I ask them instead in return them come to class on time and do their work complete. If they do not do their work complete I do not lend it to them. And I always ask the publisher for two books instead of the one or buy a used book and raffle it for them who cannot have one.”

Academic entrepreneurial faculty favor intuition over logic when making sudden decisions. Theresa was proud to state, “I go with my gut instinct.” Her experience in the
private sector includes working in a hospital, private laboratories and aerospace companies. All of her past careers relate to what she teaches now. Students learn about the advantages of majoring in chemical technology, both as a vocational trade program as well as academic. Graduates of the program are more likely to find employment, sometimes even prior to graduation due to the shortage of graduates in this field. Maintaining close relationships with industry allows Theresa to take advantage of new opportunities that directly benefit the college. Her contributions to the college are the result of her ability to sense opportunities, as she stated, “Before anyone up above (administration) gives marching orders.”

Theresa is one of those academic entrepreneurial faculty members who favor their intuition. Theresa undertook the building process to construct a process technology program from scratch with no initial support from the college that later became nationally known. She stated, “I pretty much developed that degree here on campus in collaboration with my industry partners who at the time were interested in a process technology program.” Theresa’s industry contacts gave her the ability to grow not only the chemical technology program, but also create a process technology program from start. She stated that during a conference in Texas, “… someone told me that they had just gotten a phone call from somebody from one of the oil refineries out here (California) and they were interested in a process technology program, but there weren’t any out here. So I went to Texas to get a telephone number of somebody out here in California and then I came back and contacted them and it all started from there in 1998.” Theresa demonstrates the value of being a proactive extrovert who is willing to follow their intuition in the pursuit of opportunities.
The majority of research subjects value the initiative that extroverts have in their pursuit of academic entrepreneurial opportunities. Jessica’s statement echoed those of the majority when she stated, “I am extrovert most of the time, taking chances and sticking my neck out there, going with my gut feeling most of the time, but keeping myself in check at best as I can.” Not all research subjects believed that basing decisions on intuition is advisable. Paul argued this fact as he finds it “very hard to keep my emotions in check by using logic.”

Data shows that extroverts tend to embrace the human element instead of as Jim claimed “just the facts.” Harold argued that when he is personally dealing with people that he “pretty much goes with his gut instinct.” Reading people is a trait that emotional and social intelligent people utilize at a greater rate (Goleman, 2007). Following your emotions encourages people to pursue agendas that as Brian stated, “May not be logical as it does not bring you wealth, but it is the right thing to do.” Paul defended this sentiment with caution, “Embrace your emotions, but always do so logically in order to assure that your decision-making is on the money.” Following their intuition instead of logic is a motivating factor for goal driven faculty.

Shifting gears from one industry to another comes naturally to those who base their decisions on intuition. Faculty who rely heavily on their intuition are more willing to adapt new techniques. These faculty are also keenly aware of industry trends within higher education. For example, Brian’s decision to pursue a doctorate degree in higher education opened career opportunities in academia, but also for other industries. Other benefits include learning for what Brian stated is a “love of learning” that in turn allows someone “to take what you do as a career for a hobby and even the other way around. I went back to
school not to earn more money, but to enjoy the experience.” Student success includes helping them to pursue their career pathways. This is true even if their initial academic program does not lead to a career path they were originally intending to secure. Harold, Franklin, Brian, and Jennifer all argued that instructors should emphasize career pathways as a guide to lifelong learning. Data indicated that intuitive faculty are more goal driven.

**Faculty Self-Development for Personal Gain Benefits the Individual and the Community College**

A second theme that emerged is faculty self-development for personal gain benefits the individual and the community college. Research subjects argued that pursuing personal entrepreneurial goals through the accumulation of personal wealth, position, and reputation improves their standing as well as that of the college. For example, Franklin strongly advocated for a better understanding among college faculty and administration of the value of faculty who strive for personal gain. He stated, “When faculty accomplish something, whether in business, making money, or publishing, it benefits everyone and everything around them. All those elements surrounding that successful faculty member feed off their energy and success.” Franklin, Harold, and Jennifer argued that entrepreneurial pursuits are academic entrepreneurial pursuits when it also benefits the campus along with the student population. An example of this is Stephanie. She sees academic entrepreneurialism as faculty focusing on self-development, including, “Writing a textbook, putting together some software program, or any way you are developing intellectual property.” Stephanie offered multiple examples of faculty who take the time to devise new course materials throughout their years working in the classroom even though the behavior is not a requirement for obtaining tenure as those who teach at a university. This gives them the opportunity to see
what methods work and what does not as they are developing their intellectual property. Stephanie stated, “Profit is a great motivation, but the returns are really miniscule. The ultimate return is for the students who have themselves made contributions to those works.”

All research subjects stressed that campus recognition is a motivating factor in their pursuit of faculty development and lifelong learning. Jennifer, Theresa, Brian, Franklin, and Lisa made the point that faculty are physical elements of the college. Brian argued, “Faculty interact more with the students and community than any administrator. We are physical representatives of the college and our personal success benefits the college.” Jennifer pointed out that faculty may not have any financial incentive for investing their time and energy towards these pursuits. She stated, “I for one pursue these goals to improve the college so that students in turn can benefit.” Besides the individual faculty member realizing the positive influence over student success, it is important to recognize the role recognition has over their decision to pursue academic entrepreneurialism. Franklin pointed out that faculty recognition of their success in the private sector is lacking, as well as their “achievements as entrepreneurs both academically and professionally.” The failure to recognize those faculty members who work in academia while pursuing private sector interests at the same time trivializes their extracurricular pursuits. Franklin argued, “Someone in academics who has grown professionally outside of the academic roles, who are recognized for their talents and knowledge in the private sector are a great asset to the college.” There is one subtheme related to faculty self-development for personal gain benefits the individual and the community college: faculty self-improvement to further student success.
Faculty self-improvement to further student success.

A academic entrepreneurial faculty seek to improve themselves professionally, academically, and personally in order to further student success. Brian argued that the institution itself has to provide both the training and incentives for faculty to participate in self-improvement. He found that SCCC excels in this regard as, “The college offers a good amount of training for faculty, but little to no incentives for self-improvement.” Lisa concurred with Brian, stating, “SCCC provides all kinds of training, but most of those going to training and wanting to improve themselves are the entrepreneurial faculty.” Brian further argued that, “The entrepreneurial faculty are the ones who are really serious about student success.”

This pursuit allows academic entrepreneurial faculty to find creative ways to address campus needs found through student interaction. Stephanie was the staff development coordinator at SCCC for one year, organizing training programs for faculty. She stated, “We were getting a lot of grants, like Title V money for technology training programs for faculty, teaching them how to build more online classes. Unfortunately, only those certain faculty members, those entrepreneurial ones who just crave any type of training, are the ones who participate.” Peter identified himself as a “strong believer of academic entrepreneurialism.” His desire to consistently improve himself directly correlated to his desire to, “Further student success by learning new methods, trends, practices, whether it includes learning computer programs, learning how to write proposals for private industry donations, learning how to write grants, or anything that makes me better able to help students achieve success.” Paul strongly believed that, “Student success extends past graduation, transferring to a four-year institution, or even their next big career.”
As can be seen here, the interview data demonstrate that all research subjects see their commitment to student success as limitless. Franklin stated, “It is not a terminating judgment. Student success is not limited to graduation, transferring, or any single accomplishment. It really is the continuous improvement of the individual.” This reality encourages academic entrepreneurial faculty to pursue these goals, at times without peer and institutional support, while being open to maintaining their relationship with students following completion of their academic program.

Interview transcripts revealed that academic entrepreneurial faculty connect their drive for self-improvement to furthering student success. One example from the data is Franklin who is a faculty member with a successful career in private industry who directs his students to career opportunities. Another example is Peter who is a faculty member who led the establishment of a new innovative certification program, elevating their career standing and benefitting his students at the same time. Christine’s initiative to pursue additional training and/or further her education is another example. Analysis of interviews demonstrated that the personal agendas of academic entrepreneurial faculty, both directly and indirectly, benefit students who in turn may not know the identity of the faculty member who was instrumental in furthering their success. I found the data to show that faculty correlate self-improvement with student success.

**Improving the Local Environment that the Community College Serves**

A third theme that emerged is improving the local environment that the community college serves. My analysis of data demonstrates that improving the local environment is a goal of academic entrepreneurial faculty. Theresa, Lisa, Brian, and Franklin claim that improving the local community in turn improves the nation. Brian said, “Improving this
community surrounding SCCC benefits the state, the nation and the world. Everything is connected.” Franklin suggested how entrepreneurial faculty can help with this endeavor. He stated, “They have to be creative, think outside the box, and create ways to improve student success and the community also.” These faculty demonstrated that creative thinking is a fundamental quality of academic entrepreneurialism. Lisa found it difficult to define academic entrepreneurialism since not everything she does is for the sake of wealth creation. Yet she was instrumental in authoring a drug and alcohol rehabilitation program to meet a community need, even if there was no financial benefit for doing so. When asked why she went forward with authoring the program, Lisa stated, “My philosophy is that if there is a need within the community, I do it. I am always planning in my mind what I want to do at the college.” Peter contended that his passions and motivations “are to help my college do a better job educating students and helping them achieve success in the market.”

Some research subjects argued that improving the local community requires active participation through social and political activism. I found this to be another key motivator and not to be confused as a means of self-promotion. For example, Tracy’s primary motivation for these types of pursuits was, “Because we see a need that no one is fulfilling, so we are going to do it on our own.” Theresa argued that those whose desire is to improve the local community are solely motivated by a sense of “doing good.” She jokingly said, “I do it because I am cuckoo. It is a personal motivation where I think something is important, so I jump in. It is part of my personality.”

Brian linked academic entrepreneurialism to a passion for improving society by taking advantage of every opportunity with a sense of urgency and that “nothing is impossible, as there are no limits.” Brian stated, “Improving society requires a definition of
academic entrepreneurialism that takes advantage of every possible resource, academically, such as your course work, your instructors, student services, really looking at what you can squeeze out of every resource is available for you and applying it to what you really want to be and who you want to be.” Academic entrepreneurialism to Brian is not “pigeon holing yourself into one particular job.”

Volunteerism is another example of improving the local community. Some research subjects professed that those who donate their time and money towards the promotion of a social cause in turn benefits all individuals who reside within the society. This trait of volunteerism in the form of nonprofit participation is common among academic entrepreneurial faculty. Stephanie was one of those faculty members striving to link their nonprofit work with the college. For example, Stephanie believes that her participation with nonprofits benefit the local community. Stephanie spends a minimum of five hours per week working with nonprofit organizations. She stated, “I try to link my volunteer work with the college so both sides can benefit from each other.” Utilizing the resources from the campus with those of the nonprofit organization is another example of the entrepreneurial spirit. It is also an example of improving oneself in order to improve the campus itself.

