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Abstract

Globalization and the rapidly changing market cause universities to seek new and creative ways to survive and succeed. The term *entrepreneurial university* is an ideological umbrella for those higher education institutions that are attempting to fully participate in the social and economic life of society. This qualitative study was aimed to investigate the entrepreneurial transformation at the departments of the School of Education at one Midwestern large public comprehensive university. The researcher sought to better understand the growth of the programs and services at the organization and how entrepreneurial concepts such as entrepreneurial behavior, culture, entrepreneurial products, creativity, innovations, and others play out in the chosen institution. Collected qualitative data were coded and scanned for common themes. Fourteen emergent themes were assigned to five categories: Entrepreneurial Individuals, Environmental Factors, Organizational Behaviors, Organizational Outcomes, and Organizational Systems. The following four core themes were found to be more profound among the others: Diversity of Personal and Professional Expertise and Experiences, Teamwork and Internal Collaboration, Unique/Innovative Programs and Services, and Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture. Findings were analyzed in relationship to the entrepreneurial concepts at four levels of the theoretical framework: (1) entrepreneurial individuals in the organization, (2) entrepreneurial organizational behaviors of the departments, (3) entrepreneurial university as the entire organization, and (4) university in a global environment. Application of the existing entrepreneurial theories to the findings allowed the researcher to develop implications for theory, future research, and practice. This study was an opportunity for the researcher to learn about the processes that occur in higher education because of globalization.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Problem Statement

Globalization impacts higher education systems around the world. Higher education institutions respond to global pressures by making changes in their organizational structure, instruction, and research (e.g., Casey, 2004; Clark, 2001; Eggins, 2003; Hattie & Marsh, 1996). Universities in North and South America, Europe, Australia, Africa, and Asian countries expand their participation in local and regional communities for economic growth (e.g., Casey & O’Leary, 1998; Kuratko, 2005; Naidoo, 2003). Competition between universities spreads beyond traditional boundaries of regions and nations, and universities become players in the international and global arenas (Eggins, 2003; Geiger, 2005; Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004). In order to survive and succeed, universities become more market-oriented organizations and compete with each other for resources, prestige, highly qualified faculty, and student body. Globalization has required universities to seek new ways to participate fully in the local, national, and international educational markets. One of the responses to globalization performed by higher education institutions is known in scholarly literature as entrepreneurialism/entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial transformation of higher education organizations (e.g., Bok, 2003; Clark, 1998; Etzkowitz, 2003).

The phenomenon of entrepreneurial transformation of higher education has been the subject of scholarly discourse for the last few decades (e.g., Clark, 1998; Etzkowitz, 2003; Gibb, 1998; Gittleman, 2002; Schramm, 2006). In his book, *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*, Derek Bok (2003) wrote, “entrepreneurship is no longer the exclusive province of athletic departments and development offices; it has taken hold in science facilities, business schools, continuing education divisions, and other
academic units across the campus” (p. 3.). Globalization makes the entrepreneurship in higher education become an international phenomenon, which is recognized as a response to global forces (e.g., Deem, 2001; Gaillard & Gaillard, 1997). Entrepreneurialism in academia has been defined by Shane and Venkataraman (2000) as “the scholarly examination of how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited” (p. 218). Researchers who explore entrepreneurial change recognize that notions of creativity and transferring knowledge to innovations are main features of today’s higher education institutions (e.g., Etzkowitz & Klofsten, 2005; McDonnell, 2009). Jack and Anderson (1999) argued that it is “now widely recognized that entrepreneurship provides benefits in terms of social and economic growth and development; providing the seedbed of new industries, renewal of industrial bases, job and wealth creation and social adjustment” (p. 114).

The term entrepreneur was coined in approximately 1730 by Richard Cantillon who was one of the first theorists in the field of economics (New World Encyclopedia, n.d.; Cantillon, 1959). In his very influential work, Essay on the Nature of Trade in General, Cantillon stated:

> These Undertakers can never know how great will be the demand in their City, nor how long their customers will buy of them since their rivals will try all sorts of means to attract customers from them. (Cantillon, 1959, Part 1, Chapter XIII.6)

Thus, entrepreneurs had been considered by Richard Cantillon as undertakers who offered inhabitants goods or services produced by themselves or others and who competed with their rivals in the uncertainty of the free market. The definition of entrepreneurs has been developed based on Cantillon’s scholarship toward academia and includes faculty, staff, and
students who deal with uncertainty, take a risk of creating their programs and services in order to sell them in the marketplace (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009).

Today, entrepreneurship is the only way for America to “survive and continue its economic and political leadership in the world” (Schramm, 2006, p. 1). In his book, The Entrepreneurial Imperative: How America’s Economic Miracle Will Reshape the World (and Change Your Life), Schramm (2006) argues that entrepreneurship is an integral feature of American society and that many American universities were entrepreneurial from the beginning because they were established by famous American entrepreneurs. For example, John D. Rockefeller established the University of Chicago; Leland Stanford created Stanford University; and George Eastman was a founder of the University of Rochester. American entrepreneurs created research parks as parts of university infrastructures in order to transfer research results to the market through these structural capacities (Schramm, 2006).

The Morrill Act of 1862 and 1890 tied higher education in the United States closer to the local and regional economy by providing each state with the right to create land-grant universities and colleges. Most research universities focused on practical subjects such as agriculture, engineering, and military science by “providing both a practical education and excellent research designed to help sustain the new nation” (Schramm, 2006, p. 126). Given this fact, university entrepreneurialism is a vehicle to improve the quality of life for individuals, communities, and society at large (e.g., Bash, 2003; Clark, 2001; Cope, 2005; Etzkowitz, 2003).

The GI Bill (the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944) contributed tremendously to the expansion of American higher education. The GI Bill was aimed to solve the problem of unemployment right after World War II when the country’s economy was unable to
provide jobs to the millions of returning servicemen. This legislation provided financial aid to World War II veterans to help them obtain a college education. According to information on the *Our Documents* governmental website (Our Documents, n.d.-a), approximately eight million veterans received educational benefits under the GI Bill act. Approximately 2,300,000 of the veterans attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 individuals received school training; and 3,400,000 veterans received on-the-job training. Under the GI Bill, the United States government spent $14.5 billion for the education and training of veterans.

The launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957 forced the U.S. government to pass the National Defense and Education Act under which $887 million was invested in higher education to develop science and language programs. These funds required universities to develop research in science and develop new knowledge to serve the country’s economic and political growth (Our Documents, n.d.-b).

In 1980, the Bayh–Dole Act, another significant legislation, gave universities, small businesses, and non-profit organizations the rights and mechanisms to control the intellectual property of their inventions. Many research universities in the United States, with the support of governmental funds, have moved toward producing more innovations and transferring knowledge to products through business incubators, start-ups, and contracts with businesses and the government (Geiger, 2005). They expanded their missions by adding participation in economic and societal development of the region to the core objectives of teaching and doing research (Etzkowitz, 2003).

While the values of a traditional university still remain highly significant to society, “there is a need [across national economies] for more emphasis to be placed on transferring and commercializing knowledge generated within universities” (O’Shea, Allen, Chevalier, &
Roche, 2005, p. 995). Researchers worldwide observe that universities in different countries attempt converting the new scientific discoveries into entrepreneurial products (e.g., Berchem, 1991; Clark, 2001).

Clark (2001) acknowledged that the concept of an entrepreneurial university is an ideological umbrella that allows speaking about “a forward-looking orientation, a willingness to look at the new frontiers of knowledge. It stresses that the university is engaged in the pursuit of opportunities beyond means that are currently available…” (p. 23). This inclusive perspective on entrepreneurial universities opens the door to success for each and every higher education institution that is seeking its unique way to participate in the market and social life.

There are a few research streams identified in scholarly literature that are tied to university entrepreneurialism. The first stream of the literature refers to the growing access to higher education for the student population. Higher education is becoming a mass education involving those groups of people that were not previously served by post-secondary institutions (e.g., Levin, 2001; Clark, 1998; Bash, 2003). Secondly, governments worldwide decrease traditional funding for universities and force them to work more productively and efficiently at lower costs. At the same time, the expectations in receiving “knowledge workers” from universities for contemporary industry and market are growing (e.g., Levin, 2001; Burgess, Lewis & Mobbs, 2003; Gittleman, 2002). The third stream in the scholarly discourse reflects the fact that today’s universities operate internationally. They not only attract international students and faculty, but also open branches overseas and create international alliances (e.g., Deem, 2001; Gaillard & Gaillard, 1997). Because of the increase of international mobility and acquiring international standards, there is a growing
demand for universities to expand their activities to other countries and develop global networking (e.g., Jacob, Lundqvist & Hellsmark, 2003). The last group of studies explores the phenomenon of knowledge transfer. In today’s world, when knowledge is disseminated in a narrow academic community and not put into use, it loses in its value (Etzkowitz, 2004). When universities utilize knowledge, transfer knowledge to innovations they enhance their role in society (Dzisah & Etzkowitz, 2007).

By producing new knowledge and offering new programs and services to the larger community, universities are seen as catalysts for regional and national economic and social development (Kirby, 2006). However, entrepreneurialism emerges differently across different types of universities and disciplines (e.g., Clark, 2003; Lee & Rhoads, 2004). Research universities (Carnegie, n.d.) and fields like engineering, medicine, and technologies receive the majority of funds from the government and industry. These universities quickly acquire features of entrepreneurial ventures and become more reflective to the market demands. Research universities are often defined as entrepreneurial organizations because of certain activities associated with these universities such as start-ups, spin-offs, incubators, business centers, and inventions and licensing that are performed by sciences, engineering, and medicine (e.g., Baumol, Litan & Schramm, 2007; Casey, 2004; Guerrero-Cano, Kirby & Urbano, 2006; O’Shea, Allen, Chevalier & Roche, 2005). Entrepreneurial transformation of liberal arts disciplines lacks attention from the scholars. Engagement of liberal arts and social sciences into the entrepreneurial process is crucial; otherwise, according to Clark (2000), universities cannot develop themselves and sustain as fully entrepreneurial organizations. Unlike research universities, their comprehensive counterparts (Carnegie, n.d.) focus more on teaching rather than on research. Comprehensive teaching universities
comprise a majority of the post-secondary institutions in the United States; therefore, understanding the impact of globalization and entrepreneurial transformation of comprehensive public universities is important because the best practices can be applicable for many higher education institutions across the country.

In order to determine an investigation scope for this dissertation study, the researcher utilized Biglan’s (1973) model that distinguishes university disciplines according to their academic tasks. Biglan’s model appeared to respond to the need of college administrations and the government to compare departments and programs for the purpose of evaluation, accountability, planning, budget allocation, and monitoring of departmental progress (Muffo & Langston, 1981). Biglan explored similarities among 35 academic fields and found three dimensions that can be used to categorize all disciplines in the examined areas. These three dimensions divide disciplines into Hard vs. Soft, Life System vs. Non-Life System, and Pure vs. Applied. The disciplines such as Educational Administration and Supervision, Secondary and Continuing Education, Special Education, and Vocational and Technical Education fall under the category of Soft-Applied-Life System. When one applies Biglan’s classification to see how entrepreneurship has been observed and explored across academic disciplines, it appears that most studies on entrepreneurial activities have been done in the Hard-Applied disciplinary fields which include engineering, computer sciences, biology, and nutrition (e.g., Louis, Blumenthal, Gluck & Stoto, 1989). In an attempt to address the gap in the research of entrepreneurship in the field of education, this dissertation study focuses on education disciplines in Soft-Applied-Life System.

There are several reasons for selecting the disciplines for this inquiry: (1) the lack of research that has been done in the Soft-Applied-Life system, (2) the importance for
educational leaders and educators to understand entrepreneurialism in the field of their specialization, and (3) personal interests of the researcher who is eager to develop her expertise in educational leadership and entrepreneurialism in higher education from the globalization perspective.

As it was discussed above, it is assumed that the scarcity of entrepreneurial evidences by *Soft-Applied-Life System* (Biglan, 1973) departments does not mean that this field is not involved in entrepreneurial transformation that occurs at universities. *Soft-Applied-Life* disciplinary fields are as much a part of a university body as *Hard-Applied* disciplines. *Soft-Applied-Life* departments do not exist in isolation from the environment and cannot be protected from the impact of globalization. It is the researcher’s assumption that *Soft-Applied-Life* departments experience entrepreneurial transformation in different ways than *Hard-Applied* departments. In this dissertation study, the researcher intended to test the concepts related to entrepreneurial transformation in the field of education and look at how education departments respond to global forces, how they contribute to economic and social development of society, and how and what kind of entrepreneurial products (programs and services) they produce and offer in the market.

**Purpose of the Study**

The aim of this study was to explore how global forces impact *Soft-Applied-Life System* (Biglan, 1973) academic and non-academic departments at the School of Education at one large public comprehensive university located in the Midwestern region of the United States. This University was chosen because of its reputation as an institution that expands branches, programs, and partnerships. Because of its fast growth and applied innovations in the region, it is assumed that the selected University can be considered an exemplary
entrepreneurial higher education organization among non-research universities (Carnegie, n.d.). Conducting this study, the researcher attempted to look at how two academic departments and one non-academic department within the School of Education make changes in their operation, instruction, research, and service in order to succeed in the competitive market on the local, national, and international levels. The researcher tested the globalization theories and the concepts of entrepreneurial transformation through analysis of the activities by the University’s departments to deepen understand the phenomenon of success and uniqueness of their programs and services.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this dissertation study was built with the concepts that helped the researcher to better understand the phenomenon of entrepreneurial transformation. The researcher developed a funnel approach to explore the phenomenon of entrepreneurial transformation at the selected departments.

![Funnel theoretical framework](image)

*Figure 1. Funnel theoretical framework.*

Figure 1 displays the theoretical framework in which the widest part is represented by the larger concepts that explain globalization and its impact on higher education institutions.
(Altbach, 2004; Deem, 2001; Eggins, 2003; Kellner, 2002; Levin, 2001), then narrows down to the theories of emergence of entrepreneurial universities (Etzkowitz, 2003, 2004; Clark, 1995, 1998-a, 1998-b, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004). At the following lower levels of the funnel, the organizational entrepreneurial culture concepts (Schein, 1990, 2004; Clark, 2004) and theories on entrepreneurial behaviors by organizational members were employed to explore entrepreneurialism (e.g., Gibb, 2005; Mair, 2005; McClelland, 1961; Stevenson, 2000).

Figure 2 represents an incorporated diagram of the concept map of an entrepreneurial university that the researcher developed for this dissertation study.

![Concept map of an entrepreneurial university](image)

**Figure 2.** Concept map of an entrepreneurial university.

Figure 2 indicates the following: (a) *Funding* comes to an entrepreneurial university from different sources (Clark, 2000) that can be tuition, fees for services, grants, contracts, donations, facility rent, and other possible sources; (b) An entrepreneurial university brings *entrepreneurial products* (programs and services) to the market (Slevin & Covin, 1990).
These products possess social and economic value and are in demand on the market; (c) An incorporated entrepreneurial culture supports creative and innovative activities by the people at the university. There is an entrepreneurial spirit at the university, and people are excited about what they do and they enjoy dealing with uncertainty and complexity (e.g., Clark, 2000; Gibb, 2005); (d) The university responds to global pressures by making changes in nine areas identified by Levin (2001). The names of these nine global behaviors are abbreviated in the concept map chart (see the detailed description in Chapter 2: Literature Review); and (e) finally, the departments exhibit entrepreneurial behaviors of faculty, staff, students, and their collaborations with external stakeholders. These collaborations are recognized as three sets of behaviors reflected by the following activities: (1) identifying, assessing, and exploiting opportunities, (2) using, attracting, and re-organizing resources, and (3) creating new programs and services that are sold in the market (e.g., Etzkowitz, 2003; Slevin & Covin, 1990; Stevenson, 2000).

The theoretical concepts, which were mentioned above, play the role of a foundation for examining the phenomenon of entrepreneurial transformation and answering the formulated research questions. Chapter 2 provides a detailed discussion on the integrated concepts as they were proposed by scholars.