Research subjects stated their motivation to improve the community their college serves through the pursuit of local industry partnerships. I found the interview transcripts to show that academic entrepreneurial faculty can use these partnerships to help students secure employment, while fostering a campus environment that promotes entrepreneurialism throughout the institution. The residential location of the faculty member may not influence their goal of improving the local community as more than half of research subjects live over twenty miles from the case site.
Community enrichment also includes upgrading the physical aesthetics of the campus. SCCC has been busily upgrading its entire campus with funding from multiple bond measures. Upgrading the campus has had a profound impact on community residents even if they may not be currently attending. Christine stated, “If you look at our new buildings and our new modern facilities, the community overall looks better.” Even though SCCC is a commuter college, its new campus facilities attract community residents into its doors. Theresa argued that when the college looks good, that, “It serves to enrich the community by opening its doors to people who otherwise may have never thought about going to college.” The positive impact of a college can encourage residents to believe they can go further academically.

Enriching the community is not only physical, but it also includes job training along with providing academic instruction. Jim equated this with revitalization, “A total renewal of the entire community.” For many communities like those that SCCC serves, the community college is as Paul stated “the center or nucleus” of revitalization. This requires the campus to be proactive and market their services to its constituents. Jessica stated, “We have people who work within the community, educating people about what we offer.” Jim concurred with the statement, “We send recruitment teams to all the neighboring high schools to be sure that they understand that there is a college here in the neighborhood.” I found the data to indicate that faculty who demonstrate a belief in local community improvement also exhibit a higher commitment to student success.

**Commitment to Student Success**

The fourth theme is commitment to student success. Commitments are personal motivators driving individual behavior that relates to personal goals (Lee & Rhoads, 2004).
All research subjects identified student success as the primary goal that guides all decisions relating to their academic career. Overall, subjects reported they are likely to pursue goals directly relating to their passion for student success and/or discipline of study. The interviews showed these goals to include, but not limited to, creating hybrid courses that combine lecture and online instruction, adapting course curriculum to private industry standards, and establishing scholarships for students demonstrating the greatest academic talent. These goals encourage student success, examples of which include graduation, completion of certificate training, and/or transferring to a four-year college program.

Research subjects claimed that the primary motivation behind their academic entrepreneurial behavior is to bolster student success. Christine made the case that the positive impact she makes at SCCC is due to her realization that the majority of her students are “helpless” as many have “fallen through societal cracks.” The majority of students attending SCCC are lacking in basic skills due to a whole range of factors including economic. The reality though encourages Christine to rely more on emotional and social strengths when dealing with students, “Because I was a needy student also.”

I found that the overall goal of research subjects is to bolster student success. Christine identified a key area of student success as “the primary goal of every good instructor.” Academic entrepreneurial faculty are willing to undergo additional training if they believe it will better enable them to further student success. Soon after assuming her position at SCCC, Christine made the decision to undergo distance education training through extensions courses from the University of California. As one of the first SCCC instructors to teach online at a time when distance education was in its infancy, Christine maintained the belief that, “A student should be able to access their classes and continue
their education if they are working full-time or if they are not able to come for whatever reason. That is why I wanted to start teaching online.” Satisfying her passion for increasing student success encourages Christine to invest her time and money so she would be able to incorporate distance learning into her discipline.

Discovering solutions to problems that hinder student success is a fundamental part of academic entrepreneurialism. Jennifer’s greatest passion is student success. She stated her view that academic entrepreneurialism is “figuring out ways to get the job done in a way that is more efficient, more streamlined, more effective and then applying it to the academic world.” When questioned why she continues to push for distance education and technology integration into the classroom environment, Jennifer alluded to the fact that the college needs to maintain pace with the market so that our students are able to be successful. Theresa believes that academic entrepreneurialism is the willingness to construct viable programs that aim to strengthen student success. When asked why she invests so much energy into academic entrepreneurial activities that go beyond her job description, Theresa simply stated, “Entrepreneurial projects are about the teaching. They are about the students. They are about increasing student success.”

Another example of providing solutions to problems that hinder student success is enabling better access to course instruction. Investing in technology instruction along with providing relevant training for students and faculty gives students the means necessary to access relevant material. Jennifer took the lead at her campus when the Internet was still in its infancy to push for key investments before it became the norm. She argued that broadening technology literacy for students ties directly to “the importance of teaching according to the standards of the industry” and that student success depends on “teachers
assuring their curriculum reflect industry standards.” Broadening technology literacy directly correlates to student success relating to career advancement, as today’s market requires technology competency.

Helping students achieve success does not only include their academic achievements. Theresa argued that their success has to also include being able to have a career. She stated that her passion is to help her students “have a good life by graduating from our programs and getting a good job, better yet a career.” All research subjects argued that helping students discover their career pathways allows them to attain success. Stephanie claimed that, “When a college has faculty members who tailor their programs that help students succeed academically and career wise, this motivates both student, and faculty alike.” Typical measures of student success among community college professionals include graduating with an associates degree, completion of a certification program, and/or transferring to a four-year college (Hull, 2005). Entrepreneurial community college faculty also equate student success with securing employment, achieving professional goals, and/or personal accomplishments that include learning time management skills (Hull & Hinckley, 2007). I found that the research data shows that determining how faculty can best encourage student success is directly dependent on their interaction with students. There is one subtheme related to commitment to student success: student-faculty interaction to better assure student success.

**Student-faculty interaction to better assure student success.**

Another element of student success is student-faculty interaction to better assure student success (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). I found the interview data to indicate that academic entrepreneurial faculty interact with students to better understand their needs. For
example, Harold advocated student-faculty interaction, because “we as faculty need to hear from students what they need.” Student-faculty interaction also makes students aware of those academic entrepreneurial endeavors academic entrepreneurial faculty pursue to further their success. Lisa stated, “I communicate with my students. This keeps me aligned one hundred percent that everything I do is relevant.” Lisa said that she sees herself as a student who is constantly learning new methods, because “they are who I am and they keep me aware of what they need to succeed.” Brian contended that this also includes “understanding what students need by working with them directly.” Witnessing firsthand what your students need, delivering what they need and watching them achieve success, is a great motivation for faculty. Brian stated that “being in the present, witnessing students through their self-expression that they are succeeding further drives me.” Encouraging students to express their needs with faculty begins their first day of school. Tracy is a strong believer in first year experience orientation programs as “they are very beneficial to students as faculty tell them how to succeed and students tell us what they need.” Jennifer stressed that knowing firsthand what students require to be successful helps entrepreneurial faculty like herself to “focus on the number one priority and that is student success.” She went on to say, “Knowing the needs of students brings out the academic entrepreneur from within who works to seek out what is new and available now that will help my students succeed faster, better and easier.”

**Connecting Entrepreneurial Pursuits to Instruction**

The fifth theme is connecting entrepreneurial pursuits to instruction. All research subjects asserted the importance for academic entrepreneurial faculty to connect their entrepreneurial pursuits to course instruction as it benefits students and the institution as a
whole. They argued that connecting entrepreneurial pursuits to instruction helps to foster a

campus environment where peers encourage one another to actively search for opportunities

that may benefit themselves individually and/or the campus at large. There are four

subthemes of connecting entrepreneurial pursuits to instruction: faculty industry experience

bringing greater awareness of market needs, establishing partnerships between the

community college and private industry, incorporating industry standards into course

instruction, and requiring faculty to be academic entrepreneurs.

Faculty industry experience bringing greater awareness of market needs.

Faculty who possess industry experience are more likely to pursue private market

opportunities, while tailoring their curriculum according to industry requirements. I found

the interviews demonstrated that entrepreneurial faculty are more open to pursuing career

opportunities in private industry or academia. They also find that this faculty trait is the

ability to draw from industry experience to identify and pursue entrepreneurial opportunities

in either the public or private sector. Research subjects claimed that faculty members with

industry experience could draw from their knowledge to discover opportunities that can also

benefit their students. These opportunities include student job placement, industry contracts

involving campus faculty, and marketing contract education programs for industry

employees. For example, Brian frequently talked about his work experience outside of

academia and his current small business that involves the manufacturing of beverage

products. He stated, “We live in a capitalist society and money is important, but it is not my

only goal.” All research subjects consistently offered similar examples of how fulfilling

their dreams and being passionate about life relate to their academic courses. Brian
discussed how his small business relates to speech communications and how it directly relates to course instruction as those same lessons apply to all facets of industry.

Research subjects who teach in the natural sciences and vocational trades made the transition from private industry to the classroom. For example, Peter stated that the ability to “balance the theoretical with the practical can come only from faculty who have real world experience.” Industry experience does not have to be limited to only those professions that a faculty member may be teaching. Jennifer stated, “I worked for various companies doing different things from being a computer operator to working in a factory assembling products.” Demonstrating diversity in career pursuits shows students what private industry is looking for, as Paul stated, “... multitalented individuals.” Harold also made the case that, “... take welders, gone are the days when someone can just weld good and not be educated.” Faculty with industry experience are better able to influence curriculum to reflect the expectations of employers.

Having experience in private industry allows Harold to base his curriculum on industry standards to assure that students have the knowledge to compete in the workforce. Demonstrating to students how furthering their education increases their value in the marketplace encourages them to persist. Harold found that one of the biggest issues that restrict academic entrepreneurialism is a “resistance to change.”

All research subjects stressed the need for assuring that curriculum is always relevant. They further claimed that academic entrepreneurial faculty with industry experience are among the first to assure their curriculum keeps up with market needs since society is constantly changing. For example, Harold argued that true academic entrepreneurs “see something that is not working as well as it should, stop, and make it work
better.” Theresa agreed, stating, “The campus has both academic and vocational trade faculty who are academic entrepreneurs. They are quick to adapt, at one point making simple changes to a syllabus or course description, or more drastic actions that can include proposing new courses.” Research subjects argued that recruiting faculty with industry experience bolsters academic entrepreneurialism at a community college as it better enables them to seek industry partnerships.

**Establishing partnerships between the community college and private industry.**

Faculty with industry experience are better capable of establishing partnerships between the college and private industry (Hull & Hinckley, 2007). My analysis of interview transcripts found that the key motivation for their academic and vocational trade departments to pursue industry partnerships is when campus policies reflect its importance to the college. Academic entrepreneurial faculty argued that establishing true partnerships between campus and industry requires academic entrepreneurial faculty to identify how both sides can profit from one another. My analysis of data found that there are multiple types of partnerships with the first including academic and vocational trade departments working with industry to tailor curriculum according to market realities. Another form of partnership is establishing on the job training for academic and vocational trade departments. All research subjects claimed that they are proud of SCCC’s reputation for its successful vocational trades more so than its academic programs. Tracy stated that this correlates to the feeling among many academic faculty that, “The college just wants them to focus on transferability, updating curriculum to maintain our transfer rates more so than anything else.” Even those students who attend SCCC to complete their full associate’s degrees are doing so to transfer to a four-year university.
Financial industries have made monetary contributions to SCCC for the establishment of green technology programs. These contributions ranged from the multiple thousands to the high millions. Stephanie talked about how one financial institution profited from their contribution, by showing in “national commercials how they are investing in job training at local educational institutions.” Jennifer stressed that the college attracts industry with its reputation. She said, “These companies know their donations are not wasted, because of our track record of training students who then get into great careers.”