Definitions

The working definition of an entrepreneurial university for this dissertation study was drawn as follows: An entrepreneurial university is a higher educational organization that actively participates in the global market addressing educational, social, and economic demands of society by transferring knowledge to innovations and by preparing students to succeed in the globalizing world. The wider definition suggests that an entrepreneurial
university is a self-steering, self-reliant, and progressive higher education institution that is reflective to the external demands of competitive and changeable markets. An entrepreneurial university is an organization that recognizes the complexities of the globalizing world and develops an organizational culture that supports and encourages faculty, staff, and students to work creatively in identifying and pursuing opportunities to transfer knowledge to innovations, products and services that obtain economic and social values that are in demand by society. An entrepreneurial university seeks ways to allocate those resources, which traditionally are considered as unreachable. An entrepreneurial university prepares students to succeed in the globalizing world.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The main concepts in the related literature are discussed in the order they were outlined in the Theoretical Framework section of Chapter 1 (see Figure 1). The literature review starts with the concept of globalization and the responses of higher education institutions to global forces and then narrows down to organizational entrepreneurial behaviors at the department level of the university and the individual level. Three sections have been created to organize the review of the relevant literature: (1) Globalization and Global Behaviors of Universities; (2) Entrepreneurial Universities; (3) Entrepreneurial Organizational Culture and Entrepreneurial Behaviors.

Globalization and Global Behaviors of Universities

Globalization is the first foundational concept which is applied in this study to explore relationships between globalization and university entrepreneurial transformations. Globalization is understood as a multi-dimensional term which is widely used in economics, politics, environmental studies, education, and other disciplinary fields. One common condition that can be drawn from all works on globalization suggests that the world is a single place in which everything is interconnected (e.g., Held, McGrew, Goldblatt & Perraton, 1999). Kellner (2002), in theorizing globalization, argued that globalization is “a product of technological revolution and the global restructuring of capitalism in which economic, technical, political, and cultural features are intertwined” (p. 286). Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and Perraton (1999) suggested the following way to think about globalization:

The world is rapidly being molded into a shared social space by economic and technological forces and that developments in one region in the world can have
profound consequences for the life changes and individuals or communities on the other side of the globe. (p. 1)

Analytical framework, proposed by Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and Perraton (1999), includes the following four global dimensions: (1) “a stretching of social, political and economic activities across frontiers”; (2) “intensification, or the growing magnitude, of interconnectedness”; (3) “a speeding up of global interactions and processes”; and (4) “growing extensity, intensity and velocity of global interactions that can be associated with their deepening impact…” (p. 15). These four dimensions reflect the on-going processes that occur in today’s globalizing world. They emphasize the dynamics, speed, and constant changes that are observed in economics, politics, environment, and the social life of people.

Scholarship in the field of higher education explores the phenomenon of globalization from the perspective of interconnectedness and inevitable change. Altbach (2004) proposes to define globalization “as the broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable” (p. 5).

The globalization concept applied in this dissertation was built on theoretical underpinnings proposed by Kellner (2002), Altbach (2004), Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton (1999), and other researchers (e.g., Sahlberg, 2004). The challenges that higher education faces worldwide can be described by what Kwiek (2001) said:

Budgets [of universities] are going to be squeezed, state support, already small, is expected to become even smaller, owing to other huge social needs, to the universalization of higher education, to its expanded scope, diversity, and numbers, and owing to growing social dissatisfaction with the public sphere in general. (p. 28)
Globalization creates uncertainty and complexity. It forces all organizations, governments, and individuals to rethink and reposition themselves in order to better fit in to the new order of this rapidly changing world (Gibb, 1998). Many factors, such as technologies, political realignments, international standards, and others, combine to bring greater opportunities and also greater challenges to governments, organizations, and individuals. Uncertainty and complexity create the need for entrepreneurial responses by the universities. A report by the Kauffman Foundation stated, “American higher education must reflect the experience and conditions of contemporary life” (Kauffman, n.d., p. 4), because the role that higher education plays in a knowledge-based economy becomes significantly important for government, industry, and society as a whole.

As it was stated above, the main domains of globalization identified in scholar literature are as follows: economic, political, cultural, and information/technology domains. They impact higher education and force universities to make changes in their operations in order to respond to these pressures. The changes that universities make in order to survive and succeed in the global environment are often considered as entrepreneurial transformation of higher education institutions (e.g., Etzkowitz, 2003; Bok, 2004; McDonnell, 2009). This entrepreneurial process employs innovations and the active participation of higher education institutions in the economic and social development of society. Universities tend to develop their capacities to address not only the educational but also the social and economic needs of people. Figure 3 demonstrates these global domains: Information/Technology Domain, Cultural Domain, Political Domain, and Economic Domains.
The Political Domain suggests that the international power of nation states has been transforming under globalization and nation governments are no longer centers of the decisions that are made on the global scale (Baumol, Litan & Schramm, 2007). The political power and influence of international alliances (e.g., European Union) and international organizations (e.g., Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) have been growing continuously for the last few decades (OECD, 2004). Intergovernmental organizations, international governmental organizations, transnational organizations, and other types of international entities link more governments, businesses, educational organizations, and individuals from around the world. The growth of international laws and treaties is also evidence of increasing connectedness and interdependencies of governments and organizations (Eggins, 2003). Issues which were recently considered as domestic for a particular country now attract attention and resources from other nations. Politicians, businessmen, educators, and other professionals as well as ordinary people are becoming more involved professionally and personally in situations that occur far from their home.
country. Academic mobility expressed in student and faculty traveling abroad for study and work is developing under the political domain. Universities from around the world impact politics on the continents through dual degree programs, transfer policies, and partnerships at the international level (e.g., Bologna Process). Vaira (2004) suggests that the role of government in steering higher education is reducing in many countries; however, the partnerships between governmental agencies and educational organizations are increasing. Governments worldwide expect that “higher education will enhance the nation state's competitive edge in the global market place by producing the new “smart” workers who will take up key positions in the knowledge economy” (Naidoo, 2003, p. 251). Etzkowitz (2003) acknowledged that successful universities evolve to entrepreneurial type of organizations. These universities obtain a high level of autonomy but actively collaborate with the government and industry that help them transfer new knowledge to innovations, and, by doing this, universities contribute to the economy and increase the quality of life in the regions and nations.

The Economic Domain reflects the growth of transnational corporations, international companies, off-shores, and other types of international businesses. Today, funds and resources flow on the global scale and the global market demands universities to search resources that are not available locally or even regionally. Universities produce and disseminate new knowledge to the larger community by bringing their programs and services outside of traditional walls through delivering their programs and running their branches in other regions and countries (e.g., Levin, 2001; Aronowitz, 2000). Marketization and commodification are not only becoming everyday features of academia, but also contribute to a growing concern of transforming the traditional mission of higher education institutions
(Levin, 2001). Etzkowitz (2003, 2004) proposed the Triple Helix as a model of collaborations between universities, industries/businesses, and government that make higher educational organizations behave more like businesses. Before, the university function was to fill the job positions that government and industry created for society. Today’s universities are expected to create jobs, and there are many evidences of university business-parks and start-up firms that give birth to new companies in which university graduates are employed. The impact of economics on higher education, which leads to significant shifts in the university’s identity, is one of the most contradictory discourses in interdisciplinary research (e.g., Baumol, Litan & Schramm, 2007; Kuratko, 2003; Kwiek, 2001).

The **Cultural Domain** refers to local, regional, and international migration when people move to new places seeking better conditions and more opportunities for education and employment. Cultural domain also involves global academic mobility and brain circulation (Mahroum, 2000). International sports, cultural events, mass popular cultures, social networking, and tourism motivate and encourage millions of people to share experiences and values, to speak common languages, and to promote a common *global* culture. Universities around the world deal with diverse multicultural non-traditional student populations. International educational and cultural exchanges elevate global thinking and an understanding of shared issues and concerns.

The **Information/Technology Domain** is one of the most noticeable phenomena in today’s world. Today, the internet and communication technologies are becoming available to the masses, and, consequently, new knowledge is quickly spreading beyond the narrow academic communities. Online courses and programs captivate more and more university disciplines by replacing traditional forms of teaching and engaging more learners in non-
traditional learning activities (Smathers, n.d.). Online programs are considered as a new type of products and services that universities offer in the markets. Today’s universities are expected not only to produce and disseminate knowledge, but transfer knowledge to programs and services which are in demand by local, regional, and global societies.

The globalization theory and its political, economic, cultural, and information/technology domains allow the researcher to better understand the global environment in which contemporary universities operate, as well as the ways by which universities respond to global pressures. The global perspective provides the researcher with the foundation to explore interconnectedness and transformations that occur at higher educational institutions because of external pressures.

The concept of global behaviors by Levin (2001) describes the ways in which higher educational institutions respond to global pressures. This concept is helpful to understand how successful entrepreneurial universities pave the way for other higher educational institutions to become more efficient in operations. John Levin analyzed numerous studies that were conducted on higher education and globalization and identified nine common characteristics of changes. These characteristics, which Levin named global behaviors of higher education institutions and which are considered as nine areas of change in this dissertation, are as follows: (1) Internationalization, (2) Multiculturalism, (3) Commodification, (4) Homogenization, (5) Marketization, (6) Re-Structuring, (7) Labor Alterations, (8) Productivity and Efficiency, and (9) Electronic Communication and Information Technologies. Figure 4 shows these nine global behaviors and their abbreviation codes.
Internationalization (abbreviation code—“I”) is the first set of global behaviors in Levin’s (2001) concept. According to Levin, it includes internationalization of curriculum and of the campus which involves extending campuses into other nations. Internationalization also refers to the recruitment and enrollment of international students, international exchanges, international schools, online educational programs, and other transnational educational activities (e.g., Gaillard & Gaillard, 1997; Altbach & Teichler, 2001). Altbach (2004) argued that the internationalization of US universities involves all international trends and flows and goes beyond international student enrollment and transnational education. In the era of globalization, international education is becoming synonymous of a global education market where educational institutions prepare learners for successful participation in the global world (e.g., Sidhu, 2005; Altbach, 2004). Documents from the Organization for Economic and Co-operation Development (OECD, 2004) state that the number of international students in OECD countries has doubled over the last twenty years. Today, the movement of people in higher education around the world has been increasing significantly because of the expansion of higher education, proactive student

Figure 4. Nine global behaviors (areas of change) by Levin (2001).
recruitment policies at many universities throughout the world, development of transportation, and speeding-up the information flows and communication (Tremblay, 2005).

Internationalization is recognized as a highly challenging, endless, and ongoing process in higher education. Stohl (2007) and Teichler (1999, 2004) discussed the increased challenges and the “pressing problems” that internationalization brings to campuses along with new opportunities and ideas for new programs, delivery methods, and new student populations.

The second set of behaviors identified by Levin (2001), *multiculturalism* (abbreviation code—“MC”), relates to internationalization and involves services for a wide range of the groups that were previously left beyond the walls of academia. Among them are the underserved minority groups, immigrants, working professionals, K-12 students, seniors, and other groups. Higher education is now education for the masses. Rajani Naidoo (2003), researcher from the United Kingdom, stated:

> Universities are therefore expected to play their part in national skills strategies by developing policies to increase the total proportion of the population entering higher education as well as encouraging the participation of members of social groups previously excluded from higher education. (p. 251)

Scott (1993) argued that massification of higher education is not only *liberalization* because of the expansion of democracy, it is not only *marketization* because of the growing global economy, but also it is an evidence of *intellectual transformation* of society and societies in large scale. This intellectual transformation of society impacts the university by increasing the need in new knowledge production, as well as new programs and services.
The third sets of behaviors, *commodification* (abbreviation code—“COM”), engages programs, services, and goods that are sold in the marketplace (Levin, 2001). Jackson (1999) defined commodification in relation to globalization. The researcher suggested, “Commodification refers, literally, to the extension of the commodity form to goods and services that were not previously commodified” (p. 96). Like McDonald’s restaurants becoming a feature of mass culture around the world during the last decades, higher educational programs and services have been spreading around the world and creating a world education system.

Commodification of higher education has received a lot of attention from researchers in the United Kingdom. Cooper (2004) argued “The ‘commodification’ of higher education is here to stay. It is important, then, that people are given an appropriate range of choice, quality assurance and a fair, and open pricing system” (p. 5). Every higher education organization turns its traditional commitments to market-like products and services. Students view the university as an organization that ensures them that their financial investments will be returned through future employment (Eggins, 2003). Higher education for the sake of education is no longer a reason for students to go to college, but it is the necessary step to further employment and professional success (Stohl, 2007).

Online courses are great examples of the commodification of instruction and the delivery of courses and programs in higher education. Learning technologies represent a new way of knowledge dissemination in academia, when knowledge is becoming a “hot commodity” (Bok, 2004). Universities create packages of online courses and programs and offer them in the market. These programs and services are usually created by teams of professionals who are course designers, writers, technicians, and instructors. Bok (2004)
emphasized that collaboration work of professionals contributes to the high quality of the products because teamwork provokes discussions about the teaching-learning, quality, and assessment that does not happen often with traditional single-instructor classes. The educational degree system, as well as the credit/hour system, is transforming to a way in which it will be similar and applicable for everyone around the world as a higher education consumer (Altbach, 2004). Students view higher education as a service for which they are required to pay and in which they, therefore, see themselves in the role of clients (e.g., Naidoo, 2003; Duderstadt, 2004).

Naidoo (2003) suggested repositioning higher education as a global commodity. With the massification of higher education, the majority of higher education institution clients are middle and lower social class representatives, and higher education programs and services are sold to these groups of populations. Those universities that have larger financial capital create and promote their “commodities” more actively and with larger profits than the universities with a lower level of capacity related to markets (Shumar, 1997).

The next set of behaviors in Levin’s (2001) classification is **homogenization** (abbreviation code—“HOM”), which refers to standards of curriculum, as well as ways of instruction. The homogenization process in higher education is tied to its massification and expansion. Peter Scott (1993) indicated the need to rationalize curriculum in its organization and delivery because of the growing number of students and the declining cost for units. He predicted that trends in higher education in countries like the United Kingdom and the United States will lead to the use of standardized teaching packages for differently prepared groups of students and individuals who will “experience the same academic material in different ways” (p. 17). Today, higher education institutions attempt to make their programs and
services similar, comparable, and transferable across not only one country but across the nations. Through this avenue, homogenization is also linked with internationalization.

The Bologna process in Europe is a very forceful movement toward homogenization in higher education. Started in 1999 in the Italian city of Bologna, the Bologna Declaration was signed by the ministers of higher education from 29 countries. Today, it unites 47 European and Asian countries that have agreed to create a common higher education area in Europe. The key homogenizing characteristics of the Bologna declaration include: (a) promotion of European standards and guidelines for internal, as well as external quality assurance within higher education institutions in participating countries, (b) establishment of European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) as a standard for comparing the study attainment and performance of students in higher education across the European Union and other partnering countries, and (c) development of the three-cycling system of higher education degrees such as bachelor’s, master’s, and doctorate in all participating countries. The Bologna declaration is aimed, through homogenization of higher education across the European Union and other countries, to develop a common educational and job market which will allow people from European countries to travel among countries in the European Higher Education Area for the purposes of studying, teaching, conducting research, or collaborating on joint projects. Also, the Bologna Process intends to develop a homogenized culture in Europe in which people will share their values and beliefs across national borders (Bologna, n.d.). It is obvious that the processes in European higher education lead to the appearance of one more global competitor, besides the growing higher education system in Asian countries, which creates threats to the post-secondary system on its educational and job markets of the United States.
Marketization (abbreviation code—“MRK”) refers to the behaviors of higher education institutions in which they align themselves to businesses that seek a profit (Levin, 2001). Universities compete with each other in the marketplace for revenue. They assess the market needs and address them by producing new knowledge, “knowledge workers,” programs, and services (Levin, 2001). According to Subotzky (2000), marketization in higher education is characterized by “closer partnership with outside ‘clients’ and other knowledge producers, by a greater onus on faculty to access external sources of funding and by managerial ethos in institutional governance, leadership, and planning” (p. 97). Rhoades and Slaughter (2004) discussed marketization as “academic capitalism” that changes higher education institutions and makes them behave like business organizations and forces faculty to market their services. Gumport (2000) compared higher education with the knowledge industry that offers a diverse range of goods and services. Rasmussen, Moen, and Gulbrandsen (2006) discussed marketization in terms of increasing the commercialization of knowledge, the changing role of the university, and intellectual property rights that belong to the university and/or university employees. Participation of the universities in market affects the traditional values and traditional culture of organizations and often leads to internal resistance and tension.

In order to survive and operate efficiently, higher educational institutions make changes in their structure in order to develop and improve the services they provide to their clients. Levin (2001) calls this set of behaviors re-structuring (abbreviation code—“R”). The scarcity of resources causes resource reallocation and a change of the work patterns that leads to job loss and the creation of new jobs. Mok (2005) argued that, due to tremendous pressure from the government and the general public, universities around the world make
changes in their structure in order to “adapt to the ever-changing socio-economic and socio-political environments” (p. 59). Mok discussed how globalization forces the restructuring of higher education institutions along with marketization, corporatization, and privatization. Mok argued that universities in China were restructured into training centers under the leadership of different governmental departments in order to promote efficiency. Clark (2000) referred to re-structurization when he discussed developmental periphery units that universities create for better linkage with their external partners. In Etzkowitz’s (2003) discussion, re-structuring is explored in the Triple Helix model where newly created tri-lateral university divisions develop networking with industry and the government.

Labor alteration (abbreviation code—“LA”) is another set of behaviors that refers to changes in instruction, methods of delivery, technology, and management (Levin, 2001). Dzisah & Etzkowitz (2007) discussed the concept of Professors of Practice, which refers to those professionals from business organizations who teach in non-tenure based positions. This concept involves the emergence in academia of a variety of non-tenure forms such as adjunct professorship or research professors, whose primary duties are very limited and specific. Environmental pressures drive university departments to seek more efficient ways to plan workloads (Burgess, Lewis & Mobbs, 2003).

More than a decade ago, researchers shared their concerns that the number of positions for well-qualified scientists declined and many university graduates had to change their professional field because they could not find jobs in academia. In their study conducted at Scottish and English universities in the United Kingdom, Bond and Paterson (2005) found an increasing engagement by academic individuals with local civic and business organizations. According to these researchers:
The main reason for the increase in academic engagement in their communities is the increased pressure upon more traditional academic activities: expansion towards a mass system means a higher workload in terms of teaching and assessment, and the emergence of research assessment exercises means increased pressure to access funding, conduct research, and produce publications for an academic audience. (Bond & Paterson, 2005, p. 347)

*Productivity and efficiency* (abbreviation code—“P/E”) behaviors refer to what higher education institutions do to decrease cost and increase the efficiency of educational services. When governmental funding constrains universities existence, universities take two ways: (1) increase proficiency by producing more programs, goods, and services, (2) and/or reduce the cost for their labor force and increase the workload on their employees (Levin, 2001). University departments around the world face the similar problems of confined resources and the growth of administrative and environmental pressures. Burgess, Lewis, and Mobbs (2003) found that increased environmental pressures are pushing university departments to “confront workload planning in a more rigorous and effective manner” (215). Bond and Paterson (2005) discussed how the academic pressures of obtaining prestige and quality of education force the faculty to step down from the *Ivory Tower* approach to partner with the community and establish relations with non-academic and business organizations in order to better understand the changing world and to be more relevant in teaching and research. Operation in the market means that universities compete with other institutions and organizations for resources and students and with the scarcity of resources they have to make efforts in increasing their proficiency and efficiency.
Set of behaviors called *electronic communication and information* (abbreviation code—“ET”) mirrors the behaviors of higher education institutions in technology usage and how universities deal with information flows. Technologies contribute greatly to all of the global behaviors. Online courses for domestic and international learners, intercontinental online educational projects, and the growing online network of academic groups and individuals that crosses the boundaries between different countries and cultures have already become an everyday routine for university departments (Dahlgren, Larsson & Walters, 2006).

The described global behaviors show that globalization pushes universities to make changes in their operation, structure, and the delivery of services and programs. Universities have no choice but to become involved in the global market and in economic and societal development in ways they have never been involved before. The described global behaviors/areas of change were used further in this study to explore the changes that occur at the School of Education in the selected University.

**Entrepreneurial Universities and Their Characteristics**

This section discusses theories that explain the emergence of entrepreneurial universities as a product of globalization. This is a two-way process in which pressure and change flow in both directions between the higher education system and globalization: entrepreneurial universities experiencing external forces become active actors in the market and, in turn, they influence and intensify the processes in the market, politics, technology, and society as a whole (Clark, 2000).

which “will be as powerful to the twenty-first century as the Industrial Revolution was to the twentieth century (if not more!)” (p. 3). They further continue that entrepreneurs will be “critical contributors to economic growth through their leadership, management, innovation, research and development effectiveness, job creation, competitiveness, productivity, and formation of new industry” (p. 3).

Etzkowitz (2003) discussed the emergence of entrepreneurial universities from the perspective of the evolution of American universities from teaching institutions with the mission to *preserve* and *disseminate knowledge* to entrepreneurial entities that contribute, like all other organizations, to the economic and social development of society. Given the fact that universities in the United States vary on the history and purposes of their establishment, Etzkowitz’s theoretical approach suits this dissertation study because the chosen University was founded with two goals to prepare teachers (normal school) and industrial workers (business school) for the Midwestern region of the United States.

Etzkowitz (2003) describes the process of university entrepreneurial transformation toward the market as the *second academic revolution* which started in higher education at the end of 20th century. The scholar refers to the time during the late 19th and early 20th centuries as the *first academic revolution* in American higher education. It was the time of expansion of higher education when many land-granted universities were created across the country under the Morril Act passed in 1862. Later, the Hatch Act (the Agricultural Extension Service), passed in 1887, provided governmental support for the crop research based state universities. Motivated by those programs, numerous public universities initiated research and technology transfer programs for agriculture, forestry, and mining to provide industries with qualified workers (Noll, 1998). Universities that opened research avenues with
government money expanded their mission. It became two-fold and included traditional teaching functions and research as another major activity which was aimed to give society the more practical benefits of the existence of university.

Etzkowitz (2004) discussed that with globalization and shifts in society toward a knowledge-based economy, research universities started evolving to entrepreneurial type of institutions with three-folded missions: teaching, research, and “economic and social development” (Etzkowitz, 2004, p. 71). Etzkowitz states that “the entrepreneurial university retains the traditional academic roles of social reproduction and extension of certified knowledge, but places them to a broader context as part of its new role in promoting innovation” (Etzkowitz, 2003, p. 300). The third mission requires universities to fully participate in the market. To prove the concept of the evolving mission of entrepreneurial universities, Etzkowitz proposed the following:

This new function of economic and social development will be integrated into the university much as research was integrated with teaching in an earlier era, with incubators adjoining classroom and laboratory facilities. Conducting the activities separately is not as productive of basic research or applied research or technology and new product development. It is more productive to see innovation as non-linear, where basic research problems can come out of practical issues, as well as problems in a discipline. As each new mission is incorporated within the university, it restructures how the previous one is carried out. Because research is assumed to be an academic mission, students are taught how to do it, thus making it part of the educational mission. (Etzkowitz, 2004, p. 76)
Etzkowitz (2004) acknowledges that there is still tension at many universities in accepting research as a mission because many traditional professors argue that the mission of the university originally was, and continues to be, teaching. The third mission also provokes resistance. For example, James Duderstadt (2004) is concerned that when universities are involved in many partnering activities, “they not only compromise their core missions (teaching and research) but also erode their priorities within our society” (p. 73). Another research by Campbell and Slaughter (1999) is focused on faculty and administrators’ attitudes toward university-industry relationships. Researchers found that the increased interactions between universities and industry “contribute to a trend in which public service becomes service for fee rather than for free, and only the service that generates external revenue may be encouraged” (p. 347).

Transformation toward economic and social contribution is based on the activities that universities implement and their proactive positioning in the market. Etzkowitz (2004) suggests that entrepreneurial universities are characterized by their active collaboration with government and industry/businesses. He argues that universities had traditionally been viewed as a supportive system for innovations; even though they did not participate in the production as much as they are expected to do today. With globalization and formation of the knowledge-based economy, the role of universities shifted from the periphery to the center. Start-ups and business incubators produce not only qualified knowledge workers but companies and firms that are established and nurtured at the university and then go to the business world. This production makes today’s universities competent participants in the market along with the government and industry/businesses. The Triple Helix Model (see Figure 5) developed by Etzkowitz (2004) exhibits the emergence of entrepreneurial
universities in the areas of collaborations and tri-lateral networks that accompany these collaboration processes.
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**Figure 5.** Triple Helix model: Emergence of entrepreneurial university.

The Triple Helix overlapping spheres of *Academia, State,* and *Industry* also illuminate the contemporary situation when the globalizing market and the increasing role of the federal government influence university missions and the role that they play in today’s society (Natale & Libertella, 1998). In the Triple Helix model, the role of the government is to stimulate interactions and exchanges between *Industry* as a production source and *Academia* as a source of new knowledge and technology. Tri-lateral networks and hybrid organizations emerge from interaction among the three helices—*Academia, Government,* and *Industry.* Etzkowitz (2003) emphasized that the Triple Helix interaction is a key to “improving the conditions for innovations in a knowledge-based economy” (p. 295). The researcher argued that intellectual capital in the knowledge-based economy becomes as essential as financial capital and "financial capital is increasingly infused with knowledge" (p. 297).

Etzkowitz (2003) described four stages of emergence of a Triple Helix model. The first stage refers to internal transformation in each of the helices. Governments provide
funding programs for innovation, universities establish technology transfer offices, and industry/businesses create strategic alliances for Research and Development among companies. At the second stage, the participating helices influence one upon another: the government establishes technology transfer framework (e.g., Bayh-Dole Act of 1980); universities and companies develop rules and norms for interaction. At the third stage, new tri-lateral networks and organizations are created from the interaction between universities, government, and businesses (e.g., Silicon Valley as a joint venture). At the fourth stage, the triple helix interaction influences the larger society and universities transform their view on research and their relations with industry/businesses and government (Etzkowitz, 2003).

The main idea that can be drawn from Etzkowitz’s (2003) concept is that entrepreneurial universities evolve from teaching-research universities that develop their interactions with both government and industry with the purpose to better fit in the globalizing market and address the demands of society. Applying this approach of viewing entrepreneurialism in higher education, it is appropriate to state that all higher educational institutions are forced to collaborate with business and governmental organizations and expected to participate in social and economic development and operate in real market conditions. Therefore, all higher education institutions that seek ways to survive are more or less entrepreneurial.

Another concept which explains the entrepreneurial transformation of universities, which has been selected for this dissertation study, is the theory of five elements/pathways of entrepreneurial universities developed by Burton Clark (1995, 1998a, 1998b, 2000, 2003, 2004). Clark’s works on entrepreneurial universities have been very influential on
scholarship and were cited by many researchers who explored this field (e.g., Etzkowitz, 2003; Vaira, 2004; Lee & Rhoads, 2004; Kuratko, 2005; Gumport, 2000).

In his book, entitled *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, Burton Clark (1998a) describes five major elements of entrepreneurial transformation which he identified while conducting his study of several successful universities in Europe. Clark’s scheme of entrepreneurial transformation consists of the following elements which are shown in Figure 6: (1) a diversified funding base; (2) a strengthened steering core; (3) an expanded developmental periphery; (4) a stimulated academic heartland; and (5) an integrated entrepreneurial culture.
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**Figure 6. Five elements of entrepreneurial university.**

The big circle on the chart (Figure 6) represents an entrepreneurial university as an organization. It has traditional borders that protect the organization as an entity from the external environment. Arrows, labeled “1,” represent diverse funds that flow to the university from different sources. These diverse funds are described by Clark (1998a) as three main streams of a university’s income which include the following: (1) support from a government that is other than core governmental funding; (2) funds from the private sector; (3) a diversified funding base; (4) a strengthened steering core; (5) an expanded developmental periphery; (6) a stimulated academic heartland; and (7) an integrated entrepreneurial culture.
such as firms, philanthropic foundations, professional associations; and (3) the stream-income which includes all other sources that a university generates from fundraising, tuition, fees, and patents. Clark states that multiple sources of income promote the autonomy of a university over the dependence upon government and spur initiatives and innovations. Clark (2001) emphasizes that universities cannot simply be compared to businesses; they are “much more than a business. They have unique genetic features, and they have developmental trajectories projected by their own generic trends and societal commitments. And proactive universities shape their environments as much as they are shaped by them” (p. 10).

The wide arrow, labeled “2,” represents a strengthened steering core that shows the university’s movements forward a chosen direction. It is the main stream in the university development which has directed out of the circle. This main stream means that the university is intending to become more open to its environment. According to Clark (1998a), a strengthened steering core is tied closely to diversification of funding because new sources of income lead to the emergence of new groups of people who bring money to the university. These new interest groups, associated with the funds they generate, possess the power which makes their role in steering the university more noticeable. Faculty and staff, by bringing funding for implementation of entrepreneurial ideas, become involved in university decision-making. Their participation changes the relationships between the central authority of the university and its departments and divisions. According to Clark (2003), mature entrepreneurial universities are strong on all levels and are being led by change-oriented people who impact the process of steering a university and directions that the university chooses to go.
The third major element in Clark’s (1998a) concept is an expanded developmental periphery which is shown on the chart as arrows numbered “3” (Figure 6) that are targeted out of the organization. This element of an entrepreneurial university refers to non-traditional units and divisions in the university which serve as interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary centers, technology-transfer offices, off-campus centers, or continuing education departments. These units and divisions act across the university and collaborate with disciplinary departments. These developmental periphery units bring new income along with new populations of learners to the university. They serve as linkages between the university, external organizations, and a larger community.

A stimulated academic heartland, expressed in small circles labeled “4” on the chart (Figure 6), refers to the liberal arts and humanities departments and programs which are located within the university (large circle) and overlap the strengthened steering core (arrow “2”). This means that people at the academic departments get involved in steering the university and become a part of the change process. Through their participation, heartland departments become “a part of the sustaining foundation of the entrepreneurial university” (Clark, 2004, p. 361). Academic departments with their faculty, students, and staff, along with their internal culture, values, and activities are understood as being an academic heartland. Clark (2003) argues that entrepreneurial universities have strong departments when faculty and students actively collaborate and participate in innovations. Typically, the technology and applied science departments receive support for their entrepreneurial activities and recognize the benefits of entrepreneurialism sooner than other departments. However, according to Clark (2004), there are cases when humanities departments become entrepreneurial before the others. Clark argued that universities succeed when administrators
emphasize the involvement of faculty and students from different departments throughout the university into entrepreneurial activities. All departments at the university must be included in the entrepreneurial transformation process.

The fifth element of an entrepreneurial university is the *integrated entrepreneurial culture*. Clark (2004) defines entrepreneurial culture by saying:

*Organizational culture, seen as the realm of ideas, beliefs, and asserted values, is the symbolic side of the material components featured in the first four elements. Always ephemeral, often wispy to the touch, it escapes empirical identification. However, it is there: participants in universities today are even schooled to conceive of culture and point to its appearance in concrete practices and particular beliefs.* (p. 361)

In the chart above (Figure 6), it is shown as a large circle, labeled “5” that reflects the entire organization. Clark (2004) argues that in the situation of growing competition for prestige, better students, and funding universities are encouraged nationally and internationally to become more creative and entrepreneurial. Some universities are idealized as exemplary entrepreneurial institutions while others are characterized by developing their identities as forward-oriented organizations. Clark points out that the element of integrated entrepreneurial culture of an organization is very important for entrepreneurial transformation. When entrepreneurialism is a part of organizational members’ perceptions and beliefs, it becomes a foundation for future sustained development. Clark states that those higher education institutions that reach the status of entrepreneurial universities cannot see their way back to a traditional way of existence. Entrepreneurial universities accept and develop their unique identities; they recognize the uncertainty of the globalizing world and apply creativity to their operations and everyday activities. Finding their own *unique* way to
succeed, universities attempt to sustain their entrepreneurial operations, as well as their entrepreneurial spirit and culture. Sustainability and growth of entrepreneurial universities is critical both for the universities that employ the entrepreneurial approach to survive and succeed in competition with other universities and for the society that benefits from education, research, and innovations.