Departments themselves have the ability to pursue industry partnerships without the initial involvement of the college. Harold made the argument that the vocational trade departments are more likely to attract and/or pursue industry partnerships. One reason is that the vocational trades are more expensive to maintain than most academic departments. Harold argued that, “… some departments like welding are very expensive to operate so I have to constantly partner with industry representatives to encourage them to invest in our program.”

Research subjects representing the vocational trades specifically addressed why their departments are more likely than academic departments to pursue partnerships with private industry. All vocational trade departments have to participate with industry advisory boards that meet at a minimum of once per year. Hillary stressed that this “requires the vocational departments to meet with industry representatives so both sides can learn what the other side needs.” Partnerships give private industry the ability to advocate the adoption of industry standards into course instruction in the vocational trades. Hillary’s department is helping to alleviate the nursing shortage. She said, “This means our curriculum has to reflect what the
industry is using.” This is the same argument made throughout all interviews regardless of whether the faculty member teaches in the academic or vocational trade departments.

**Incorporating industry standards into course instruction.**

Franklin identified a key benefit of establishing partnerships with private industry. He found that “these relationships allow faculty with access to industry sources allow for curriculum to reflect industry standards.” My results from data analysis revealed that incorporating industry standards into course instruction involves faculty who embrace the concept of being open to the needs of industry. Faculty in this study who embrace industry proactively tailor their academic and/or vocational trade programs to the needs of industry today and in the future. Research subjects found that embracing industry encourages faculty to tailor curriculum to future industry needs, so that students entering a career field can better compete against those workers with multiple years of experience. All research subjects claimed that teaching according to industry standards is more important than maintaining curriculum that has lost its relevance. Harold, Franklin, and Theresa stressed that this is especially important with community colleges that offer trade vocational programs. Tracy asserted that vocational faculty who maintain industry contacts are better capable of enriching their course curriculum to meet industry needs. For example, Franklin takes the time to enrich his course content principally to demonstrate his accomplishments in private industry. This in turn gives him the ability to bring industry into the classroom. He stated, “I bring technology and materials from the knowledge of the private sector, and my experience from the private sector. I have brought technologies here like the flexible solar panels, bringing samples to the class and also the process.” This enables students to see for themselves what types of careers are available in the sciences.
Those instructors with private industry experience are better capable of helping students discover their career pathways. Franklin and Theresa claimed that students give greater credibility to those instructors who have industry experience specifically relating to their discipline. Brian professed the belief that it is necessary to tell students who may be majoring in your discipline what career opportunities exist. Students hear about his industry experience in the field of television and his philosophy to “give yourself as many options as possible, because you never know what the future holds.” Brian tells students on various occasions that he learned this lesson when one of the companies he worked for was taken over and he was laid off. Keeping yourself aware of upcoming trends is the best way to assure your professional success in your discipline of study.

One element of academic entrepreneurialism is tailoring course instruction according to the needs of your client base. Students are those clients who look to SCCC for programs that will help them secure successful careers and/or satisfy their life learning interests. Nursing students are unique, as their training requires them to interact with real life patients. Hillary stated, “Nursing has to be ever alert to industry changes.” Tracy stated that, “Fulfilling the needs of students directly increases their quality of life. This requires the college being open to industry needs today while updating curriculum to prepare students for the future job market.” All of the research subjects agreed that the college influences future industry trends today. Tracy added, “Our campus is linked to industry and to the community and then the nation. We are not so separate. Try doing either of those without the other and see how successful you are.”
Faculty who possess private industry experience are more likely to introduce professional lessons that may not directly relate to their course of instruction. Lisa argued that her corporate experience leads her to, “Introduce self-management lessons to students since this is very important in today’s workplace.” These lessons include time management, taking responsibility for your actions, making contributions to your field, and as Lisa put it, “…how your mother taught you to behave.” These life skills are essential for anyone to succeed in their personal, professional and academic lives. Franklin also talked about those practical lessons that originate from private industry as, “... very important rules that students need to know in order to succeed.” Students in possession of these skills are more likely to find employment in a world that as Theresa stated, “... values street smarts over sheer technical knowledge.”

Some subjects believed that faculty who have “real world experience” with private sector pursuits are better capable of creating new, innovative programs at their academic institutions. Franklin stressed that entrepreneurial faculty are capable of, “…discovering new products and new things. It helps them to see the limitations, while motivating themselves to move beyond those limitations and pursue new opportunities.” Working with industry partners allows the science department to adapt its curriculum accordingly. Jim stated, “Some of our students go to medical school, pharmacy school, some go into industry, it all depends.” He argued that it is a mistake for community colleges to focus only on private industry partners. Doing so avoids medical colleges whose “acceptance criteria requires us to cover certain things.” Jim expressed his belief that industry partners do not only include private businesses, but also universities and government agencies. Peter was also able to draw from industry contacts so that students are able to secure on the job
training, which, “… makes them more competitive in the job market.” I found the interview transcripts revealed that establishing industry partnerships depends on faculty engaging entrepreneurial pursuits.

**Requiring faculty to be academic entrepreneurs.**

Theresa argued that incorporating industry standards is easier when faculty embrace academic entrepreneurialism. She stated, “Entrepreneurial faculty refuse to confine themselves to anything old. So they are always on the lookout for new trends and standards, so they are communicating with industry all the time.” Most research subjects were of the belief that it is necessary for job descriptions and job announcements to require academic faculty entrepreneurialism. Brian found that hiring committees have the freedom to tailor job announcements to weed out those who do not possess the necessary qualifications. Similarly, Christine argued that state and local laws, as well as district regulations dictate minimum qualifications in job descriptions and subsequent job announcements. Research subjects emphasized that hiring committees face considerable limitations pertaining to the hiring process. Stephanie found that the only flexibility that hiring committees have in their pursuit of academic entrepreneurial faculty job candidates is stating this requirement in the desirable qualifications of a job announcement. She stated, “Even though you cannot list academic entrepreneurialism as a minimum qualification, committees can include this as a desirable characteristic.”

Research subjects asserted that their entrepreneurial pursuits are not part of their required duties as a part-time or full-time instructor. Theresa stated, “My entrepreneurial pursuits are not part of my job description, but when I see something that I think is important, I jump in.” Jessica also found a major issue pertaining to job descriptions. She
stated, “We need to specifically state entrepreneurial qualities in the desirable qualification area.” This is the only area hiring committees may edit.

Stephanie, Theresa, Christine, Harold, and Franklin demonstrated that job descriptions are a useful guide for hiring committees who use them to tailor job announcements in their pursuit of the best faculty member. They specifically claim that job descriptions do in fact influence the overall hiring process. I analyzed job descriptions and job announcements that related to the faculty positions of each research subject to ascertain whether academic entrepreneurial pursuits are a fundamental requirement of their employment.

Discovery of academic entrepreneurial identifiers came as a result of my analysis of research subject interviews. I coded job announcements in ATLAS.ti to see if they specifically address the following academic entrepreneurial qualifiers identified during the interviews with research subjects: emotional and social intelligence, improving programs / departments / college to enhance student success, collaborate with people to find answers, work with little direction, train peers in new techniques, seek funding sources, and consulting with industry peers. My analysis of job descriptions and job announcements with ATLAS.ti revealed a lack of conformity among faculty positions relating to entrepreneurial characteristics among the areas of duties, responsibilities, and qualities of the faculty member. None of the positions contains any academic entrepreneurial qualifiers arising from interviews with research subjects.

**Risks of Faculty Academic Entrepreneurialism**

The sixth theme is risks of faculty academic entrepreneurialism. At SCCC, there is no requirement for tenured faculty to pursue entrepreneurial agendas, as there are no
repercussions for not going above their normal job requirements. My analysis of interviews
demonstrated that any risks apply mostly to part-time rather than full-time faculty. Paul did
not express concern about the risks tenured faculty face by being academic entrepreneurs.
At least for tenured faculty, they “would not face anything dire in the sense of disciplinary
action.” Paul argued that if he chose not to be entrepreneurial, that “…nothing would
happen to me in the sense of disciplinary action, but I would be far less satisfied with myself
if I did that.” Lisa stressed the belief that the faculty member is letting students down if
“They were not pursuing entrepreneurial agendas and going above the call of duty.” Lisa
found that adjunct faculty may be hesitant to take chances since, “They are sometimes
reluctant to take chances since they don’t want to risk any chance of getting a full-time
position.” Frank agreed that this is more so the case with academic adjunct instructors since
“…vocational trade faculty, part-time and full-time are expected to be engaging
entrepreneurial pursuits.” All interview subjects argued that faculty self-impose these risks
and that there is no campus policy prohibiting anyone from pursuing academic
entrepreneurialism.

Academic entrepreneurial faculty members who participated with this study argued
that student success is their ultimate goal. Lisa found that this characteristic ties into her
belief that it is the responsibility of the faculty member to “place student success as their
highest priority.” This requires the willingness of the faculty member to “embrace academic
entrepreneurialism to try new things that will help students succeed at a faster pace.” Harold
and Franklin both emphasized that trying new things sometimes requires academic
entrepreneurial faculty members to take risks. Lisa pointed out that risk taking should not
be “made in haste, but be well calculated while also assuring that not too many toes are stepped on.”

Summary

All interview subjects were adamant with their opinion that institutional policies have a great influence over faculty academic entrepreneurialism. These policies provide incentives for faculty who engage in academic entrepreneurialism, along with the necessary training and support. Jessica stated, “The faculty are the ones who are better able to identify available funding, especially with industry partners because of their insider access to industry.” Another key factor is the recognition of academic entrepreneurial faculty from the standpoint of the institution that in turn fosters an academic entrepreneurial environment. None of the research subjects had any adamant objections to those existing institutional policies concerning academic entrepreneurialism. Jessica added that the college has “made great strides over the past ten years to encourage academic entrepreneurialism.”