The University of Warwick, which was explored by Burton Clark (2000) in the United Kingdom, became a national model of entrepreneurial transformation for other universities by obtaining its unique way, the Warwick way, of operation. Clark pointed out the importance of the creation of a story-saga of the university’s success that encourages people at the university to behave entrepreneurially. He stated, “The idea that had turned into a belief system and then into a still wider culture had in the space of a decade become a saga of successful institution-building within a harsh environment” (p. 17). The researcher emphasizes the role of people who work together toward change and develop a better understanding of entrepreneurship as a phenomenon of their group. In particular Clark said:

Entrepreneurialism works in universities when faculty as well as administrators can say ‘we have done it ourselves’. Collegiality - that much treasured resource of traditional universities - is then no longer overwhelmingly biased toward defense of the status quo, even the status quo ante: instead it becomes biased toward change.

(Clark, 1995, p. 3)

This is evidence of an entrepreneurial culture that reflects the conditions in which people within academia value teamwork and their rights to create their own projects. The Triple Helix model (Etzkowitz, 2000), which highlights collaborations between academia, government, and industry, aligns Clark’s (1995) statement about people at the university who
feel that they work together as a team. The word “we” must be understood broadly and inclusively because entrepreneurial collaboration engages people from different helices to work together as teams and they identify themselves as “we.”

Clark (1998a) points out the importance to not only understand the main entrepreneurial pathways of transformation of the universities but also the connections between these five elements, their interdependence, and influence on each other. Clark (2003) acknowledges that entrepreneurial transformation is an ongoing process and none of the principal elements should be idealized. The five elements have to be used not only as guidance for transformation but also as a foundation to build up a sustained development of entrepreneurial growth. According to Clark (2001), each university develops its own unique pathway of transformation. The concept of entrepreneurial university is an umbrella that allows a higher educational institution to choose and find its own way of becoming a self-steering, self-reliant, and proactive university.

**Entrepreneurial Organizational Culture and Entrepreneurial Behaviors**

Geert Hofstede (1997) defined organizational culture as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the member of one organization from another” (p. 180). Different researchers (e.g., Hofstede, 1997; Schein, 1990) agreed with the main features of the organizational culture phenomenon such as its *holistic nature* and how it is *historically determined* and *socially constructed*. *Holistic nature* of organizational culture refers to the notion that the culture of an organization must be considered not as the sum of its parts but as a whole thing. It is essential to recognize that all parts of the organization are tied together, interconnect, and influence each other. The current state of the culture should not be considered without the context in which it evolved. Mars and Metcalfe (2009) acknowledge
that not all business firms can be recognized as entrepreneurial organizations because their operation does not employ creativity and innovations. The transformation of the culture of an educational institution which is moving toward an entrepreneurial paradigm is different from the culture of business firms (Clark, 2000). Organizations are *socially constructed*, and their culture is built and preserved by the group of people who work for these organizations. People bring their values, beliefs, and assumptions that become a part of the value system of the organization (Schein, 1990, 2004). Hofstede (1997) points out that organizational culture is *soft* and can be changed; however, this *soft* is very *hard* because changes in organizational culture are very complex and people tend to avoid and often resist changes.

In order to better understand the phenomenon of an entrepreneurial organizational culture, it is useful to employ the concept offered by Edgar Schein (1990, 2004) who identified three levels of organizational culture. Schein described the following three levels of culture in an organization: *Artifacts, Espoused Values*, and *Underlying Assumptions*. A metaphor of an iceberg is used in this paper to visualize Schein’s concept (see Figure 7). *Artifacts* are described as material and non-material things that can be observed, heard, and felt. Artifacts are at the first level of the organizational culture. The second level of *Espoused Values* lays below the *Artifacts*. According to Schein, values are not seen, but they can be explored through documents and interviews. Values are tied to each other and are in alignment across the organization. *Underlying Assumptions* reflect people’s deep beliefs and perceptions. They are placed at the lowest level of the organizational iceberg model. Underlying assumptions are invisible; however, their role is highly profound because they drive what is going on at the upper levels. Understanding the lowest hidden level of a
The cultural iceberg model allows one to better understand what is happening on the higher levels and why people value certain things and why they behave in certain ways.

**Figure 7.** Three levels of organizational culture.

Describing the development of an entrepreneurial culture, Clark (2000) spoke about the organizational saga and described how ideas grow to certain beliefs and how these beliefs later turn to a strong culture with a sense of uniqueness. An entrepreneurial spirit arises at a successful university and embraces the departments, larger divisions, and the entire organization (Clark, 2000; Kaffman, n.d.).

Works by Allan Gibb (1998, 2000) on entrepreneurialism at small and medium-size enterprises contribute to research on enterprise/entrepreneurial culture in educational organizations. Gibb distinguished between entrepreneurial and traditional organizations. Both traditional and entrepreneurial types of organizations can be found in all helices of the Triple Helix model (Etzkowitz, 2003). Some organizations that collaborate actively with other helices are forced to deal with constant changes that the collaboration brings. These organizations should be considered as entrepreneurial entities because they tend to be open systems and deal with uncertainty and have to be creative in order to address the needs and
demands of their partners and clients. Other organizations choose to stay away from active collaborations; they implement their routine work in relatively “stable conditions” and resist changes. It is appropriate to recognize this type of organizations as traditional and non-entrepreneurial institutions. Therefore, entrepreneurial organizations develop a set of values which differentiate them from traditional organizations regardless of which social-economic sphere or of which helix in the Triple Helix model they operate (Etzkowitz, 2003).

Gibb (1998) found that entrepreneurial organizations show *untidiness vs. order* that the traditional managerial organizations value. Also, the entrepreneurial culture of a university is recognized through informality, trusting relationships, and doing things *my own way*. Mistakes made by the organizational members are not subject to punishment but are a reason for learning. According to Gibb, entrepreneurial entities value personal observations, holistic expertise, intuitive planning, and personal monitoring vs. formal standards. In the entrepreneurial organization, individuals are the authors of projects and they manage their projects from the initiative to a stage of creating an entrepreneurial product.

Gibb (1998) divided universities into two categories: those organizations that act like big corporations with the traditional managerial style and those universities that act as entrepreneurial organizations. He identified the qualities of higher education institutions that value entrepreneurialism and make changes in their operation become more entrepreneurial. In his study, Gibb argues that the traditional *managerial* model of a university must be replaced with an alternate *entrepreneurial* model which resembles the notion of an entrepreneurial university culture promoted by the Kaufman Foundation (Kaufman, n.d.) and researchers like Burton Clark (2000) and Henry Etzkowitz (2003).
Gibb (2005) acknowledges that not only the *know-how* is a component of university entrepreneurship but also *know-who*. He used the term *know-who* to highlight the significance of networking, trust-based relationships, and ongoing social interactions by all participants of entrepreneurial activities. This notion aligns with the Triple Helix model (Etzkowitz, 2003, 2004) that proposes close collaboration between university, government, and businesses.

Stevenson (2000) also distinguished the qualities of *entrepreneurial* and *traditional/administrator* led organizations by six key business dimensions: Strategic Orientation, Commitment to Opportunity, Commitment Process, Control of Resources, Management Structure, and Reward System. In Stevenson’s (2000) description, the notions of opportunity, quick commitment to it, flexibility in attracting resources, net-working, and the value of the team play a significant role. While an administrator in a traditional organization makes decisions based on *controlled resources*, an entrepreneur identifies and pursues opportunities by seeking a way to attract resources that are traditionally considered as unreachable.

Non-entrepreneurial values, such as order, formality, control, accountability, planning, and rational decision-making, contrast with the trust-based relationships and intuitive decision-making that are components of an entrepreneurial organization. This contradiction raises obstacles to accepting entrepreneurial values by members of a traditional university in which teaching itself is for its own sake and knowledge is considered as a product. However, the aim of an entrepreneurial educational organization is to transfer knowledge to innovations which are another type of *products* (Etzkowitz, 2003, 2004) and
possess market value. Table 1 demonstrates the combined qualities of traditional/managerial and entrepreneurial organizations proposed by Stevenson (2000) and Gibb (1998).

Table 1

Qualities of traditional/managerial and entrepreneurial organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business dimensions (Stevenson, 2000)</th>
<th>Traditional/managerial organization</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driven by resources currently controlled</td>
<td>Corporate strategy</td>
<td>Driven by perception of opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Opportunity</strong></td>
<td>Evolutionary with long duration</td>
<td>Functional expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-stage with complete commitment upon decision</td>
<td>Planning; Order; Formality; Information; Control measures</td>
<td>Multistage with minimal exposure at each stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Resources</strong></td>
<td>Ownership or employment of required resources</td>
<td>Formal standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Structure</strong></td>
<td>Formalized hierarchy</td>
<td>Clear demarcation; Positional authority; Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward System</strong></td>
<td>Resource-based individual and promotion oriented</td>
<td>Formal performance appraisal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clark (2000) mentioned that the term entrepreneurship/entrepreneurialism in academia has received a bad reputation because some “entrepreneurial leaders, operating top-down, leave behind traditional collegiality; entrepreneurial faculty members strike out on
their own for personal profit, abusing peers and students along the way” (p. 18). He promoted the notion that university entrepreneurialism must be collegial and must involve faculty, administrative staff, and students in the entrepreneurial activities and all interest groups have to be involved in collective decision-making. An entrepreneurial culture must be supportive of all the people in the university and give everyone a chance to apply his/her creativity and the development of innovative ideas. At an entrepreneurial university “problems are turned into opportunities to be exploited by developing new capacities. As they build those capacities, universities become active learning organizations” (Clark, 2000, p. 19). People in an entrepreneurial university must not only cope with and provoke uncertainty, but also “enjoy, an increasingly complex and uncertain world” (Gibb, 2005, p. 18). The idea to enjoy the complexity and uncertainty of the changing world resembles the so-called entrepreneurial spirit that one can feel at entrepreneurial organizations (Kauffman, n.d.).

Per the concepts described above, an entrepreneurial culture is distinguished from other organizational cultures by having trust-based relationships and supportive entrepreneurial spirit that allows everyone in the organization to express his/her creativity and initiate a project. It is also important for an entrepreneurial culture that people feel ownership of the innovation projects; they trust each other, recognize the uncertainty and complexity of the world, and are not punished for mistakes but learn from them. An entrepreneurial university has a saga, or a story, on its entrepreneurial transformation and achievements.

Scholars use different language when they discuss organizational behaviors. Organizational behaviors that involve creativity, risk, creation of new products and services,
are not always labeled with the term of *entrepreneurial* behaviors. For example, John Levin (2001) developed a concept of global behaviors of higher educational organizations which is described in the section *Globalization and Global Behaviors of Universities* of this dissertation work. Barbara Sporn (2001) used a theory of university adaptation to external changes when she discussed the changes that universities make in order to address external forces. Phillip Altbach (2004) discussed the responses of universities to globalization and the changes that university make in their operations in order to fully participate in the global market. Some authors (e.g., Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt & Cantisano Terra, 2000) identified similar patterns of university transformations and called this phenomenon *isomorphism* (*iso* – similar, *morpheme* – pattern). Other researchers (Vaira, 2004) recognized the differences in behaviors and used the concept of organizational *allomorphism* (*allos* – different, *morpheme* – pattern). Many of these researchers did not consider changes and activities by higher educational organizations from an entrepreneurial perspective; whereas a scholar who explores entrepreneurialism in higher education would find many *entrepreneurial* features in their concepts.

In his cultural concept, Hofstede (1997) proposed that *Values* are a core of the symbolic part of culture that includes *Symbols, Heroes,* and *Rituals*. *Symbols* are described as material things, words and gestures with assigned meanings attached to them. *Heroes* refer to persons, alive and dead, about whom stories are told in the organizations, those who serve as role models and inspire other people to do some certain and special things for the organization and the people in it. Finally, *Rituals* are collective actions in which things and heroes are brought together to enhance and refresh the meaning of the core values of the organizational culture.
Economic literature describes organizational entrepreneurial behavior as an activity and/or a set of activities aimed to create a new product, a good or a service, and to better address the needs and demands of clients/consumers (García-Cabrera & García-Soto, 2008; Mair, 2005; Slevin & Covin, 1990). Brown (2004) pointed out that entrepreneurial behavior should have a wider understanding. In particular, he said:

[it] can be interpreted as being more about – ‘ways of doing, seeing, feeling and communicating things’, ‘ways of organising things’ and ‘ways of learning things’. It is concerned with the way individuals organise and implement change, new ideas, new ways of doing things, responding proactively to the wider environment, and provoking change, often involving risk, uncertainty and complexity. (Brown, 2004, p. 3)

Entrepreneurial organizational behavior includes characteristics such as risk-taking, pro-activity, and innovations (Slevin & Covin, 1990). It is also described as a process of opportunity recognition, assessment, and exploitation (Shane & Venkataramen, 2000; Westhead, Ucbasaran, Wright, & Binks, 2005). Mair (2005) defined entrepreneurial behavior as “a set of activities and practices by which individuals at multiple levels autonomously generate and use innovative resource combinations to identify and pursue opportunities” (p. 51). The definition of entrepreneurship/entrepreneurialism as a pursuit of opportunities with resources that are not controlled (Stevenson, 2000) is very widely accepted among scholars in different fields and from different countries.

Another important entrepreneurial concept is innovations. In their book, Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity, Baumol, Litan, and Schramm (2007) defined innovations as “the marriage of new knowledge, embodied in
an invention, with the successful introduction of that invention into the marketplace” (p. 5). These authors pointed out that the innovations have value and are useful only when they reach the market and make consumers want to buy them. Another definition of innovation provided by the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship stated the following: “innovation is defined as creating and exploiting opportunities for new ways of doing things resulting in better products and services, systems and ways of managing people and organizations” (NCGE, n.d.). Drucker (2007) described innovation as the “specific tool of entrepreneurs, the means by which they exploit change as an opportunity for a different business or a different service” (p. 17). Consequently, innovation for this dissertation study is understood as new and improved programs and services and new ways that are applied to produce programs and services which better address the needs and demands of people who pay for these programs and services in the market. A very important characteristic of an entrepreneurial product is that it possesses an economic and/or social value that allows the product to be successfully sold in the marketplace (Kauffman, n.d.).

An entrepreneurial behavior or action does not simply lead to a desirable outcome or entrepreneurial product (Zampetakis, Beldekos, & Moustakis, 2009). It involves a more complex mixture of features in order to get the products which are sold in the markets. All entrepreneurial behaviors result in entrepreneurial experiences. An entrepreneurial experience is what has been learned and gained from entrepreneurial efforts (Iivonen, Kyröb, Mynttinenb, Särkkä-Tirkkonenac, & Kahiluotoc, 2010). Entrepreneurs search for knowledge when they need to solve a problem. Knowledge is not sought for the sake of finding new knowledge but for the solution to a problem. Iivonen, Kyröb, Mynttinenb, Särkkä-Tirkkonenac, and Kahiluotoc (2010) discussed entrepreneurial “informal problem-oriented
learning by doing in a real life context” (p. 20) which is suggested to be considered as entrepreneurial experience. Any entrepreneurial behavior leads to entrepreneurial experience; it, however, does not always lead to entrepreneurial products.