Research subjects find that though the level of academic entrepreneurialism at SCCC is commendable that there is always room for improvement. Theresa said, “We are a long way from being perfect, but our campus is a massive engine of entrepreneurialism and we will get there someday.” Chapter five analyzes these results to offer methods for encouraging academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results of this study allow this final chapter to offer findings and a set of recommendations to promote academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. This chapter first evaluates the research questions from the description of three factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism: individual, institutional, and environmental. The chapter then offers an explanatory model of how to understand the interrelationship of these three levels of individual, institutional, and environmental factors that foster academic entrepreneurialism at a community college campus. The chapter follows with recommendations that focus on institutional policies as they pertain to the recruitment, retention, and training of academic entrepreneurial community college faculty. Recommendations for further research seek to extend this single case study to academic entrepreneurial faculty at a community college that does not possess strong vocational trades programs, examine academic entrepreneurial college administrators at community colleges that possess and lack strong vocational trades programs, and to include multiple case sites.

Research Questions

The study seeks to identify individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Accordingly, the research questions intend to identify key factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty and explain how they facilitate faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. The research questions that I evaluated are:

1. What individual, institutional, and environmental factors influence community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism?
2. What is the relationship between faculty background, institutional, and environmental characteristics and the frequency and quality of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty?

Factors That Encourage Academic Entrepreneurialism

The first research question of the study attempts to understand what individual, institutional, and environmental factors encourage community college faculty to engage in academic entrepreneurialism. Individual factors include demographic and background characteristics, including age, race, gender, academic training, and previous professional careers. Institutional factors include program offerings available for students, institutional reputation and history, institutional policies and practices, and academic and administrative leadership. Environmental factors relate to the peer influences of a campus that encourages academic entrepreneurial behavior of faculty. I added to these general individual, institutional, and environmental factors with those that directly influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty.

Results from this study tentatively allow for identification of the individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. The individual factors that directly influence academic entrepreneurialism consist of the following elements: commitment to student success, commitment to life-long learning, proponent of career pathways for traditional / nontraditional students, possession of a high degree of emotional and social intelligence, commitment to sharing entrepreneurial pursuits with students through course instruction, and the willingness to act independently when professional opportunities arise. The institutional factors that directly influence academic entrepreneurialism consist of the
following elements: requiring academic entrepreneurialism in job descriptions and job announcements, incorporating industry standards into course instruction, setting institutional goals for academic entrepreneurialism, and establishing policies requiring faculty to actively seek industry partnerships. Finally, the environmental factors that directly influence academic entrepreneurialism consist of the following elements: campus recognition of faculty members who possess industry experience, faculty recognition of academic entrepreneurial peers, and industry recognition of academic entrepreneurial faculty.

**Individual Factors that Directly Influence Academic Entrepreneurialism Among Community College Faculty**

Faculty entrepreneurialism is the result of individual factors that encourage this behavior (Amey, 2010). The results of this study suggest that individual factors consist of the following elements: commitment to student success, commitment to life-long learning, proponent of career pathways for traditional / nontraditional students, possession of a high degree of emotional and social intelligence, commitment to sharing entrepreneurial pursuits with students through course instruction, and the willingness to act independently when professional opportunities arise. The study finds that academic entrepreneurial faculty exhibit these qualities inside and outside academia.

**Commitment to student success.**

This study finds that commitment to student success applies to encouraging coworkers, employees, as well as personal and professional acquaintances to be successful in the private market. Results from this study seem to indicate that encouraging success is a key inherent quality of academic entrepreneurial faculty both within and outside academia. Academic entrepreneurial faculty actively pursue goals that further student success. This is
the key individual factor that serves as the foundation of all other characteristics that serve to support their commitment to student success. Faculty with a strong commitment to student success strive to influence institutional policy, along with the development of a campus environment that encourages their peers to be academic entrepreneurs.

The drive for student success relates to faculty commitment to life-long learning. For example, as described below, academic entrepreneurial faculty affirm their personal commitment to life-long learning, even prior to their careers in academia. Embracing life-long learning applies to academic instruction along with independent pursuits, which in turn determine how faculty influence students. Pursuing goals that further student success tend to resonate better with faculty who demonstrate extrovert characteristics, as they openly advocate for their students. This study indicates that there is a correlation between having a commitment to student success with a commitment to life-long learning.

**Commitment to life-long learning.**

Commitment to life-long learning relates to individual faculty members who consistently improve their own capacity of knowledge, without being a professional requirement. Results indicate that this quality also relates to academic faculty members who openly promote life-long learning to everyone both inside and outside academia. This commitment better enables the academic entrepreneurial faculty member to encourage students to continue their educational pursuits, whether in the classroom, in private industry, and/or individually. Results of this study find that these faculty members dedicate their time to learning by attending professional conferences, independently studying additional subjects, and pursuing additional graduate and postgraduate degrees. Finally, the results of this study find that having a commitment to life-long learning enables the academic
entrepreneurial faculty member to better promote career pathways for traditional and nontraditional students.

**Proponent of career pathways for traditional and nontraditional students.**

Proponents of career pathways for traditional / nontraditional students relate to the faculty member encouraging those inside and outside academia to capitalize on their knowledge in the private market (Hull, 2005; Hull & Hinckley, 2007). Results demonstrate that academic entrepreneurial faculty encourage students to link their academic and vocational trade pursuits to a career pathway. Academic entrepreneurial faculty in all instructional departments are strong proponents of career pathways for traditional and nontraditional students. Results from this study indicate that these faculty members take the time to connect their courses to potential career pathways so that students can further benefit from the experience. Multiple cases emerged over the course of data analysis where research participants incorporated discussions of career pathways into the course lecture. The results also indicate that academic entrepreneurial faculty balance course theories with real world practicality, so nontraditional students with more work experience are more likely to relate to lecture material.

**Possession of a high degree of emotional and social intelligence.**

Results demonstrate that academic entrepreneurial faculty possess high degrees of emotional and social intelligence. They have a tendency to follow their instincts rather than logic when deciding whether to pursue endeavors relating to entrepreneurialism, either academic, or otherwise. Further, results indicate that the majority of academic entrepreneurial faculty are extrovert both inside and outside the classroom. This character trait is not a requirement, as a minority of academic entrepreneurial faculty may be introvert
inside and/or outside the classroom. The results also show that all academic entrepreneurial faculty possess a great deal of social intelligence and are able to attract support from their peers, administrative supervisors, community representatives, and private industries. The results of this study suggest that faculty members with high degrees of emotional and social intelligence, first devise a strategy, and then sell their plan to potential supporters. The results of this study also suggest that faculty who possess high degrees of emotional and social intelligence exhibit a strong commitment to share their entrepreneurial pursuits with students through course instruction.

**Commitment to sharing entrepreneurial pursuits with students through course instruction.**

Academic entrepreneurial faculty connect their entrepreneurial pursuits to course instruction. This finding pertains to academic entrepreneurial faculty in academic and vocational trade departments. The results of this study suggest that faculty with private industry experience do not separate market practices from course instruction. Instead, these faculty members appear to maintain a philosophy that private industry dictates what graduates should learn in their respective programs. The results of this study indicate that academic entrepreneurial faculty tailor their course curriculum to private industry practices and are willing to introduce market concepts prior to institutional approval of curriculum. They also appear to believe that sharing personal and professional interests with their classes increases student success.

A cademic entrepreneurial faculty seem to be willing to share their entrepreneurial experiences that include disclosure of both professional successes and failures to provide students with the knowledge necessary to succeed. These experiences do not only pertain to
the course subject material. It can also include practical advice that is relevant for any student. Connecting entrepreneurial pursuits to instruction also applies to faculty sharing their pursuits with those outside of academia who may be in need of guidance. The results of this study suggest that faculty members who share their entrepreneurial pursuits with students may also act independently when entrepreneurial opportunities become apparent.

**Willingness to act independently when professional opportunities arise.**

The results from this study suggest that academic entrepreneurial faculty pursue various professional opportunities. This finding is consistent with the notion that entrepreneurs pursue opportunities that benefit themselves directly, and/or those who they want to help succeed (Gergen and Vanourek, 2008) and that entrepreneurs in all areas of industry exhibit a tendency to act quickly when opportunities become apparent (Goleman, 2000). A cademic entrepreneurial community college faculty equate student success with their ability to secure private industry advancement and may act independently to help them achieve success (Hull & Hinckley, 2007). Theresa works directly with industry partners to provide employment opportunities for her students. She stated, “I don’t need anyone’s permission from anyone up above to help a student get a job.” Further, the results indicate that academic entrepreneurial faculty have a tendency to share opportunities with their students without the knowledge of administration.

The majority of research participants gave multiple examples of academic entrepreneurial faculty who took the time to direct students towards employment and career opportunities. Stephanie stressed that, “The college does not stress student job placement, but it should be the goal of faculty to prepare students so that they can be gainfully employed. I along with other likeminded faculty guide students to opportunities that we
come across.” Paul, Harold, and Theresa argued that they prefer acting independently without notifying administration. Paul stated that, “Sometimes helping a student directly is better than having the entire college or administration find out.”

Institutional Factors that Directly Influence Academic Entrepreneurialism Among Community College Faculty

Institutional policies determine the degree of academic entrepreneurialism at a community college campus. There are four institutional factors that directly influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty: requiring academic entrepreneurialism in job descriptions and job announcements, incorporating industry standards into course instruction, setting institutional goals for academic entrepreneurialism, and establishing policies requiring faculty to actively seek industry partnerships.

Requiring academic entrepreneurialism in job descriptions and job announcements.

The majority of research subjects made the case that academic entrepreneurialism at the campus level is the result of institutional factors that encourage this behavior. They further claim that institutional policies set goals and expectations for faculty along with corresponding rewards and punishments. The majority of research subjects argued that the most effective method of promoting academic entrepreneurialism is for community colleges to state these requirements in job descriptions and job announcements. Analysis of all interviews reveal that there are additional benefits with requiring academic entrepreneurialism in job descriptions and job announcements: providing guidance to hiring committees with their search for academic entrepreneurial job candidates, providing guidance to evaluation committees as they determine if faculty are satisfying academic
entrepreneurial requirements, and offering guidance to faculty members striving to be academic entrepreneurs.

**Incorporating industry standards into course instruction.**

Course instruction that is not relevant in the marketplace both today and in the future can cause significant harm to students as well as society as a whole (Hull, 2005; Hull & Hinckley, 2007). Institutional policies that require tailoring curriculum to industry standards encourages academic entrepreneurialism. Incorporating industry standards requires the community college to maintain communication with private industry. In fact, previous research indicates that community college faculty with expertise in their field of instruction are the key link between the community college and industry leaders (2007). The research data suggests that community college faculty who are in communication with private industry are better capable of fulfilling institutional requirements for tailoring curriculum to industry standards.

The **Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA 1998)** requires that vocational trade departments maintain advisory boards. Each vocational trade program has an advisory board that meets a minimum of once a year. These advisory boards consist of private industry representatives and faculty representatives of vocational trade programs at a community college. Results show that vocational trade programs are better capable of steering their students towards relevant career pathways, as their departments are more likely to provide relevant course instruction. Lacking are mandatory requirements for academic programs to maintain advisory boards to assure their curriculum is relevant today and in the future. Incorporating industry standards into course instruction solidifies student success as a requirement for the campus to achieve as a set institutional goal.
Setting institutional goals for academic entrepreneurialism.