Entrepreneurial behaviors involve different entrepreneurial qualities or attributes which are interrelated and intertwined. For example, when one is attempting to identify an opportunity, that person is characterized by having such traits as alertness and holistic thinking (Mair, 2005). Social skills must be applied by individuals in order to build trust, establish relationships, and achieve goals. Baron and Markman (2000) found that certain social skills of individuals contribute to entrepreneur achievements. These skills are organized in the following sets: Social Perception, Impression Management, Persuasion and Influence, and Social Adaptability. Scholars defined Social Perception as the ability of an individual to be accurate in “perceiving others, including perceptions of others' motives, traits, and intentions… to correctly gauge current moods or emotions of others, their underlying motives, and their personal characteristics” (Baron & Markman, 2000, p. 108). Impression Management refers to an ability to apply a wide range of techniques in order to invoke positive reactions and feelings in people. The third set of social skills that contribute to entrepreneurial success involves Persuasion and Influence which are determined as skills that help an individual to change “the attitudes or behavior of others in desired directions” (Baron & Markman, 2000, p. 109). Finally, the fourth set of social skills refers to Social Adaptability which involves the abilities of an individual in dealing with and feeling comfortable with people from diverse backgrounds. Baron and Markman described these types of individuals as “social chameleons” who can easily adapt their behaviors to almost anyone in any social context.
When the opportunity is to be exploited, or there is a need to allocate resources, the traits such as risk-taking, initiative, ownership, autonomy, trusting, net-working, and creativity play out in an entrepreneurial behavior (Gibb, 1998; Knight, 1921). Gibb (1998) suggested an extended list of entrepreneurial behaviors, entrepreneurial attitudes, and entrepreneurial skills (see Table 2) which helps to better understand the phenomenon of entrepreneurial behavior in its relations with other traits, qualities, values, and assumptions.

Table 2

Entrepreneurial behaviors, attributes, and skills by A. Gibb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneurial Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grasping opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solving problems creatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing autonomously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking responsibility for, and ownership of, things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeing things through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking effectively to manage interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>putting things together creatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using judgment to take calculated risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneurial Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement orientation and ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-confidence and self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perseverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high internal locus of control (autonomy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preference for learning by doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneurial Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>creative problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persuading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holistically managing business/projects/situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intuitive decision making under uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Gibb, 1998, p. 33.

These organizational attributes and behaviors should be viewed as characteristics that individuals possess and how these characteristics play out in the context of an organization. Consider trust that plays an important role in entrepreneurs’ interactions with other people (Iivonen, Kyröb, Mynttinenb, Särkkä-Tirkkonenac & Kahiluotoc, 2010).

In reviewing the characteristics of entrepreneurial behaviors and entrepreneurial universities, as suggested by Gibb (2005), it appeared that people at an entrepreneurial university have to have a strong sense of ownership, freedom and autonomy. They must have highly developed networking with both internal and external stakeholders.
Entrepreneurial leaders must possess abilities to manage processes and things holistically, involve a wide range of stakeholders in decision making, tolerate intuitive thinking and mistakes, and encourage learning from mistakes and strategic thinking. Gibbs believes that in order to be considered as entrepreneurial the university has to offer entrepreneurship which is taught university-wide while covering all subjects and disciplines. It must establish collaborations with teams of entrepreneurs from various fields of business while allowing them, along with their peers at the university, to “harvest ideas” for future projects (Gibbs, 2005, p. 29).

From many entrepreneurial behavioral components discussed in the literature, the researcher chose three major categories of organizational entrepreneurial behaviors with the purpose of exploring them further in the dissertation study. These categories, labeled Resources (Stevenson, 2000; Hall, 1992), Opportunities (McMullen, Plummer, & Acs, 2007), and Products (Schramm, 2000), include certain related behaviors (see Figure 8).

![Figure 8. Three sets of organizational entrepreneurial behaviors.](image)

The label Opportunities includes the following behaviors: identifying, evaluating, and exploiting the needs in the markets. McMullen, Plummer, and Acs (2007) defined
opportunity as an appropriate or favorable, or advantageous combination of circumstances; a situation or condition favorable for attainment of a goal; a good position, chance, or prospect, as for advancement or success. The label Resources includes the following behaviors: identifying resources within the organization and outside of the organization, re-order and re-organizing available resources, and attracting those resources that are traditionally considered as unreachable (Stevenson, 2000). Resources are defined as a source of support, supply, or aid. They can be material and non-material things that can eventually be converted into money. Intangible resources range from the intellectual property rights of patents, trademarks, copyright and registered design; through contracts; trade secrets; public knowledge such as scientific works; to the people dependent, or subjective resources of know-how; networks; organizational culture, and the reputation of product and company (Hall, 1992). The label Products employs outcomes of entrepreneurial behaviors aimed at creating programs and services by transferring new knowledge to innovations, marketing products and services, and selling them. Entrepreneurial products at the university are innovations that may include programs, courses, services, delivery methods, new documents, etc. The entrepreneurial programs and services are created individually or collaboratively by faculty, administrators, staff, and/or students with/without external partners. It is essential that entrepreneurial products have economic and social value and are demanded in the markets. Evidence of the demand is that actual and potential clients are willing to buy and to use entrepreneurial programs and services (Schramm, 2000).
Chapter 3: Research Methods

Seven main sections comprise the arrangement of this chapter. The first section discusses the nature of entrepreneurial data suggested by experts in the field of entrepreneurship (e.g., Kuratko, 2005). The ethics of the study and issues related to trustworthiness is provided in the second section. The third section contains a general description of the research settings. The following section discusses the design of the study and research questions. The fifth section is devoted to the artifacts analysis method. The sixth section provides a description on how observations were conducted and the researcher role in observations, and the last section discusses interview methods.

Defining Entrepreneurial Data

In order to reflect on the existing approach in identified entrepreneurial data (Kuratko, 2005), the researcher provides a brief review of the major sources of data suggested by Donald F. Kuratko who is recognized as one of the leaders in the field of research in entrepreneurship. These sources of entrepreneurial data were adapted to academic settings and used in data collection.

According to D. Kuratko (2005), there are three major sources of information supplying the data related to entrepreneurship. The first source, research based [sources] including popular publications (Kuratko, 2005), commonly refers to artifacts in educational research methods. They can include scholarly publications, dissertations, books, book chapters, newsletters, news periodicals, conference proceedings, c-vitas of faculty and guest speakers, and government publications. The second major source of information is direct observation of practicing entrepreneurs as well as interviews with them and conducting surveys (Kuratko, 2005). Based on the developed conceptual framework, faculty,
administrators, and students at the selected departments were considered as practicing entrepreneurs. Kuratko argued that analysis of interviews, surveys, and case studies can “provide insights into the traits, characteristics, and personalities of individual entrepreneurs and leads to the discovery of commonalities that would help explain the perspective” (Kuratko, 2005, p. 580). The final source of entrepreneurial information identified by Kuratko refers to speeches and presentations (including seminars) by practicing entrepreneurs.

**Ethics of the Study and Trustworthiness**

Ethics is critical in studies that involve human beings. Johnson and Christensen (2008) argued that “consideration of the ethics of any research study is necessary to assist the researcher in preventing abuses that could occur and in delineating the responsibilities of the investigator” (p. 101). Conducting this study, the researcher followed the Ethical Standards developed by the American Educational Research Association. Research participants were provided with safe conditions, and their rights for privacy and anonymity were not violated. Each interview participant was advised that he/she could withdraw from the study at any time without negative consequences. The identities of the interviewees are protected by assigning a fictitious name to each participant.

The researcher followed the eight procedures suggested by Glesne (2006) in order to verify the validity and trustworthiness of the study as much as possible. These eight procedures are as follows: (1) Prolonged engagement and persistent observation, (2) Triangulation (multiple data collection methods, multiple sources, multiple theoretical perspectives), (3) Peer review and debriefing, (4) Negative case analysis, (5) Clarification of
researcher bias, (6) Member checking (sharing data with interview participants), (7) Rich, thick description, and (8) External audit.

All data were coded in order to provide confidentiality and organization for further analysis. Observation notes and transcripts of the interviews were destroyed at the end of the study. All materials—artifacts, observation notes, and transcripts of the interview—were reviewed by the dissertation study chair.

**Research Settings**

The institution, further called University, selected for this study, was recognized by the Carnegie Classification (Carnegie, n. d.) in 2005 as a large, four-year public, and primarily residential doctoral/research institution with high undergraduate enrollment accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). Because this University is a doctoral degree granting institution, the researcher refers to it as a large comprehensive university. The reason to choose this University was its reputation in the state and the region as an entrepreneurial organization which expands its program not only nationally, but also internationally.

The chosen University is located in a rural area in the Midwestern region of the United States. The University was founded as a Normal School and a Business Institute at the end of the 19th century. Today, this University is among the 100 largest public universities in the United States. According to the Fall 2009 Enrollment Reports, approximately 20,500 students were enrolled in the University’s programs on campus and over 15,000 students enrolled in online classes and off-campus locations. The University has more than 60 off-campus locations throughout the United States. Several international centers are located in Canada and Mexico. The University offers more than 200 programs
through eight colleges in the fields of Business, Communication, Fine Arts, Education, Human Services, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Science and Technology, Health, and Medicine. According to information on the University’s website, this institution has been named as the 10th most productive university in the nation and is recognized as a leader and innovator in off-campus delivery since 1971.

Analysis of the website pages shows that the president of the University has a vision which reflects the main characteristics of the concepts of globalization and entrepreneurialism. The key notions expressed by the president in his speeches were to promote innovative actions, global thinking, creativity, and pursuing educational and economic opportunities. The president sees change as an inevitable process and acknowledges that the University’s future is “exciting and vibrant.”

According to information from the University’s website, the University’s strategic goals for the 2010-2011 academic year are developed in the following six areas: (1) Strategic planning; (2) Student success; (3) Diversity and global engagement; (4) Scholarship, research, and creative activity; (5) Partnership and public engagement; and (6) Resources, infrastructure, and culture. Each of these areas refers to the metrics/Measures that allow the University community to assess the progress being made toward achieving goals and objectives. These metrics include creativity, innovations, internationalization, networking, and entrepreneurship.

The School of Education at the University, chosen to be explored in this dissertation study, consists of five departments which are as follows: (1) Counseling and Special Education; (2) Leadership; (3) Human Environmental Studies; (4) Recreation, Parks, and Leisure Services Administration; and (5) Teacher Education. Most recent data, which refer
to the Fall 2010, show that these departments offered undergraduate and graduate programs to over 11,000 students enrolled on campus and more than 3,000 off-campus and distant learning students. The five departments at the School of Education offer the following graduate degrees: (1) The Department of Counseling and Special Education offers master’s level programs in Professional Counseling, School Counseling, and Special Education. (2) The Leadership Department offers master’s, specialist, and doctoral degrees in Educational Leadership and master’s degrees in Community Leadership, General Education Administration, and School Principalship. (3) The Department of the Human Environmental Studies offers graduate programs in Apparel Merchandising and Design, Child Development and Family Studies, Food and Nutrition, Interior Design, and an interdisciplinary Gerontology graduate program certificate. (4) The Department of Recreation, Parks, and Leisure Services Administration offers Master of Arts degree programs. (5) The Department of Teacher Education offers degrees in the following areas: Educational Technology, Elementary Education, Middle Level Education, Reading and Literacy, and Secondary Education.

Five University departments were selected for data collection. The departments at the school level (two academic departments and one non-academic office) were chosen based on analysis of the artifacts and recommendations made by the Interim Dean of the School of Education. The University level departments (the Faculty Development Center and the Center for Off-Campus Programs) were identified from data provided by the interviewees. The selected organizational units are shown in Table 3.
Table 3

Selected sites for data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sites</th>
<th>Departments &amp; Centers/Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic departments</td>
<td>Teacher Education Department (School of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Department (School of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charter Schools Office (School of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Development Center (University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center for Off-Campus Programs (University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design of the Study and Research Questions

To give this dissertation study a focus and provide analytical direction to the methodological approaches, the following guiding researcher questions were developed for this study:

1. What entrepreneurial elements (Clark, 2004) and global behaviors (Levin, 2001) can be identified in the selected departments?

2. What evidences of entrepreneurial behaviors and entrepreneurial programs and services can be identified in the selected departments?

3. How do global behaviors, entrepreneurial behaviors, and entrepreneurial programs and services impact the entrepreneurial transformation in the selected departments?

Three qualitative methods were employed in this dissertation study in order to answer the guiding research questions: (a) artifact analysis, (b) observations, and (c) interviews with practicing entrepreneurs who are administrators, staff members, faculty members, and students. Interviews were the main research method in collecting data.
Artifacts Analysis

The relevant artifacts were collected from the publicly accessible sites at the main campus of the University, from the departments and centers at the School of Education, from the University’s website, and the University’s and local newspapers. Collected artifacts were organized into following categories: (1) selected webpages of the University and its schools and departments such as (a) School of Education, (b) Teacher Education Department, (c) Department of Leadership, (d) Charter Schools Office, (e) Faculty Development Center, (f) Center for Off-Campus Programs, as well as the personal webpages of faculty and staff members of the University; (2) printed text materials (i.e., brochures, fliers, booklets, reports, issues of the University’s newspaper); (3) text materials in a digital format (i.e., syllabi, departments’ and centers’ calendars, college reports, CVs); (4) photos taken during visits by the researcher to the main campus; and (5) brief audio recorded interviews with organizers and participants of the Open House event at the School of Education which the researcher attended for the purpose of observation.

Observations and the Researcher’s Roles

For this dissertation, six participant observations were conducted in the School of Education at the chosen University: one public event and five observations of the departments. The public Open House event took place on July 22, 2011 and involved “over 900 visitors including 264 high school students” (Annual Report, 2011). While attending this event, the researcher played two roles: a complete observer and an observer-as-participant (Gold, 1958). The Open House event allowed the researcher to perform complete observations browsing around and watching both the organizers (staff, faculty, and students) and the visitors (prospective students and their parents). The researcher also was an
observer-participant and talked with both the organizers and the participants and asked them
questions in regards to study inquiry. Five other observations were conducted
simultaneously with interviews on the main campus. The researcher was able to interview
the study participants in their offices, and most of the interviewees provided the researcher
with tours of their departments.

Adler and Adler (1987) argued that the Chicago School research members recognize
two main strategies in observation methods: overt role, which refers to situations when
members are aware of the purpose of an observer’s presence and fieldwork, and covert role
when the researcher does not admit that the research is conducted with the study participants.
Both of these strategies were used at the time of observations.

Observations were conducted and analyzed by using Crabtree and Miller’s (1999)
observation framework which includes the following elements: Who, What, When, Where,
Why, and How (see Table 4).

Table 4

*Observation Framework*

| **Who** | is present? How would you characterize them? What role are they playing in the group? How did they enter the group? On what is their membership in this group based? Who did the organizing or directing of the group? |
| **What** | is happening? What are people doing and saying, and how are they behaving? How did this activity/interaction begin? What things appear to be routine? To what extent are the various participants involved? What is the tone of their communication? What body language is being used? |
| **When** | does this activity occur? What is its relationship to other activities or events? How long does it last? What makes it the right time (wrong time) for this to occur? |
| **Where** | is this happening? What part do the physical surroundings contribute to what is happening? Can and does this happen elsewhere? Do participants use or relate to the space or physical objects differently? |
| **Why** | is this happening? What precipitated this event/interaction? Are different perspectives on what is occurring evident? What contributes to things happening in this manner? |
| **How** | is this activity organized? How are the elements of what is happening related? What rules or norms are evident? How does this activity or group relate to other aspects of the setting? |

*Note: Adapted from Crabtree & Miller, 1999, p. 55*
The questions suggested by Crabtree and Miller (1999) helped the researcher to frame the observations, to record all necessary details, and to properly analyze the meaning of the observed events and activities.

**Interviews**

The sample of the study participants was obtained by a snowball method. The first few names of potential interviewees were suggested by the Interim Dean of the School of Education who was very supportive to the researcher in data collection. Additional participants were selected based on recommendations by the interviewees. In order to protect identities, pseudonyms were used for the interviewees. The actual names of places, events, and actions were also changed to avoid identification. The pool of 14 interviewees consisted of the Interim Dean of the School of Education (Dr. Kathy Williams), two department heads (Dr. Larry Smith and Dr. Elizabeth Campbell), four faculty members (Dr. Natalia Lee, Dr. David Jones, Dr. Barbara Martin, and Dr. Daniel White), three doctoral students (Mr. Jeff Wilson, Ms. Tammy Harris, and Ms. Margaret Robinson), one staff member of the Charter Schools Office (Mr. Timothy Taylor), the Director of the Faculty Development Center (Dr. James Parker), the Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs (Dr. Mary Carter), and one staff member of the Center for Off-Campus Programs (Ms. Julia Moore). Table 5 displays the distribution of the interviewees by their positions.
Table 5

Distribution of study participants by position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dean of the School of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Head of an academic department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director of a University center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty member</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff member of a University center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Doctoral student in Educational Leadership Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 14 study participants were interviewed on the main campus of the University.

The researcher conducted ten one-on-one interviews and two interviews in which two participants were interviewed at the same time. Total interview time was approximately 16 hours. The interview time with the study participants was approximately 16 hours. All interviews were semi-structured and contained open-ended questions. The interviews were audio recorded, fully transcribed, and scanned for major themes. Semi-structured interviews contained the following questions:

1) What programs does your department offer in the market?

2) Do you consider your department/school as an organization that values creativity?

3) Do you have any experiences in creating any innovative programs/services?

4) What is unique about your department, school, and university?

5) How do people collaborate to create a new program or service?

6) Are students, faculty, staff involved in joint projects/activities?

7) How are decisions made in the department and school?

8) What grants and partnership contracts does your department/school implement?
9) What criteria and policy are applied to newly hired employees?

10) What international activities does your department/school have?

11) What do the people at your department/school value?

12) How does the administration of your department/school and the University support initiatives by faculty, staff, and students?

13) How are external partners/stakeholders involved in the activities at your department/school?

14) What new divisions/sub-units/committees have been created at your department/school during the past 5-7 years?

15) What is the most/least enjoyable for you to be a part of your department, School of Education, University?
Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter comprises the data analysis. All qualitative data are described in this chapter reflect the language and perceptions of study participants and do not reflect the researcher’s definition of entrepreneurialism at the university. The following 14 themes emerged from narratives by the study participants as well as from the content analysis of written materials from the relevant sources.

1. Entrepreneurial Individuals in the Organization: “They put high expectations and provide support.”

2. Diversity of Personal and Professional Experiences and Expertise: “Experience of living in different places and communities allowed us to get opened up for new ideas and innovative activities.”

3. Entrepreneurial Reputation: “People refer to us as being entrepreneurial.”

4. Location and Expansion: “We are from coast to coast.”

5. Business-Like Behaviors: “We are not going to be academic in Ivory Tower; we do business.”

6. Teamwork and Internal Collaborations: “If you want to achieve many things, you cannot work in isolation.”

7. External Collaborations: “We will go there and establish a long-term relationship.”

8. Accredited Programs: “We do what the state wants us to do.”

9. Research Activities: “It takes the researcher outside of the traditional box.”

10. Unique Programs and Services: “No one else does it.”

11. Internationalization: “Students need to understand globalization.”
12. University Support: “I know the door to knock on when I need help.”

13. Obstacles for Entrepreneurial Transformation: “It was a threat to change.”

14. Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture: “We challenge each other in our department to see where we can go for our market” belongs to all of the categories.

**Entrepreneurial Individuals in the Organization: “They Put High Expectations and Provide Support”**

This section provides descriptions of the individuals who were selected and interviewed for this dissertation study. The *portraits* of the entrepreneurial individuals at the unit of analysis help the researcher to better understand the backgrounds of the people in relation to their work as well as their values and beliefs. The *portraits* are organized in the following order: (a) former and current administration of the School of Education; (b) seven interviewees from the Educational Leadership Department; (c) two interviewees from the Teacher Education Department; (d) the Charter School Office interviewed staff member and the former leader of the Charter School Office; and (e) the Director of the Faculty Development Center.

**Former and current administration of the School of Education.** According to the interviewees, the *former Dean of the School of Education*, who passed away unexpectedly several years ago, built the foundation for a caring atmosphere at the School of Education (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 22, 2011). The interviewees brought up the name of the former dean with deep respect and recognition for her efforts, achievements, vision, and support that she provided to them and the students. Specifically, Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, said:
[She] gave me a chance to be sort of a student to see how things can be done, and how does somebody, who is a dean, reaches across the table, shares what we have to offer, tries to nurture a partnership. So I feel that I really learned from a master. And it was really exciting… She was always worried about how are students doing. She even traveled to those locations. If students teach in Ghana, she travels to Ghana. She was nurturing those sorts of things… (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Another interviewee said about the former dean, “[She] was a very supportive person. She was able to recognize great ideas and support them. She established a culture for creativity” (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

**Dr. Kathryn Williams** served as Interim Dean of the School of Education during the data collection. She was also recognized as a very supportive person by the interviewees. Dr. Williams continued to support and develop the tradition of creativity and openness to new ideas. Many of the interviewees mentioned that she was always supportive and did her best to encourage colleagues at the School of Education (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). For example, Dr. Parker said about his work with the School of Education, “There is a high interest in teaching improvement over there and the Dean is very supportive” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 21, 2011).

**Entrepreneurial individuals at the Leadership Department.** Dr. Elizabeth Campbell is the recently elected head of the Leadership Department. Dr. Campbell started her career in the K-12 system where she was a teacher and a high school principal and always wanted to teach at the university. She received her Ed.D. from the Department in which she now serves as department head and professor. During her work at the secondary
school level, she collaborated on a project with the Teacher Education Department at this University. In addition, she had been teaching summer courses for the Teacher Education Department for two years.

Dr. Campbell is highly passionate about the internationalization of her Department. She travels often abroad with groups of students. Dr. Campbell believes that international experience must be a requirement for today’s students in Educational Leadership programs.

Mr. Jeff Wilson, doctoral student, shared his observations of changes that have occurred in the Leadership Department and emphasized the role that Dr. Campbell plays:

Right now, Dr. Campbell goes to a leadership position… I think it is a good shift for the Department, even for the University… I think she [Dr. Campbell] is trying new and different things. They have a Specialist degree tied to the Doctoral degree program. They go to other sites for a new doctoral cohort. They are willing to take programs where students and customers are. I think Dr. Campbell is really innovative. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Dr. David Jones is a faculty member in the Leadership Department. Dr. Jones has been working in the Department for approximately 15 years. Prior to joining the University as a faculty member, he was a high school teacher and a school principal for 10 years each. Dr. Jones teaches Leadership courses at the Department. Four years ago, he took the initiative to design a new online master’s degree program for Charter School Leaders. During the last few years, he was Director of this new program and worked to promote it within the state and nationwide. Dr. Jones is ready to pass on the responsibilities of the Program Director to another faculty member in order to pursue his goal of receiving a promotion to full professorship. He is proud to be at the Department that was the first in the
nation to come up with a fully online program for Charter School Leaders. According to Dr. Jones, similar programs are offered by only a few other universities in the United States.

**Dr. Barbara Martin** is an assistant professor in the Department of Leadership. She came to this University two years ago from another Midwestern university where she defended her dissertation on *Green Education*. Dr. Martin retired from the public K-12 education system and started her new career in higher education. According to Dr. Martin, she chose this University and the Department because of the *entrepreneurial spirit* at the School of Education. She expressed her excitement to work with people who are creative. Her responsibilities at the Leadership Department include leading the development, launch, and management of a new master’s degree program for Teacher Leaders. According to Dr. Martin, similar to the program for Charter School Leaders, this fully online Teacher Leadership program is also unique in the region and in the nation. Her plans include creating an Educational Leadership master’s degree program for *Green* K-12 schools.

Dr. Martin has experience in working with charitable foundations. She has served as president of a charitable foundation for women and successfully collaborated with several grantmakers in the state. Regarding her plans in this direction, she said, “I worked with these foundations in the past and now I want to look for money” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

**Dr. Daniel White**, professor in the Leadership Department, is originally from the area where the University is located. He spent approximately 30 years working for a university in the Southern region of the country and has extensive international traveling experience.

Dr. White is a qualitative research professional with expertise in the qualitative software NVivo. He obtained this expertise and experience in qualitative software through
his active involvement with the American Educational Research Association. Dr. White shared with the researcher that he was invited by the software developers to join an international team of higher education professionals and go through the training experience along with them. It was about 15 years ago. That training took place in Australia which became a partnering country for Dr. White. He said the following about his international collaborations:

When I started my travels throughout Australia, I became a part of an international academic group. These people that were living and draw from the Commonwealth and really opened up doors in the United Kingdom, South Africa, Australia, and India. They still are engaged in this initiative. Just started traveling with this contact group to international conferences, training, conducting seminars, publishing..., very involved throughout that whole circuit. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 21, 2011)

Dr. White also stated that he is a visiting professor in Australia. He travels there frequently and has already spent several sabbaticals in that country working on research and organizing study abroad trips for students to Australia.

Dr. Daniel White is recognized as one of the most innovative professors in the Leadership Department (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Mr. Jeff Wilson, doctoral student, said about Dr. White:

He is my advisor and a dissertation chair. We have a good relationship. We learned about each other better during this [study abroad] trip. It was really good bonding experience because I had not seen him much. He knows how to push you to find out
what you need. He teaches phenomenally. For example, I am struggling right now with the purpose and focus. He pushes you and helps you to find out what you need. We are using NVivo, the software to analyze qualitative data, and he is an expert in that. He has strong connections with Australia. He made some research there. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Mr. Jeff Wilson is a full-time lecturer with the Marketing Department at the School of Business and a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership program. Jeff moved to the University area 30 years ago to pursue a job opportunity. Later, as an entrepreneur, he established a small health care firm which he later sold when he decided to pursue an MBA degree at this University. While studying marketing, Mr. Wilson realized that he enjoyed teaching and he became an adjunct faculty member with the Marketing Department at the School of Business. Mr. Wilson attempted to pursue a doctoral degree in for-profit entities, but he was unable to accomplish the program because of his family situation. Several years ago, he found out about the Educational Leadership doctoral program and realized that this program addresses his interests in teaching and administration at a higher education institution. According to Mr. Wilson, who has personal entrepreneurial experience, the School of Education can be seen as a truly entrepreneurial organization.

Ms. Tammy Harris and Ms. Margaret Robinson are doctoral students in the Educational Leadership program with over ten years of experiences of working in diverse settings in the K-12 system. Ms. Harris taught foreign language at a high school in the Southeast Region of the United States. Ms. Robinson taught at public and charter schools located in rural and urban areas; in addition, she taught a diverse student population from different countries at a school for the U.S. Department of Defense in Germany. Ms. Harris
and Ms. Robinson currently work as graduate assistants for the Leadership Department where each of them is assigned to help three-four faculty members with their research projects. According to these interviewees, most projects in which they are involved are aimed to explore the educational market in the country. For example, one task was to compare and analyze different Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs in the Educational Leadership field offered by universities throughout the nation. The goal of another assignment was to compare syllabi for certain courses in Educational Leadership programs taught at different universities.

Ms. Harris and Ms. Robinson participate in the group initiative at the Leadership Department that brings faculty from across the campus to work together on improving student learning. Both are very excited about their doctoral program and their work for the Department.

Dr. Martin spoke very highly on the work that these graduate assistants do. She said the following about Ms. Harris and Ms. Robinson:

We have some amazing graduate students. We can ask them to do something, and they are creative and will do whatever you need them to do. They are becoming excited about research, and they are getting involved in this study and that study. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Dr. White told the researcher that he enjoyed working with Ms. Harris as a doctoral student. According to Dr. White, Ms. Harris is planning to pursue a grant opportunity in order to conduct her dissertation study in Australia. He said, “She is now, hopefully, finding funding, so that she can go over and conduct the evaluation, gather the data, and report it out to all stakeholders” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011).
In turn, Ms. Harris and Ms. Robinson emphasized the importance for their professional and personal growth through their work with the faculty at the Leadership Department. In particular, Ms. Harris explained:

They [faculty members] put high expectations, and they provide support and understand our limitations. I did not expect that they would think that I can do all the things. For example, four faculty members work on one editorial. Each writes a piece from her own strength. One knows legal issues in higher education; she writes her piece. The person, who understands organizational and administrational part, writes her piece, and another writes from teacher perspective. Then they give all to me, and I have to pull all these pieces together as one editorial, and I think, “This is a lot of trust.” (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 28, 2012)

Ms. Robinson added, “They challenge me too. They say, ‘Let’s see if you can do it,’ and they do it in a nice way… They will support you if you cannot… This is really nice, and this is where learning comes in” (Ms. Robinson, personal communication, October 28, 2012).

**Entrepreneurial individuals at the Teacher Education Department.** *Dr. Larry Smith*, Head of the Teacher Education Department, started his career in the K-12 public school system as a teacher of Science and Math. Throughout his career, he has worked as a teacher, school principal, and superintendent. After retirement from the K-12 system, Dr. Smith came to the University because he wanted to continue to be active and work in higher education. He had been working as the Director of Student Teaching for five years in the Teacher Education Department and was then promoted to the department chair position which he has been holding for the past two years. Dr. Smith stated the following about himself:
I think I bring something unique to the Department. That is my experiences working with teachers and developing teachers when I was the principal, when I was the superintendent. Now, being in the position where you do training to have these future teachers go out into the work world, I think it makes a big difference to our University and to our Department. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Smith supports creativity and respects the academic freedom of the faculty. According to a faculty member from his department, Dr. Smith tries to create an atmosphere in which the faculty can grow and succeed (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011). He views the current market as many opportunities for students to pursue their careers in different fields besides the traditional K-12 system. He said:

Teaching is not just the traditional thinking of teaching anymore. You might teach here in the state, but you could teach in another state. […] We also tell all of our students that they can teach overseas. We have graduates that are teaching in Australia, Ghana, and the Dominican Republic. They are also told that there are Defense Department contracts because of our military installations across the world where the personnel have families, so they need teachers. There are also international families and international experiences that different universities can set them up. We also talk about that there is not only the traditional type of teaching, but there are also those non-traditional opportunities where there could be corporations looking for professional development people and there are even prisons that need teachers. We also have the largest charter school organization in the United States right downstairs. Teaching in charter schools is an opportunity, so there are things out there. We try to
push them in a lot of different directions… (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Smith promotes opportunities for students to gain teaching experience in schools overseas. He is very active in establishing and maintaining contacts with people in countries where the Teacher Education Department organizes study abroad programs. He also travels abroad with students and encourages faculty to establish partnering programs with educational organizations in other countries:

I have done some of these [study abroad] programs myself. I have been to London a number of times and have also been doing some work in Hong Kong, and I will be going to the Dominican Republic here in October. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Natalia Lee is a faculty member in the Teacher Education Department. Dr. Lee has been working for the Teacher Education Department for five years; she was hired immediately after graduation with the Ph.D. degree from another large research Midwestern university. Dr. Lee has an international background and does a lot of research and international work with universities in her home country of Russia. During the course of her master’s and doctoral programs in the USA, she organized several study abroad trips to Russia. Dr. Lee is a highly active instructor and researcher. According to Dr. Lee, she challenges herself with teaching new courses and conducting new research projects every year. She described one of her research projects the following way:

I developed a research project in which students practicing at schools here and in Russia will record videos of their classes, will skype, interact via emails and work together. I will collect data on how our students learn from these international
collaborations. The students will develop their international competences. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

**Entrepreneurial individuals at the Charter School Office.** Mr. Timothy Taylor, a staff member at the Charter Schools Office, has been working for the Office for the past ten years. His official position is *Special Adviser for New Initiatives*. Prior to his work at the Charter Schools Office, he was an attorney with a specialization in intellectual property. Mr. Taylor explained how he became an employee of the Charter School Office:

My background is the law field. I was an attorney and specialized in the intellectual property and business upstarts. So, my specialty is kind of entrepreneurial/intellectual property area... That is one reason why I joined this Office because I saw a lot of the same concepts or the same models that were used out in the commercial science world and now being used in public education. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The Charter School Office also had a former leader who influenced the staff members at the Office, promoted success, and had a strategic vision. Mr. Taylor shared the following about that influential person:

We had a strong leader [name] who liked to see things down the road. He pushed us: “How can we do this?” He had a lot of business background. He was a visionary. He was also very politically driven. He could also predict the political environment, so, we tried to build system because we saw the political environment to go where and we knew that we had to react. We found that reacting before it [happens] is much easier than to react after it happens. We learned by scars and by burns as we were alone. So, we learned how to predict. Then, we learned that we can change the
direction we are going. When we came up with this realization, we realized that we can change policies. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Entrepreneurial individuals at the Faculty Development Center.** Dr. James Parker, the Director of the Faculty Development Center, took his position two years ago. He came to the University with the rich experience of working in many different fields. His experience includes studying history, work as a recreation administrator, collaboration with a local community, implementation of innovative play programs for people with different needs. He was a business consultant and worked for a senator in Washington D.C. He also worked in K-12 education and was Program Director for Early Child Education at a university.