Interview subjects argued that academic entrepreneurial community college campuses are better capable of coordinating resources to achieve their goals. The study finds that parties of interest set institutional goals that assure the entire institution is aware of its priorities. Theresa, Paul, and Harold asserted that academic entrepreneurial campuses invite all parties of interest to assure that institutional goals address the needs of all academic and trade vocational departments, as well as the general needs of private industry and the community. Theresa stated, “Everyone has to come together at the college to come up with a game plan to seek out private industry resources to help us help them.” Paul concurred with Theresa and said, “Setting institutional goals is important, especially when it comes down to finding ways to be more entrepreneurial, but it does require everyone communicating with one another.” All parties of interest have to be willing to communicate with people outside of their respective departments. Harold asserted that, “Faculty especially have to venture outside of their comfort zone and be willing to communicate with those people at the campus, who like them want to push the entrepreneurial envelope.” Theresa, Paul, and Harold stressed that setting institutional goals for academic entrepreneurialism is difficult if faculty are not willing to communicate with one another and also administration. Harold stated, “It makes it harder for academic entrepreneurial faculty to be very effective without the support of administration and their faculty peers.”

Establishing policies requiring faculty to actively seek industry partnerships.

Academic entrepreneurial campus environments attract industry partnerships. These business friendly campuses proactively pursue mutual beneficial partnerships through entrepreneurial faculty members who maintain active relationships with the private and
public market. This study finds that the reputation of a community college campus for embracing academic entrepreneurialism occurs through promotion of its academic entrepreneurial faculty, along with their entrepreneurial achievements within academia, private industry, and advancement of academic programs that further student success.

This study finds that entrepreneurial faculty partnerships through industry investments support financial donations, equipment donations, student employment opportunities, and access to industry trends to assist with curriculum development. Industries benefit from their partnerships with community colleges in ways that include access to graduates with the proper training, ability to influence curriculum for their future workforce, and the ability to advertise their community investments for marketing purposes (Boone, 1997). Faculty with relevant industry experience are able to solicit private industry partnerships and serve as agents for their community college campus as points of contact for industry (Thorp & Goldstein, 2010).

**Environmental Factors that Directly Influence Academic Entrepreneurialism Among Community College Faculty**

Interview subjects claimed that campus environments determine the level of academic entrepreneurialism among its faculty. These elements determine whether peers are either supportive or dismissive of community college academic entrepreneurial pursuits among faculty. There are three environmental factors that directly influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty: campus recognition of faculty members who possess industry experience, faculty recognition of academic entrepreneurial peers, and industry recognition of academic entrepreneurial faculty.
Campus recognition of faculty members who possess industry experience.

Research subjects argued that identifying community college faculty with industry experience allows the institution to engage partnerships with private industry. The results from this study seem to indicate that community colleges are better able to identify vocational trade faculty with industry experience than academic faculty with industry experience. The primary reason is an institutional bias within many community college campuses that correlate vocational trade departments with private industry instead of equal recognition of both vocational trade and academic departments (Bird & Allen, 1989). The results of this study seem to suggest that recognizing faculty with industry experience elevates their respect and solidifies the commitment of industry standards.

Academic and vocational trade faculty with industry experience provide the community college with market experiences along with potential contacts in their fields that can result in significant industry partnerships (Hull, 2005). The results of this study suggest that academic entrepreneurial campuses advertise the accomplishments of their faculty with industry experience, as it is a vital marketing tool for their institutions (Thorp & Goldstein, 2010). It not only assists with student recruitment, but also the proactive solicitation of private industry partnerships. The results of this study indicate that promotion of faculty academic entrepreneurialism as it relates to maintaining marketable and relevant educational programs may further student success. The results of this study suggest that institutional recognition of academic entrepreneurial faculty encourages this behavior among their peers.

Faculty recognition of academic entrepreneurial peers.

This study finds that when community colleges link academic entrepreneurial goals to faculty recognition of their entrepreneurial successes, it serves to encourage their peers
with the pursuit (Hearn, 2003). It also serves as a public declaration that the community college places academic entrepreneurialism as a priority goal of the institution (Hess, 2006). Faculty recognize their academic entrepreneurial peers internally through one-on-one interaction with their peers and officially through faculty representative bodies. The results of this study suggest that representative faculty bodies elect to recognize academic entrepreneurial faculty internally by one or more of the following methods: distribution of e-mail bulletins, posting announcements throughout a campus, hosting a formal reception, and distributing awards.

The study finds that faculty peer recognition also includes external recognition by one or more of the following methods: press releases, media campaigns, and publicity pieces sent to private industries promoting the academic entrepreneurial accomplishments of faculty. This proactive marketing strategy attracts those private industries that are looking to establish partnerships with academic entrepreneurial community colleges. Another positive aspect of external recognition marketing campaigns is that it strengthens those partnerships that the academic entrepreneurial community college already enjoys with private industry (Thorp & Goldstein, 2010). The study suggests that faculty recognition of academic entrepreneurial peers may attract industry recognition of their campus.

Industry recognition of academic entrepreneurial faculty.

Research data indicates that industry recognition can sometimes benefit academic entrepreneurial faculty directly with financial awards, jobs, and/or independent contract opportunities. The data also seems to suggest that industry recognition of academic entrepreneurial faculty benefits the institution as it legitimizes and promotes academic entrepreneurial environments. Theresa found that the college benefits when industry
recognizes its entrepreneurial faculty. She stated, “Industry recognition of entrepreneurial faculty brings positive attention to the institution and with that comes financial support from industry and even partnerships.” Franklin argued that community colleges benefit when industry recognizes its entrepreneurial faculty as “it gives the institution greater validity among its competitors, whether public or private institutions of higher learning.” Peter stated, “When private industry starts to recognize entrepreneurial faculty, it brings with it great benefits, including donations, partnerships and career opportunities for our students.”

**Explanatory Model**

The second research question of the study attempts to understand the relationship between faculty backgrounds, institutional, and environmental characteristics and the frequency and quality of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Answering this second research question requires the construction of a theory grounded in the results that examine evolving patterns of action and interaction among subjects, events, environments, and occurrences that may or may not be significant and scrutinizes the entire development. The theory draws from a unique form of rational choice theory to make the argument that individual, institutional and environmental factors work together to influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. I generated a theory throughout the data collection period to help with the analysis of individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism of community college faculty.
Interdependent Relationship Between Individual, Institutional, and Environmental Factors

Rational choice theory dictates that individual self-interest determines all behavior, whether made according to logic or emotion (Lane, 1996). The theory requires the individual weighing costs against benefits when deciding whether to pursue something (1996). Understanding what influences individual behavior requires taking into account all factors that influence their actions: individual, institutional, and environmental (1996). Rational choice theory is the concept of behavior according to individual self-interest that involves conducting a cost benefit analysis. Individuals weigh the cost along with the benefits and then decide to pursue something if the benefits outweigh the costs. Lane’s conception of rational choice theory supports the argument that all three variables are interdependent on one another. The individual behavior of one individual can influence institutional and then environmental factors (1996). This study finds that all three factors are essential elements of academic entrepreneurialism.

Emerging Theory

Results reveal the belief of all research subjects that individual and environmental factors support the development of academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Accordingly, the emerging theory that this study supports is: both individual and environmental factors support institutional factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Individual, institutional, and environmental factors follow the tenets of rational choice theory. Rational choice theory allows the study to discern the primary motivation of individual, institutional, and environmental interaction as they all consist of single actors pursuing their own self-interest.
(Lane, 1996). Institutional factors facilitate individual and environmental factors that in turn support institutional factors that influence academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. This self-sustaining model promotes academic entrepreneurialism as an institutional societal norm of behavior. Rational choice theorists argue that societal norms influence individual behavior (1996). Influencing societal norms of behavior within the institution promotes the development of academic entrepreneurialism where the institution itself promotes academic entrepreneurialism with little internal resistance.

**Institutional factors that promote institutional policies and practices related to entrepreneurialism.**

Institutional factors that encourage policies promoting academic entrepreneurial behavior include: requiring academic entrepreneurialism in job descriptions and job announcements, incorporating industry standards into course instruction, setting institutional goals for academic entrepreneurialism, and establishing policies requiring faculty to seek industry partnerships. These institutional factors clearly indicate the policy pursuits of the organization. Institutions are pursuing their self-interest as their individual members determine according to those policies and procedures they put into place. Group pursuits of self-interest are elements of rational choice theory as individual member pursuits join together to determine institutional goals (Lane, 1996).

Institutional policies hinder academic entrepreneurialism if they do not factor the need for pursuing academic entrepreneurialism. This is apparent as it pertains to hiring practices. Tracy referred to this fact when she states, “Department chairs have to follow the book when hiring adjunct faculty, it follows seniority lists, pure and simple.” Franklin referenced institutional policies not only to hiring practices of full-time and adjunct
instructors, but also to the selection process of department chairs and other administrators. He stated, “If you look at most chairs they do not have private industry experience, are not business people and do not appreciate entrepreneurial people.” Institutional policies also hinder the ability to retain essential adjunct instructors who are valuable to a department. Jim in particular talked about various instances at the college where adjunct instructors are hesitant to invest their time and energy towards entrepreneurial projects, because “they can be here one semester and then not another, so what is the point?”

Making changes to the institutional policies of a community college campus is the key method for encouraging academic entrepreneurialism. Institutional policies determine whether the college can successfully recruit and retain academic entrepreneurial faculty. It also determines whether the college environment attracts public and private industry partnerships, as well as the ability to solicit for donations and grant funding. Institutional policies that promote academic entrepreneurialism promote the recruitment and retention of academic entrepreneurial faculty. Another result are entrepreneurial campus atmospheres that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty through peer influence. Influencing societal norms of behavior within the institution that promote the development of academic entrepreneurialism, allows for the development of a self-sustaining model, where the institution itself promotes academic entrepreneurialism with little internal resistance. Changing societal norms of behavior within any society is a slow process that in time can become self-sustaining (Lane, 1996).
Individual factors directly influence the development of academic entrepreneurship.

Individual factors encourage faculty academic entrepreneurial behavior. These individual factors include: commitment to student success, commitment to life-long learning, proponent of career pathways for traditional / nontraditional students, possession of a high degree of emotional and social intelligence, and commitment to sharing entrepreneurial pursuits with students through course instruction. These individual factors are examples of individual pursuits of self-interest that for academic entrepreneurial faculty directly relate to furthering student success. This is a key element of rational choice theory. This conceptual framework allows us to understand that even if the individual goal is to promote student success and not the pursuit of wealth, it is an example of a faculty member pursuing their own self-interest, which in turn is the result of their belief system.

The individual faculty member influences institutional policies through shared governance, serving on hiring committees and their influence on multiple committees that can determine institutional policies. Faculty members also influence the campus environment, as their actions influence peers and alter the overall image of the college. Institutional policies influence all elements of a college as it pertains to what is acceptable and not acceptable. The campus environment is a reflection of both individual and institutional factors that in turn influences them as well.

Eleven of the fourteen research subjects were a principal investigator, director, or supervisor of an entrepreneurial project and/or held a management position during their career at SCCC. All eleven of the research subjects talked about the importance of following institutional policies and procedures during their career at SCCC. This was the
greatest influential factor over their individual decisions that in turn determined the overall campus environment. Harold took the time to explain the connection institutional policies and procedures have over the recruitment and retention of academic entrepreneurial faculty. He stated, “The community needs entrepreneurial faculty and institutional policies need to specifically state that this is a priority.” Theresa contended that policies are sometimes made “just to do something busy” and that policies and procedures should be “reasonable and take into account the need for pushing the envelope, to innovate and to be creative.” Stephanie argued that what is truly needed is “common sense from all parties” and that the reality is “times change and the college as a whole needs to embrace change with academic entrepreneurialism.”

All research subjects recognized a need for community colleges to address institutional restraints that as Jennifer stated “restrict entrepreneurial faculty.” Hillary addressed a key institutional constraint that serves to “treat everyone the same.” She went on to say, “Some administrators think all departments are the same and this assumption is always wrong.” Peter also touched on this subject with the argument that “every department has faculty who know better what they need to best serve their students.” Jennifer said, “Sometimes all it takes for faculty to achieve entrepreneurial success is for administration to listen and give moral support, even if the idea sounds farfetched.” Harold argued, “Institutional policies encourages faculty to be entrepreneurial and this promotes campus environments to be entrepreneurial too.”
Environmental factors directly influence the development of academic entrepreneurialism.

Environmental factors promote the development of academic entrepreneurial campus atmospheres. These environmental factors include: campus recognition of faculty members who possess industry experience, faculty recognition of academic entrepreneurial peers, and industry recognition of academic entrepreneurial faculty. The environmental atmosphere of encouraging proactive pursuits of opportunities fosters a campus environment that encourages entrepreneurial behavior. This is the power of peer influence. Environmental factors influence individual belief systems, along with their self-interest that in turn influence the overall atmosphere of the institution (Green & Shapiro, 1994, 1996).

All research subjects argued that institutional policies determine whether a community college campus environment promotes academic entrepreneurialism. Paul claimed that institutional policies influence “whether entrepreneurialism is a valid faculty pursuit or something that should be shunned.” The issue of validity came up again with Lisa even though she stated her belief that “most entrepreneurial faculty are entrepreneurial with or without institutional support.” Lisa stated, “Even though most of the entrepreneurial faculty have these qualities already, having institutional support does give us that extra push of encouragement.” Rational choice theory recognizes institutional support as campus societal validation of academic entrepreneurialism (Lane, 1996).

**Recommendations for Practice and Sustainability**

Changes to institutional policies are the key determining factor to encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. Institutional policies may determine how a college functions and understands the interrelationship between individual,
institutional, and environmental factors. Encouraging academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty may require institutional policies that focus on: recruiting, evaluating, and retaining academic entrepreneurial community college faculty.

Academic entrepreneurial faculty recruitment and evaluation requires institutional changes to the process of tailoring faculty job descriptions and faculty job announcements to state academic entrepreneurial requirements. Assuring that faculty job descriptions and faculty job announcements state these requirements requires a rubric evaluation tool. Retaining academic entrepreneurial community college faculty involves institutional practices that recognize faculty academic entrepreneurialism. The rubric evaluation tool is also useful when determining who among the faculty deserve recognition for their academic entrepreneurialism. There are four recommendations:

1. job descriptions and job announcements requiring academic entrepreneurialism
2. recruiting and evaluating academic entrepreneurial faculty
3. entrepreneurial faculty evaluation
4. retaining academic entrepreneurial faculty through financial incentives

**Job Descriptions and Job Announcements Requiring Academic Entrepreneurialism**

Faculty job descriptions and faculty job announcements influence each other. Stating academic entrepreneurial requirements for community college faculty in job descriptions and job announcements assist hiring committees with their recruitment process and evaluation committees during the faculty review process. Job descriptions for instructional positions are generic without specifically addressing the type of instruction, whether academic or vocational trade. This results in corresponding job announcements that do not conform to relating academic instruction positions. Hiring committees have the
freedom to tailor job announcements to weed out those who do not possess the necessary qualifications. State and local laws, as well as district regulations dictate minimum qualifications. Job announcements differ for the same academic instructional position, whether they are academic or vocational trade.

Hiring committees are only able to edit desirable qualifications. State and local laws, as well as district regulations dictate minimum qualifications. Job announcements differ for the same academic instructional position, whether they are academic or vocational trade. Faculty job descriptions and their relating faculty job announcements need to address components of academic entrepreneurialism. There are four key components of a faculty job description and faculty job announcement: position description, duties of the position, minimum and desirable qualifications, and professional responsibilities.

Committees responsible for assuring that job descriptions and their corresponding job announcements address academic entrepreneurial requirements, can accomplish this task with a rubric. This evaluation tool is useful for determining whether each of the four key components of a faculty job description and faculty job announcement address academic entrepreneurialism. These four key components are identical for both faculty job descriptions and faculty job announcements: position description, duties of the position, minimum and desirable qualifications, and professional responsibilities.

Recruiting and Evaluating Academic Entrepreneurial Faculty

There are no one-size-fits all templates for authoring job descriptions that state the requirement for academic entrepreneurialism. Tailoring the minimum qualifications area of a job description by a hiring committee is not possible. Job descriptions stating the necessity of community college faculty academic entrepreneurialism provide hiring
committees essential guidance. This is the essential first step to recruiting academic entrepreneurial faculty.

The recruitment process is dependent on job announcements that state the requirement for job candidates to have academic entrepreneurial qualifications. Table 5 provides a rubric for community colleges to assure their faculty job descriptions and faculty job announcements effectively address academic entrepreneurialism. Community colleges may use this rubric to evaluate the following four major areas of a job description: position description, duties and tasks of position, desirable qualifications, and professional responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>0 Unacceptable Entrepreneurialism</th>
<th>1 Acceptable Entrepreneurialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description lacks mentioning of entrepreneurial personality characteristics. The position description itself does not represent entrepreneurial traits, qualities, and requirement for independent thought.</td>
<td>The job description exemplifies academic entrepreneurialism in its title and portrayal. Description represents entrepreneurial characteristics that include charisma, dynamism, motivation, and a belief in student success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties and Tasks of Position</td>
<td>Position duties and responsibilities do not require active campus interaction with faculty, staff, and students. Duties and tasks do not require the individual to work with individuals residing outside of their departments.</td>
<td>Components clearly state the requirement for committee participation, curriculum participation, accreditation participation, professional development, and the necessity for interaction with the campus community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirable Qualifications</td>
<td>Academic entrepreneurialism is not an inherent quality in the qualifications. Desirable qualifications do not reflect academic entrepreneurial qualities that go beyond the minimum qualifications of the position.</td>
<td>Qualifications exemplify academic entrepreneurialism. Reas include experience with external funding solicitation, mentoring faculty peers in academic entrepreneurialism, and mentoring students while helping them pursue their career pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td>Primary duties of the faculty member highlight only the minimum employee requirements that include teaching, assessing programs, participation in program review, SLO review, developing and updating existing courses, participation in department and college committees and meeting with students during scheduled classroom and office hours.</td>
<td>Responsibilities include the incorporation of academic entrepreneurial qualities in the area of professional responsibilities. This is in addition to those primary duties of the faculty member and includes at minimum the requirement of faculty participation with advisory boards to assure the relevance of their programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though hiring committees are not able to make changes to the area of minimum qualifications, it is necessary to include this section in the academic entrepreneurial evaluation process so the institution can take the necessary first step of making recommendations.

**Position description.**

Position descriptions are a synopsis of the job that compresses the entire job announcement into one or two paragraphs. There are four personality characteristics relating to academic entrepreneurialism that require mentioning in the position description: charismatic, dynamic, motivated, and a belief in student success. These emotional and social intelligence characteristics exemplify academic entrepreneurialism.

**Duties and responsibilities of the position.**

Stating duties of the position reflect those minimum responsibilities that someone in their respective job has to fulfill. Union contracts specify these duties and responsibilities as the agreement between labor and the college district. All faculty have to fulfill a 30-hour a week assignment that includes both teaching and departmental duties. Department responsibilities include four major areas: maintaining scheduled office and campus hours that include participating in department and campus meetings, participation in curriculum development and accreditation, serving on college committees, and participating in appropriate professional development activities.

**Minimum qualifications.**

The results of this study demonstrate that minimum qualifications vary for academic and vocational trade positions. The minimum qualifications for a faculty position in the vocational trades requires either a bachelor’s degree and two years of experience or any
associate degree and six years of experience. Vocational trade applicants must also have a medical evaluation at their expense demonstrating fitness to work in the district if they are a new employee and commit to a teaching assignment determined according to union, campus, and district rules.

The minimum qualifications for a faculty position in the academics require a master’s degree in the discipline that is being filled or a bachelors in a related major and masters or higher in a discipline related to the field. Academic applicants must also have a medical evaluation at their expense demonstrating fitness to work in the district if they are a new employee and commit to a teaching assignment determined according to union, campus, and district rules. The majority of research subjects asserted that these minimum qualifications do not address any area relating to academic entrepreneurialism. Colleges may not alter minimum qualifications as they reflect state and district regulations.

**Desirable qualifications.**

Desirable qualifications normally include the following references: sensitivity to and understanding of diverse student populations, academic excellence, keeping abreast with the subject, and experience working with committees. Academic entrepreneurial desirable qualifications can include the following: knowledge of grants, professional experience relating to their field of study, ability to mentor students towards their career pathway, and the ability to link the discipline to future career opportunities.

**Professional responsibilities.**

Professional responsibilities pertain to the primary duties of the employee that includes: teaching the course, assessing the program, participation in program review, engaging in SLO review, developing and updating existing courses, participating in
department and college committees, and meeting with students during scheduled classroom and office hours. There are stark inconsistencies with professional responsibilities as they pertain to both faculty and vocational trade positions. Only the vocational trade job descriptions state as a professional responsibility the requirement of the faculty member to develop industry partnerships, along with the need to participate with advisory boards. Incorporating academic entrepreneurial qualities in the area of professional responsibilities equally for both academic and vocational trade positions is a necessity. All faculty working in the academic and vocational trade departments need to participate with advisory boards to assure the relevancy of their programs.