Explaining the innovative approach that he uses at the Faculty Development Center, Dr. Parker emphasized the importance for him to study about innovations during his undergraduate years in college:

My thesis for the history honor [undergraduate] program was about innovations. I studied the start of the railway in the U.S. I used Joseph Shafer’s innovation model, went to New York City to the library there because it is the area in the country where the railroad started. I read original documents and looked at artifacts. It was my formal studying innovations. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 22, 2011)

According to Dr. Parker and other interviewees (i.e., Mr. Wilson), in the past two years, in his position, Dr. Parker initiated very noticeable changes at the Faculty Development Center. He believes that his innovations are often applications and combinations of existing things in different fields. He uses a strategic approach in what he does. He sees the large picture of the processes in higher education and actively promotes
innovative teaching among faculty at the University (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 22, 2011).

As an example, Dr. Parker created a new type of conference in a one-hour format. This conference was successfully launched and has already been used many times. He has also cultivated team-work among faculty members and their outstanding peers; they discuss teaching methods and seek new ways for increasing the quality of teaching. He called this program *Community of Scholars* in order to emphasize the value of peer collaborations as well as to show faculty members across campus the instructional resources that are available to them on campus.

**Diversity of Personal and Professional Experiences and Expertise: “Experience of Living in Different Places and Communities Opened Up for New Ideas”**

The theme of diverse personal experience and expertise has been found to be relevant for people to be successful in work involving creativity and innovation. Several examples below highlight the value of diverse personal backgrounds of the interviewees.

A significant proportion of the interviewed study participants and their colleagues have extensive international travel experience. Dr. Campbell shared the following regarding her colleague in the Leadership Department:

Dr. White is an international traveler and researcher. He lived in Austria. He is very comfortable around the world. Dr. David Jones took his family to the Mediterranean last year, and this year he went to Turkey and presented over there. Hannah [faculty member] has international experience. Sarah Manns [faculty member] went to Ireland with me... She was traveling when she was younger. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)
According to Dr. Larry Smith, head of the department, faculty members with the Teacher Education Department often travel overseas extensively to explore opportunities in host countries and to prepare study abroad programs. Discussing study abroad programs, Dr. Smith said, “We did all that ourselves. These are all faculty led. I have done some of this myself… What we do ourselves is to make some type of contacts” (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

In addition, two of three interviewed doctoral students also have international experience. Ms. Robertson lived and taught in Germany; Mr. Wilson traveled to Egypt where his son studied at a university, and Mr. Wilson also visited Costa Rica on a study abroad program.

All of the interviewed study participants have also lived in diverse regions of the United States, working for different organizations. Dr. Daniel White, from the Leadership Department, pointed out that when he serves on a hiring committee, he always looks at the diversity of a candidate’s background as well as his/her ability to reach out to other organizations and form partnerships with them (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011).

Dr. James Parker, Director of the Faculty Development Center, shared information about himself and his personal experiences working for very diverse organizations which included working for a government organization, and in education from kindergarten through secondary school to the college level. Dr. Parker has also worked as a consultant for businesses and health and fitness. He said that his diverse professional background, international trips, and experiences living in different places and communities allowed him to get “opened up” for new ideas and innovative activities (Dr. Parker, personal
Value of diversity of professional expertise. The value of expertise obtained from different professions was discussed with Dr. White, Dr. Martin, Mr. Timothy Taylor, and Ms. Moore. Dr. White, for example, emphasized that he looks for a diverse background of faculty candidates when he is in a hiring committee. It is important for him because it brings more diversity in professional expertise to the Department.

Mr. Taylor told the researcher that the employees at the Charter School Office represent different professional fields of which most relate to the business world. Mr. Taylor said:

What we did was we took people from many different industries because most traditional public education people refused to enter into the charter role. So, we had to take people from many different industries such as finance and accounting, the travel industry, science, and law. A lot of varieties that were non-traditional in public education... When we got in a room to figure out how we are going to manage this process, somebody said, “You know what, in my old job, this is what we used to do.”

(Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

According to Mr. Taylor, “it was a synergy and key for success. People with different perspectives who were not stuck with understanding the only traditional approach in education were able to create something new” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Mr. Taylor explained, “public education is very, very hard thing to do” and, in order to succeed, it was necessary to apply expertise from many different industries. Mr. Taylor believes if this task would be given only to educators who know only traditional education, “nothing new could be expected from them” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5,
2011). Describing what the Charter School Office created, he said:

What is very unusual for public education, we have a very sophisticated IT
department with very large databases. We have accounting people. We are able to
leverage not only concepts from business but also technologies. We have schools
everywhere, we have very hard messages, and we have data to deal with that. Even
the state [Department of Education] cannot do that. The state does not have that
system because the microscope can be on fire so intense, so we built the system to be
able to answer these questions before anybody else would answer. (Mr. Taylor,
personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Mr. Taylor’s background also lies in an entrepreneurial area. Prior coming to the
Charter School Center, he was working in the sphere of intellectual property. He pointed out
that he “saw a lot of the same concepts, or the same models, that were used out in the
commercial science world being used in public education” (Mr. Taylor, personal
communication, July 5, 2011).

Mr. Taylor pointed out that the diverse experiences give the team of the Charter
School Office an opportunity to bring solutions from other fields and apply them in
education. When he described the early stages in the Charter School Office history, he said
about the people who worked together:

It was a team because everyone wanted it to happen. People who knew what
curriculum looks like and people who understand finance were tied together. We
have different people at the table because everything is so intertwined in public
education. Everyone has to work together in order to move on. (Mr. Taylor, personal
communication, July 5, 2011)
The Center for Off-Campus Programs also employs professionals from many business fields such as marketing, technology, accounting, and other areas. Ms. Moore, a staff member of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, said the following:

We have a marketing team here. They explore the site, and they find a gap in marketing that we can fill. We have student inquiries that come from the web, those who come from the phone. Students let us know what programs they need. We have Customer Management Information System in our call center. We have Marketing and Communications. We have Academic programs. We have our own people who work on assessment. We have undergraduate program director who is here. We have faculty who will be able to work on any issue. We have a department for helping students to make a portfolio… (Ms. Moore, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

**Entrepreneurial Reputation: “People Refer to Us as Being Entrepreneurial”**

The theme of the reputation reflects the fact that the interviewees recognize that they work in non-traditional organizational settings and implement non-traditional for education tasks; this distinguish them from other University’s departments, as well as from other institutions. For the people at the School of Education, it is important how they are perceived by those from outside of their organization, as well as how they see themselves and what they do. The data described below support these two notions.

Dr. Barbara Martin, faculty member with the Leadership Department, believes that the public recognition and reputation of the University are very strong, and many students want to obtain a degree from this particular University. Dr. Martin explained her thoughts about online degrees from this University:
For many people, it [online programs] is a matter of access. Especially, when you look for an online degree, you would sooner get to our program because our University is more of a “bricks and mortar” university than other online universities that are very abstract. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Mr. Timothy Taylor, staff member at the Charter School Office, explicitly emphasized “We are not industry. We are not education. We are many things that overlap. So, we have to rethink these things every time we do it.” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). In discussion, Mr. Taylor contended the entrepreneurial nature of the Office:

People refer to us as being entrepreneurial or innovative. It is because this concept of an Authorizer, a government entity to hold another entity to what they agree to do, had never existed before in our country. There have been agencies for, like, the federal government, the stock market or the banking industry that would set standards for accounting, for example, but not for education. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

According to the interviewee, the Charter School Office has many features of a business organization that creates its own revenues from several sources, and as the result, Charter School Office staff consider themselves as business professionals. Mr. Taylor explained about people at his Office:

We have to figure out the product and process. We have a financial flow, stability. So, people know that they have a job; they have benefits, and all of the mechanisms they use, but everything else they must create. It has a great innovation and great
entrepreneurial effect when it happens. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The interviewees from the Leadership Department admitted that the work they do is considered as untraditional in many higher education institutions. For example, Dr. Barbara Martin said, “We almost do business in Education. We are not going to be academic in the Ivory Tower. We do business” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Dr. Campbell expressed her pride in working for a very proactive department. She said, “I have been very fortunate to be in the Department that is creative and looks at things and says, ‘We can do it’” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 21, 2011). In particular, Dr. Campbell in describing the Leadership Department said, “We have a lot of changes… If to get back to that entrepreneurial piece, if you do not function in this way, you are not going to exist…” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

An entrepreneurial reputation is reflected in what Dr. David Jones, faculty member at the Leadership Department, said, “We are not going to lose money, and we want to educate students. This is an entrepreneurial endeavor not only financially, but academically too…” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

Dr. Daniel White stated explicitly that the Leadership Department promotes creativity, leadership, and change which is synonymous with entrepreneurialism. He said:

In our department, we promote creativity, we promote..., well, it’s leadership. We deal with histories of culture and change. For creativity and culture and change issues to work, we are talking about the foundational elements of entrepreneurship. We do not use the term entrepreneurship, but we are definitely engaged it in practice. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 11, 2011)
**Location and Expansion: “We Are from Coast to Coast”**

The University chosen for this study is located in a rural area of the Midwestern Region of the United States. The three closest urban higher education clusters are located within 60 to 130 miles. The issue of location spanned many of the interviews. Study participants, in their discussions, made clear connections between the location of the University and the activities of their departments.

The interviewee from the Charter School Office said, ―Did you see the corn fields? We have to be where people are…‖ (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). The Charter School Office works with approximately 60 charter schools throughout the state. According to Mr. Taylor, staff of the Charter School Office travel constantly to schools; many of the staff members do not regularly work on campus.

Dr. Smith, faculty member with the Leadership Department, said, ―We are located pretty far away from a metropolitan area. This is not a large city. We have to travel‖ (personal communication, July 5, 2011). Dr. Martin added the following, ―We go where the people are. As we are looking at new areas, where can we start the next cohort‖ (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Dr. Daniel White pointed out that this area was, historically, homogeneously populated, primarily, with white people. In particular he said, ―There is a culture, a history here… The community, the students, and the university are parochial, very ethnical-centric community yet. There is a real draw to look out into the larger world‖ (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011). He also mentioned the fact that people in this area maintained connections with the countries of their ancestors in Western Europe, hence the current international activities at the University.
Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, recalled a time when the Educational Leadership program was prominent on-campus. According to her, the last two decades changed the situation in the local market and forced the Leadership Department to reach out (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

Dr. Campbell pointed out that because the University is “centered is not in the greatest and largest pool… not in a big metro area… We are in all over the place… We are in different areas, all over…” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). This echoed a statement made by Dr. David Jones who said, “We have students from coast to coast. The percentage [of students] from out of state gets larger every year because we grow nationally” (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

At least seven off-campus locations were named by the interviewees from the Leadership Department as places where faculty members teach their courses. A hybrid format of programs including face-to-face classes and an online component has become a common way of offering programs for the off-campus sites. The School of Education’s annual report stated, “the student response for the hybrid format has been significant and will influence future program design in this direction… It is the first hybrid program in which 50% of the courses are taught online” (Annual Report, 2011).

The interviewees shared with the researcher that faculty members travel to off-campus sites to teach classes, make presentations, and advise students (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011; Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011). For example, Dr. Barbara Martin said:

I teach one class on campus, and we travel. We listen to the audience and go to where our audience is. You must listen and keep your mind open to understand what
people want. And many people want online learning because of the commute. Because commuting is the only difference for some people, but for some people online learning does not work. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

The Leadership Department has part-time faculty members in many places throughout the state and the country. Consider what Dr. Jones said about two adjuncts who teach in the off-campus and fully online Charter School Leadership program:

One person is a charter school administrator in California. She studied in our program. I liked her, and I offered her to teach. She started very successfully; she has a wealth of knowledge. Another person graduated from our doctoral program. She is a school administrator over there in [name of the place in the neighboring state]. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The Leadership Department has a plan to take their programs outside the country. China and Australia were considered as places for international delivery of the Teacher Leadership program (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

The Teacher Education Department has been very active in expanding its programs to off-campus locations. According to information in the annual reports of the School of Education, the Master of Arts program in Educational Technology is offered off-campus in a fully online format along with the face-to-face option. An additional master’s program in Education is offered in 14 locations throughout the state, in other states, and at several military based sites abroad. The Center for Off-Campus Programs provides all of their services for students at off-campus sites and online. Faculty members at the Teacher Education Department participate in teaching their students through the Center for Off-
Campus Programs off-campus and online. According to the interviewees from the Center for Off-Campus Programs and information from annual reports of the School of Education, the number of students served through the Center for Off-Campus Programs is constantly growing. In 2009-2010, there were 319 off-campus students compared to 448 students who were enrolled in all of the Teacher Education programs on campus (Annual Report, 2011). According to the interviewees, online and off-campus programs are extremely successful. They represent an emerging strategy at many of the University’s departments.

**Business-Like Behaviors: “We Are not Going to be Academic in an Ivory Tower; We Do Business”**

In this section, the term *business-like* behaviors was used to describe the data that can be considered as non-traditional for higher education institutions. For example, Levin (2001) found, “business behaviors” of higher education institutions can be observed across many studies. This section describes the data that reflect business-like behaviors or so-called *business behaviors*. The following sub-themes were identified and described below: (1) Exploring the market demands; (2) Creating new programs and services; (3) Working with a target population; (4) Ownership of the programs; (5) Pursuing opportunities on the national scale and internationally; (6) Recognizing and dealing with uncertainty; (7) Taking a risk in creating new programs; (8) Borrowing ideas from business organizations; and (9) Bridging with the market through new sub-units.

**Exploring the market demands.** Faculty members and administrators of the Leadership Department fully recognize the competitive environment in which they have to work. Dr. Campbell said, “We here in [name of the state] all are feeding off the same group of people, and it is like who can do it *quicker, better, different*” (Dr. Campbell, personal
Faculty members see the needs in the market and try to address them. Dr. Jones said:

We see the demand in the field and we are trying to respond to it. Other people are doing that too… other universities, but not so many. I think it will be a decent market for leadership programs, especially if we offer them online. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Faculty members see their role beyond teaching students. Dr. Martin made a very explicit point about the nature of her work at the Leadership Department. She said:

I do not just come here to teach. I am developing programs. I am doing things that are really service in the market. We, as educators, had never in a millions years thought that we will be in a market driven economy. Usually, you come and teach, and you do not worry about anything else, but now, I think, it is happening even in public schools and we now face kind of competition in the market place. People decided, “We want choice.” (Dr. Martin, personal communications, October 28, 2011)

Emphasizing the responsibility of faculty members to be proactive in their activities in order to attract students to their programs, Dr. Martin said:

We look at a big picture. If you really are a system thinker, and you really are looking at it, “Ok, I am going to teach this class. This cohort is going to graduate next semester.” If you do not have a new cohort, who will you teach tomorrow? So, there is self-preservation. Earlier, in the past, you could just wait for someone who would register. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)
Faculty members scan the environment for the needs and ideas for their programs.