**Entrepreneurial Faculty Evaluation**

Connecting faculty job security to their academic entrepreneurial performance may also require either amending labor contracts, and/or agreeing to a completely new agreement. Job security pertains to the ability to receive semester hiring seniority status as well as their ability to secure tenure. Determining job security requires taking into account whether the faculty member is abiding to job descriptions that state the requirement for academic entrepreneurialism.

The majority of community colleges have to follow a union contract. Changes to the faculty evaluation process require either amending labor contracts, and/or agreeing to a completely new agreement. Faculty evaluations should take into account whether the faculty member is abiding to job descriptions that state the requirement for academic entrepreneurialism. Evaluation committees may utilize those rubrics that determine whether faculty job descriptions and faculty job announcements exemplify academic entrepreneurialism for this purpose.
Retaining Academic Entrepreneurial Faculty Through Financial Incentives

Research subjects asserted that though financial incentives did not motivate their decision to pursue academic entrepreneurialism, institutional recognition does motivate the behavior. Awarding financial incentives for academic entrepreneurial achievements may require amending labor contracts, and/or agreeing to a completely new agreement. There are multiple examples of providing financial incentives. One example is writing a grant to include a stipend for the principal investigator, who may be the faculty member who undertook the challenge. A second example is awarding overtime pay for overseeing a special project. Discretionary funding sources that may include financial donations given to the college foundation may also be given to faculty known for their academic entrepreneurialism.

Recommendations for Further Research

I interviewed fourteen faculty members at a single case site representing the following major departments: social and behavioral sciences; language arts; natural sciences; counseling; physical education; and vocational trades. The purpose of this study was to identify those individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. This study then offered a practical method for changing institutional policies to assist with the recruitment, retention, and evaluation of academic entrepreneurial community college faculty. There remain areas for further research.

Multiple Case Site Approach to Academic Entrepreneurialism

Results of this study may not be typical to all community colleges. A key limitation was the decision to focus solely on one case site. Single cases make it useful to take
advantage of internal networks that exist on campus. This qualitative study allowed for distinctions by examining the whole case instead of assigning identifiers to each particular classification. Case sites are not controlled laboratory settings. These cases provide little assurance that the results are repeatable if the study were to take place in the future at the same institution, and/or at another case site. The value of a qualitative study is the appreciation for ambiguities that are essential parts of human language. This required the use of thematic data analysis. Future research should examine additional case sites to determine whether the results of SCCC are typical or atypical.

**Academic Entrepreneurialism Among Community College Administration**

Most college administrators have classroom experience. Some job announcements for the positions of dean and vice-president of academic affairs require either part-time and/or full-time teaching experience. Administrators in positions of leadership have a strong influence over institutional policies. Future research is necessary to determine whether the same individual, institutional, and environmental factors that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty also encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college administrators. Such a study should examine both those college administrators with classroom experience and those without classroom experience.

**Academic Entrepreneurialism in Community Colleges Not Possessing CTE**

Community colleges with strong vocational trades programs may have a stronger connection with industry that in turn may unduly influence academic entrepreneurialism. Community colleges with a strong emphasis on career technical education require additional funding than solely academic institutions. Some districts also maintain policies that require
community colleges with career technical education programs to maintain advisory committees for curriculum development as well as job placement for graduates. The institutional and environmental factors of these community colleges may have a strong influence over academic and vocational trade departments. Future research should include community colleges that have either weak vocational trade programs or none at all.

**Final Thoughts**

I examined faculty academic entrepreneurialism at a single community college. The recommendations of this study may be found to be applicable to not only public universities, but also private nonprofit and private for profit institutions of higher learning. The recommendations of this study offer institutional policy recommendations to encourage academic entrepreneurialism without taking into account the restraints of any local, state, or federal laws or taking into account the restrictions of union labor contracts.

Successful institutional policies that encourage academic entrepreneurialism should include procedures for recruiting and retaining academic entrepreneurial faculty. This applies to all institutions of learning: preschool, kindergarten, elementary school, middle school, high school, vocational trades, secondary, postsecondary, and graduate school. Hess (2006) argues that academic entrepreneurialism is the application of business principles to author, fund, and maintain marketable and relevant educational programs that further student success. His definition served well during the data collection phase of this study. Following analysis of the data, this study recommends a new definition that takes into account the overall qualities of the entrepreneurial faculty member. It recognizes the influence of institutional and environmental factors over their individual development as academic
entrepreneurs. This definition pays particular attention to the necessity of tailoring institutional policies that encourage academic entrepreneurialism.

Encouraging academic entrepreneurialism at a community college campus requires the implementation of institutional policies and procedures with the set purpose to recruit, retain and develop academic entrepreneurial faculty that further the entrepreneurial environment. Instituting institutional policy changes is the only effective way to implement changes that encourage academic entrepreneurialism. The barriers to change for a public institution of higher learning are different from a private institution. Barriers range from union labor contracts to local and state regulations that are more restrictive. There is more flexibility for private nonprofit and private for profit institutions than is found at public institutions.

My target audiences for this study include educators, policymakers and any member of the public who are proponents of real change in our educational system. Academic entrepreneurs harness their innovative spirit in their pursuit of furthering student success. Real fundamental change that embraces academic entrepreneurialism is not possible without public support for instituting policy changes that encourage academic entrepreneurialism.
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Y ou are asked to participate in a research study conducted by John Paul Tabakian (Principal Investigator), M.A., and Nathan Durdella (Faculty Sponsor), Ph.D., from the Michael Eisner School of Education at California State University, Northridge. You were selected as a possible participant in this study, because you are (1) either a full-time or part-time community college faculty member, (2) who has engaged in academic entrepreneurial endeavors, and (3) are willing to share your thoughts and experiences. Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study seeks to define those key variables that facilitate academic entrepreneurship and how to encourage faculty to engage in that pursuit. This research study is part of my dissertation. I am interested in defining the need for academic entrepreneurialism as well as those issues, concerns, and problems relating to its pursuit. The goal of the evaluation is to enable faculty to pursue academic entrepreneurial ventures.

**Procedures**

If you elect to participate in this study, you will be asked to (1) participate in a 45 to 60 minute interview, and (2) share documentation relating to an entrepreneurial venture.

**Potential Risks and Discomforts to Subjects**

Because the program deals with issues that are sensitive, some interview questions may involve issues of a professional and/or personal nature, including experiences with and/or perceptions of colleagues, projects, and/or the students that are served by the program. You may elect not to answer any of the questions with which you feel uneasy and still remain as a participant in the study. If, after your participation in the study, you feel that you need to seek support services, please contact CSUN’s University Counseling Services in Bayramian Hall, Suite 520, 818-677-2366, 818-677-7834 (TTY), or e-mail: coun@csun.edu.

**Potential Benefits to Subjects**

You may not benefit personally from your participation in this study. However, this evaluation addresses the increasing need for academic entrepreneurial faculty to pursue lucrative ventures. The findings of this study may allow for a better understanding of those variables that encourage academic entrepreneurialism among community college faculty. This in turn will allow for a better understanding of how to better encourage its pursuit.
Payment to Subjects for Participation

Research subjects will receive a $20 Starbucks gift card following the 45 to 60 minute interview.

Audio Recording of Subjects

During the course of the project, subjects may be audio recorded. Your initials here __________ signify your consent to be audio recorded. You will be audio recorded for reasons related to data analysis and interpretation. During the audio recording, you may decline to be recorded and have the recorder turned off at any time during the interview. Digital audio recordings (i.e., files) will be stored on the laptop (password protected of the principal investigator). De-identified records in the form of transcriptions (i.e., files) will be maintained on the laptop (password protected) of the principal investigator for the period through which findings from the study will be disseminated. After this period digital audio files and transcription files will be destroyed.

Confidentiality of Data

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Names will not be used in the reporting of findings. Every effort will be taken to ensure your confidentiality as a participant in this study. If you consent to participate, you will be assigned a random, three-digit number to protect you. No identifying information will be used, and your institution and/or program will not be identified by name in any published report.

Uses of Data

The information that you provide in this study may be used in institutional reports, instructional material, and/or scholarly presentations and publications. Any information that you provide in connection with this study will not be associated with your name or your personally identifying characteristics. That is, any direct quotations of what you say in connection with this study will be used in published or publically available documents in a way that cannot be associated with you.

Participation, Withdrawal, and Review

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are not obligated whatsoever to answer or respond to any question or to discuss anything that you are not inclined to answer or discuss. You can skip any question, or any part of any question, and will not face any penalty for answering, or not answering, any question in any way. You may ask that the digital audio recorder be stopped at any time and/or may leave the interview at any time for any reason without consequences of any kind. You may discontinue completing questionnaires and/or stop maintaining journals at any time for any reasons without consequences of any kind.
Identification of Investigators

If you have any questions, concerns, or comments about this research and your participation in this study, you may contact the following: Mr. John Paul Tabakian via e-mail at class@tabakian.com or telephone at (310) 316-3469. In addition, you may contact the following: Dr. Nathan Durdella via email at nathan.durdella@csun.edu or office telephone at (818) 677-3316.

Rights of Research Subjects

You may withdraw and discontinue participation without penalty no later than 72 hours after your 45 to 60 minute interview. You are not waiving legal claims, rights, or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, the details of this study, or any other concerns please contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, California State University, Northridge, 265 University Hall, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, CA 91330, 818-677-2901.

Affirmation by Signature of Research Subject

I have read and understand the procedures described in this “Consent to Participate in Research.” My questions have all been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

___________________________________________ __________________
Name of Subject      Date

Affirmation by Signature of Investigator or Designee

In my judgment the research subject is voluntarily and knowingly giving informed consent and possesses the legal capacity to give informed consent to participate in this research study.

___________________________________________ __________________
Name of Investigator or Designee      Date
Interview Session:

Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. Before we begin, I would like to give you the opportunity to read and sign the consent form. As we discussed, this interview is part of the study of academic entrepreneurialism from a faculty member’s perspective. Our interview will provide insight into your background along with your understanding, utilization and philosophy relating to academic entrepreneurialism.

This conversation is strictly confidential and care will be taken to exclude all names and identifying characteristics from the data. I would like your permission to record our conversation via digital recorder so that I can more accurately reflect your thoughts and experiences. We are going to begin the interview. Do you have questions before we begin?

**Individual Faculty Factors**
1. Where were you born?
2. Were you a product of the community college system?
3. What colleges did you attend and what was your major(s) and degree(s)?
4. What is your academic field of instruction?
5. Are you a part-time or full-time instructor?
6. What private / industry experience do you possess?
7. Do you currently work in private industry?
8. How does the private industry influence your course instruction?
9. What is your definition of academic entrepreneurialism?
10. What influence does academic entrepreneurialism have over your career?
11. Have you ever been a principal investigator, director or supervisor of an entrepreneurial project?
12. Do you go by your gut instincts more than logic?
13. Does teaching motivate you more than managing, supervising or creating entrepreneurial programs?
14. Are you dependent more on technical strengths or emotional and social strengths?
15. How important is it for you to prevent emotions from overtaking your well-being?
16. How effective are you in establishing rapport among community college and industry peers?
17. Are you aware of institutional and environmental constraints and if so how do you deal with them?
18. How important to you is personal wealth accumulation?
19. Do you consider yourself to be an extrovert or introvert?
20. What are your passions and motivations?
**Institutional Factors**
21. Does the college adapt its programs to meet the needs of their community?
22. Does the college create new programs to meet the needs of their community?
23. Is there a willingness to develop new programs if state funding is lacking?
24. Has the college sought external funding for programs when state funding is lacking?
25. Does the college state in its mission statement the importance of student job placement?
26. Which departments are better able to respond to crisis through entrepreneurialism?
27. What role does the college play with neighborhood economic development?
28. Does your college recognize the need to evolve to market demands?
29. Does your college pursue external funding sources?
30. In what ways does your college embrace change?
31. What assistance does the college provide faculty who pursue alternative funding assistance?
32. Does the college provide training for faculty who seek to devise new programs?
33. Which departments are the most entrepreneurial?
34. In what way has the college been adapting to future job demands?
35. What role does administration play in campus entrepreneurial pursuits?
36. Do faculty-hiring committees seek candidates with entrepreneurial backgrounds?
37. Is the college open to community input?
38. How does the college enrich its students?
39. How does the college enrich the community?
40. How does the college enrich the nation?

**Environmental Factors**
41. Are the majority of faculty peers supportive of academic entrepreneurialism?
42. What are the levels of academic entrepreneurialism in the academic departments?
43. What are the levels of academic entrepreneurialism in the vocational trades?
44. Do you feel comfortable engaging in academic entrepreneurialism?
45. Did you feel the need to pursue academic entrepreneurial pursuits without support?
46. What factors encourage academic entrepreneurialism?
47. Why does some faculty engage in academic entrepreneurial endeavors independently?
48. Do industry representatives feel welcome on this campus?
49. What process do academic and vocational trade departments follow when seeking industry partnerships?
50. What role does administration have in promoting academic entrepreneurialism?
51. Does the campus environment encourage academic entrepreneurialism?
52. How receptive are faculty peers to requests to assist entrepreneurial projects?
53. What practices do the vocational trade departments utilize when pursuing strategic partnerships?
54. What practices do the academic departments utilize when pursuing strategic partnerships?
55. Are faculty members mostly extrovert or introvert?
56. What role if any does part-time faculty play in the pursuit of academic entrepreneurial projects?
57. Are industry professionals who teach part-time more entrepreneurial than faculty who solely teach?
58. Can you rate the level of communication between all major campus departments?
59. Does the campus encourage its own faculty to lead or supervise entrepreneurial projects?
60. Are faculty members better capable of leading or supervising entrepreneurial projects?
Dear Faculty Member:

My name is John Paul Tabakian. I am a doctoral candidate in community college studies at the Michael D. Eisner College of Education at California State University Northridge. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements of my doctorate of education degree (Ed.D) in community college academic leadership. The purpose of this study is to define those key variables that facilitate academic entrepreneurship and how to encourage faculty to engage in that pursuit.

This e-mail has been sent to all part-time and full-time faculty at SCCC. The purpose is to solicit faculty members for my study who are either a current or previous principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisor, consultant, or affiliate of any program or pursuit relating to academic entrepreneurship.

I am seeking to interview twelve to fifteen faculty members from SCCC drawn from divisions that represent all disciplines at the college: social and behavioral sciences, language arts, natural sciences, counseling, physical education, and vocational trades. Interviews will be conducted on campus and last 45 to 60 minutes. Participants who complete a 45 to 60 minute recorded interview will receive a $20 Starbucks gift card.

Anyone who has an interest in participating with this study is asked to send an e-mail directly to my personal account: class@tabakian.com. Please include in the e-mail your name, academic discipline and personal e-mail address (no official college e-mail address). Those faculty members who are chosen for interview will be given additional information.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

John Paul Tabakian

Direct Line: (310) 316-3469 - Voice & Text Messaging
Direct Fax: (310) 742-5152
E-mail: class@tabakian.com

PO Box 11069
Torrance, CA 90510
From: John Paul Tabakian [class@tabakian.com]
Sent: N/A
To: Research Subject Candidate
Subject: Acceptance For Research Study

Dear Faculty Member:

Thank you for expressing an interest to participate in my case research study. Your willingness to participate is most appreciated. Let me reiterate the purpose of this study and what your involvement entails. The purpose of this study is to define those key variables that facilitate academic entrepreneurship and how to encourage faculty to engage in that pursuit. This research study satisfies part of the requirements for my doctoral of education degree (Ed.D) in community college academic leadership at the Michael D. Eisner College of Education at California State University Northridge.

You will be asked to meet with me for an in-depth interview about academic entrepreneurship along with questions that provide background information about your person. The interview will be for 45 to 60 minutes and take place at a mutually agreed time and place. With your permission, the interviews will be audio recorded digitally and transcribed. You may decline to be recorded and have the recorder turned off at any time during the interview. Participants who complete a 45 to 60 minute recorded interview will receive a $20 Starbucks gift card.

It is your decision whether to participate in this study. You are under no requirement to participate. Withdrawal from the study may be done no later than 72 hours after your 45 to 60 minute interview. After formally notifying the researcher, John Paul Tabakian in writing of your willingness to withdraw, all data, recordings and transcriptions of your participation will be destroyed.

I ask that you formally accept to participate by replying to this e-mail. Please include the following information in the body of your e-mail:

1. Preferred mailing address (campus, home, etc.)
2. Personal e-mail address (not the campus e-mail address)
3. Campus phone number
4. Personal phone number

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly if you have any questions. You are also free to contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Nathan Durdella at (818) 677-3316 or via email at nathan.durdella@csun.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, CA 91330, 818-677-1200.
Sincerely,

John Paul Tabakian

Direct Line: (310) 316-3469 - Voice & Text Messaging
Direct Fax: (310) 742-5152
E-mail: class@tabakian.com

PO Box 11069
Torrance, CA 90510
Dear Faculty Member:

Thank you for expressing a willingness to participate with my study on academic entrepreneurship. I am humbled at the number of requests.

There are criteria that this study needs to address. I regret to inform you that you were not selected for interview. Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

John Paul Tabakian

Direct Line: (310) 316-3469 - Voice & Text Messaging
Direct Fax: (310) 742-5152
E-mail: class@tabakian.com

PO Box 11069
Torrance, CA 90510
APPENDIX F

TABLE OF FACULTY REPRESENTING DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>Vocational Trades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G

**TABLE OF DIVERSITY OF DEPARTMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Departments</th>
<th>Vocational Trades</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H

### Table of Highest Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masters Degree</th>
<th>Doctorate Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX I

### TABLE OF FACULTY REPRESENTING DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Attended Community College</th>
<th>Attended SCCC</th>
<th>Private Industry Experience</th>
<th>Currently In Private Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy / Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX J

**RUBRIC FOR SUBJECT QUALIFICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Position</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lacks Qualifications</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meets Qualifications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not possess a faculty position at the case site during the time of study.</td>
<td>Possesses a faculty position at the case site during the time of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Department Affiliation</strong></td>
<td>Does not have any affiliation with any academic or vocational trade department at the case site during the time of study.</td>
<td>Has affiliation with an academic or vocational trade department at the case site during the time of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td>Does not hold either a part-time or full-time faculty status at the case site during the time of study.</td>
<td>Holds either part-time or full-time faculty status at the case site during the time of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Affiliation Relating To Student Success</strong></td>
<td>Was never a principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisor, consultant, and/or affiliate of a program or pursuit exemplifying academic entrepreneurialism.</td>
<td>Was a principal investigator, director, coordinator, advisory, consultant, and/or affiliate of a program or pursuit exemplifying academic entrepreneurialism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document and Archival Data</strong></td>
<td>There is no document and archival data available to verify the qualifications of the subject.</td>
<td>There is document and archival data available to verify the qualifications of the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Entrepreneurship Traits</strong></td>
<td>Subject’s history does not demonstrate any exhibition of entrepreneurial traits.</td>
<td>Subject’s history demonstrates exhibition of entrepreneurial traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Receipt of Recruitment E-mail</strong></td>
<td>Subject did not receive a study recruitment e-mail sent on behalf of the principal investigator.</td>
<td>Subject received a study recruitment e-mail sent on behalf of the principal investigator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Notification of Interest in Study</strong></td>
<td>Subject has not sent official notification via e-mail.</td>
<td>Subject sent an official notification via e-mail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Receipt of Acceptance From Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Subject did not receive official e-mail from the principal investigator notifying their acceptance.</td>
<td>Subject received an official e-mail from the principal investigator notifying their acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Formally Accepts Invitation to Participate in Study</td>
<td>Subject has not formally accepted via e-mail their willingness to participate in the study.</td>
<td>Subject has formally accepted via e-mail his/her willingness to participate in the study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX K

### FACULTY JOB DESCRIPTION AND FACULTY JOB ANNOUNCEMENT RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 Unacceptable Entrepreneurialism</th>
<th>1 Acceptable Entrepreneurialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Description</strong></td>
<td>Description lacks mentioning of entrepreneurial personality characteristics. The position description itself does not represent entrepreneurial traits, qualities, and requirement for independent thought.</td>
<td>The job description exemplifies academic entrepreneurialism in its title and portrayal. Description represents entrepreneurial characteristics that include charisma, dynamism, motivation, and a belief in student success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duties and Tasks of Position</strong></td>
<td>Position duties and responsibilities do not require active campus interaction with faculty, staff, and students. Duties and tasks do not require the individual to work with individuals residing outside of their departments.</td>
<td>Components clearly state the requirement for committee participation, curriculum participation, accreditation participation, professional development, and the necessity for interaction with the campus community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desirable Qualifications</strong></td>
<td>Academic entrepreneurialism is not an inherent quality in the qualifications. Desirable qualifications do not reflect academic entrepreneurial qualities that go beyond the minimum qualifications of the position.</td>
<td>Qualifications exemplify academic entrepreneurialism. A reason include experience with external funding solicitation, mentoring faculty peers in academic entrepreneurialism, and mentoring students while helping them pursue their career pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>Primary duties of the faculty member highlight only the minimum employee requirements that include teaching, assessing programs, participation in program review, SLO review, developing and updating existing courses, participation in department and college committees and meeting with students during scheduled classroom and office hours.</td>
<td>Responsibilities include the incorporation of academic entrepreneurial qualities in the area of professional responsibilities. This is in addition to those primary duties of the faculty member and includes at minimum the requirement of faculty participation with advisory boards to assure the relevance of their programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>