Dr. Martin shared her thoughts:

It is a totally entrepreneurial way to education, to schools... We at the Department really do not innovate the ideas; the idea comes from the market. It is about how you can be ready, how can you anticipate what is next. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Dr. David Jones pointed out that it is important to explore the market in order to survive in a competitive world:

I do not know what will be the next step after that [master’s degree program for Charter School Leaders], must be something. We need to keep in-depth into the market, especially with the technology parts of it. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Campbell described how her colleagues from the Leadership Department and she explored international market. She said about the idea to offer educational programs in China:

We noticed an interesting trend that China tries to send more students to study at schools in the U.S. It is really interesting. We have several partnerships with Chinese universities right now. They [some Chinese students] graduated from the U.S. high schools and with NCLB there is some money for that. And with their willingness to educate their children, it works quite well. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

The Charter School Office representative shared that the staff at the Office constantly explores the market to identify the needs and offer solutions:
Let’s see, there is a demand [in the market], and we are trying to figure it out. People are trying to figure it out for years. We started to grow, and now we have built a mechanism that supports the implementation of ideas to be actually deliberated the better way. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Creating new programs and services. An entrepreneurial product, for this dissertation study, is defined as a new program or a new type of service that the University offers in the market. Mr. Taylor, representative of the Charter School Office, described how the Charter School Office created an online service of electronic documents for charter schools:

Public schools have to submit a lot of documents to different entities and to the state. We started to figure out what documents our schools have to submit, and we found that not even state departments, but desks in the state government require schools to submit certain forms and even desks that are next to each other do not know what information each of them wants from schools. So, we went down and collected all of the forms that the state requires. We tied them and put them to our website. So, what happened next? The state started using them because it was the first time when it was all together. And our schools started using them, and it became a wonderful tool. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Another example from the Charter School Office refers to the creation of a master calendar for schools that helps them with documentation organization and circulation:

They use our master calendar. Because each of them has its own due dates, we made it easy for our schools to be hands up. When you open a charter school, how do you know what you have to do? Not only charter schools but many traditional districts
started using our master calendar and forms of the documents that are due. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

In the difficult economic times when many people lose their jobs in the industry, there is a growing demand in those professionals from different fields who want to teach in college (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). The evidence of addressing emerging market needs is the recently launched certificate program in College Teaching by the Leadership Department. This program was created for those who want to teach on the college level and need to learn about teaching methods and obtain the necessary skills. Dr. Campbell explained:

This certificate is for adjuncts, faculty, higher Ed administrators, staff, any… Let’s say that you are a science teacher, and you want to teach in college. Many of these teachers do not have teaching methods... Another example, I am from engineering and I want to teach engineering, but I do not know how. So they come and take this [program] and they get a skill set. With today’s economy, there is a lot of demand for this piece. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Many of the interviewees stated that they did not create anything new; they just employed the existing things in ways that worked better for their specific goals. Dr. James Parker, Director of the Faculty Development Center, pointed out several times that there is not much that has been newly created but that he has applied things from other fields and areas for his tasks. In particular, Dr. Parker said, “innovations do not appear from nothing. Innovations are new developed ideas of existing things or adaptation existing ideas for other types of activities” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 21, 2011).
Consider another explanation of an innovative product which is a “fresh combination of basic things” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 21, 2011). For example, he built the idea for a One-Hour Conference on the One-Hour Workshop that he was familiar with:

We turned the idea of One-Hour Workshop to One-Hour Conference. They [the participants] had a meal. They had a keynote [speaker]. They had breakout sessions. They had follow-up resources, and they had next steps – all components of the conference. It took very careful planning. In a few days, we had the same content, the same format, except a meal, in a virtual webinar, and it was broadcasted internationally. It was not rocket science. It was like integrating, thinking about what the faculty need, and they really liked it. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 21, 2011)

Another example, the Community of Scholars project for University faculty members was rooted in Dr. Parker’s past observations of kindergarten-elementary level teachers who worked together, supported one another, and helped each other in improving teaching and solving problems. Dr. Parker put these student-centered ideas of collaborations for faculty members at the University who may teach the same individuals or similar groups of students and, if share with a colleague(s) the challenges and successes, would find better ways how to teach more effectively.

**Working with a target population.** The Center for Off-Campus Programs explores the market and identifies niches in the educational market in order to fill them. Like a business enterprise that works in the market, the Center has all of the necessary departments to operate successfully and independently from the University. It is a goal for the Center for Off-Campus Programs to identify non-traditional students across the country and offer them
the University’s programs and courses in a format that is more suitable for working professionals. Dr. Carter, the Director of the Center, explained:

    We serve non-traditional students who are geographically bounded, who probably have family responsibilities. They cannot get to the local university at ten in the morning to take classes, but they can get to our University at six o’clock during the night. They [competitors] may not have a whole program available for students at night or weekend. The advantage we offer, there are some programs that we offer on the weekends, so, you can live your life during the week and go to classes on weekends. (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

The Charter School Office works with its target population, conducts analysis of demographics and students’ needs, and then develops mechanisms that address these characteristics. Mr. Taylor said:

    There are other schools in this area that do significantly better than other urban schools with similar demographics. When we look at these things, we look very holistic at all of the criteria of the kids that they have, and we then build systems in that we can actually measure if they are academically learning or not. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Ownership of the programs.** Many of the interviewed study participants have responsibilities for certain programs that they initiated, created, and developed individually or as team members. These programs are associated with the names of certain people who possess *ownership* and the informal rights to make changes, improvements, and further developments. For example, the *Community of Faculty* program is associated with the name of the Director of Faculty Development Center.
Certain study abroad programs at the School of Education have been initiated and led by certain faculty and administrators. For example, programs in Australia are associated with Dr. White. Consider, “He [Dr. White] has strong connections with Australia” (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 5, 2011); “Dr. White has extensive roots in Australia. We want to open a Center and teach Educational Leadership in Australia” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

The online master’s degree program for Charter School Leaders is associated with Dr. David Jones, professor with the Leadership Department, who has been director of this program for more than four years. Dr. Campbell said, “Dr. Jones created the Charter School Leadership program and that is highly unique in the nation” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). Dr. Martin said, “I knew about the Charter School Leadership program that Dr. Jones runs before I came to this University, but I did not realize that nobody does that” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Being in charge for their own programs, faculty members do a lot of work to promote their programs. Dr. Jones said:

We do word of mouth, through those students who graduated… They tell other people. We try to maintain relations. We try to have good relations with our alumni. They are getting jobs. We go to them; we ask them to recommend to a few people.

(Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Jones also pointed out that when faculty members travel to conferences and other academic gatherings nationally where they actively advertise their programs. Dr. Jones said, “We have a website presence. We do conferences. We have a booth there. We meet with people” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011).
Dr. Barbara Martin is in charge of a recently launched master’s degree online program for Teacher Leaders. She said about her work:

Reputation [of the person who is in charge for the program] is everything. How you develop your program, how you do your research… It is everything that makes together a whole picture. Once we start graduating a few cohorts, I hope that there will be capacity for new things. I hope it will not be a problem, but it is hard to know. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

**Pursuing opportunities in the national scale and internationally.** Sharing ideas about possibilities for the next online program, Dr. Barbara Martin told about her dream and her plan to create a new graduate program for leaders at so-called *Green Schools* that focus on environmental issues in their curriculum:

Green School Coalition is around the country. Leadership is the key for Green schools. Science people teach science. Arts people teach arts. Leadership people teach leadership. It can be an MA program for leaders in Green schools. […] Maybe I can put together things for this program in the future. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Mr. Jeff Wilson, a doctoral student at the Leadership Department, during his study abroad trip to Costa Rica established relationships with entrepreneurs abroad in order to create an internship program at the School of Business where he works as a lecturer. He shared about this experience in establishing international connections:

I was talking with one particular person over there. His family had coffee plantations in Columbia… I had an internship idea for my Marketing Department. We spoke through an interpreter because he did not speak English and I do not speak Spanish.
He said, “My family would want to explore new market. Could you help us?” We still maintain our contacts. They want me to come there to Columbia. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Dr. Campbell shared that the faculty at the Leadership Department is always looking for new opportunities in the national and international markets in order to offer their knowledge and expertise to potential students. Dr. Campbell said:

I just came back from China. I thought that they [people in China] have private schools teaching in English, and I thought that they really want to change teaching methods. It could be a master’s in Teacher Leadership that could appeal to them. But this type of partnering takes a lot of time. You need university connections. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

**Recognizing and dealing with uncertainty.** From the beginning of its existence, staff members of the Charter School Office were challenged with highly unclear tasks to create “what does not exist and that no one knows how it should look like” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Mr. Taylor shared:

When we were created, we were told, “You are going to be an Authorizer.” We asked, “What is an Authorizer?” And they said, “Well, we really do not know, but you will have to figure it out.” What happened was, back when we started, no one knew what the charter contract was because no one had ever created one before. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

There are many unclear tasks that arise for the Charter School Office. Mr. Taylor explains:

Our executive director gives me something and says, “Try to figure it out because I have no idea what to do with it.” And it is hard. I do not have one model that can be
applicable, I have to look at many models and see “what might work” or maybe not. And pieces that we create we need to communicate and communicate with the right people. As an institution, we are getting better, and we tend to be very innovative because we thought this through. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Uncertainty requires organizations to be flexible and make quick changes in order to address current needs. Comparing the Charter School Office with a business and entrepreneurial organization, Mr. Taylor said, “We change things very, very quickly. We get together as a whole group and talk a lot about why is this not happening or how do we want to be perceived, what is the value?” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Dr. Jones from the Leadership Department, speaking about the future also pointed out that the Department is ready for changes and will create new programs that will be in need in the market (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011).

**Taking risk in creating new programs.** In designing and launching new programs in the market, all of the involved parties recognize the fact that they take risks and deal with uncertainty. For example, Dr. Carter, Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, talked about how the Center takes the risk of not having sufficient enrollment. If it happens, classes can be canceled or rescheduled. The staff at the Center for Off-Campus Programs makes decisions on where and how to advertise their programs. Websites, TV, radio, and the press are actively used for advertisements (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011). At the time when this analysis was conducted, University advertisements had been found on Google paid sessions, YouTube, and on the edufire dot com.

Mr. Timothy Taylor also referred to risk that the Charter School Office takes in its operation. He said, “We learned by scars and by burns as we were alone, so we learned how
to predict. Then, we learned that we can change the direction we are going” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Dr. Barbara Martin described that taking risks is a part of the job for those faculty members who work on new programs. Trust also plays a big role in relationships in the Department. She stated the following:

When people are afraid of losing their job, they do not do good research or service, they do not teach well. It is not easy to take a risk in doing something different. If you are afraid to lose your job, you would not take that risk. We take a risk here almost every day when we create new programs. But we trust each other. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Trust and support reduce the fear of risk and helps the faculty to feel confident and supported when they initiate new programs. Dr. Jones told about the collaborative work of the Leadership Department with the Center for Off-Campus Programs and pointed out that they have “a couple of people who work full-time in Marketing there, and I meet with them often. This is their job [to calculate the risk in the market], and they know how to do that. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011)

**Borrowing best practices from business organizations.** In order to survive and succeed, the University’s departments explore how other organizations do similar things and borrow their best practices. Mr. Timothy Taylor from the Charter School Office was explicit about how the staff at the Charter School Office borrows concepts from different professional fields:

We tend to leverage through business concepts. We studied entrepreneurial organizations. We studied computer companies that were taking off. A lot of those
traditional business theories and concepts, we use those in our daily work. If you look at our stuff, you will see a lot of those traditional business entrepreneurial concepts. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

These business practices from other organizations allow the staff members to solve many tasks and place them ahead of many other authorizers in the field of charter school education. Mr. Timothy Taylor shared the following with excitement:

We looked at tools in the business environment and integrated a lot of stuff. Every time when we utilize these tools, it allows us to achieve our goals faster. So, we have a lot of innovations that come from this… We started to grow, and now we have built a mechanism that supports the implementation of ideas… (Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Consider another quote from the interview with Mr. Taylor who said, “Our goal is to create ideas and get them to happen. Making this law of 3% of Student Aid dollars, it took our money outside of the University. We are not a part of general funding of the University” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

The Leadership Department borrows the best practices from other universities from across the nation. Graduate assistants shared about their assignments that they receive from the faculty members. Ms. Tammy Harris described the faculty members “constantly are assessing themselves.” One professor wanted “to know how other schools do their comprehensive exams [in their doctoral programs]” because she said, “We need to do something different.” Ms. Harris said, “I have a notebook full of everybody webpages. I make charts, and I put all this information. How many courses they are taking, what kind of
research courses? Maybe we have to rethink how we teach research” (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29, 2011).

**Bridging with the market through new sub-units.** The Charter Schools Office created the *Charter School Institute* as an independent organization that is not officially affiliated with the University (Annual report, 2010). This Institute was founded by the former state governor and the University (Charter School Institute website, n.d.). According to information on the Institute’s website, the Institute was created to serve the charter schools nationally, “the United States Congress provided $1 million in 2001 for the Institute to separate legally from the University and expand its scope of services” (Charter School Institute website, n.d.). Thus, this new entity allows the Charter School Office to delegate those tasks that the Charter School Office cannot legitimately implement as a unit of a public university. Mr. Taylor said, “How would you figure it out, how would you know that you are not going too far away from your mission? We are not industry; we are not education; we are many things that overlap” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Mr. Taylor explained that the Charter School Institute was created to transfer knowledge to the products and services that will be sold in the market:

What we did, we created this Charter School Institute which is a spinoff of all tools we created. So, we create an avenue, technologies, and systems that are effective. I am trying to think how we can transfer the knowledge… So the Institute for Charter Schools could deliver it… (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Mr. Taylor explained further:

For example, we have data. Somebody comes to us and says, “We want these data,” and we want to give it to them because this is a very powerful thing. We need to
figure out how much we have to charge them... When sending our staff, we are taking them away from our schools. How to do this? Through the Institute for Charter Schools. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Teamwork and Internal Collaborations: “If You Want to Achieve Many Things, You Cannot Work in Isolation”**

Collected data demonstrated networking at the University which facilitates teambuilding among faculty, staff, and students. There is significant evidence of interconnectivity within the academic and non-academic departments, across campus, as well as with the off-campus sites and external organizations.

**Student—student collaboration.** The sub-theme of collaborations among students emerged from data collected from the Leadership Department. In many cases, faculty explore the individual needs of students in order address them. Dr. Campbell shared the following when she described how they prepared study abroad programs, “If you want a broader trip, you bring students of different levels. So what we had to do was to talk individually to our students about their ideas and about what they might do [during the trip]” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

Every year, the Leadership Department organizes orientation for newly admitted doctoral students and alumni. Jeff Wilson, doctoral student at the Leadership Department, spoke about the annual doctoral orientation. In particular, he said:

There is an orientation; faculty are there, students from other cohorts, alumni. What to expect… How to deal with… Usually, someone speaks. It is an alumnus or maybe someone who recently defended their dissertation. They can tell the whole process…
Last year it was a high percentage of doctoral students. I think it is valuable. You can team up with somebody. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The Leadership Department compels students from different cohorts in the doctoral program to work together. According to Mr. Wilson, every new student is assigned to a mentor student who is a few years ahead in the program. This doctoral student mentoring program is a requirement in the doctoral program and is mutually beneficial. Mr. Wilson explained:

When you are accepted, here is your advisor. There is your student mentor. Student mentor is someone who is still on the program, may be one or two cohort ahead of you. It is kind of valuable for starts. What is it like to be in the program? They give you some tips on what they learned—here I screwed up… do this, do not do this… when I took my first courses, I kind of did not know what the professor wants, you can ask your mentor… I still contact him. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Faculty members—students collaboration.** According to the doctoral students who were interviewed for this study, the Leadership Department encourages students to interact with the faculty as well as to provide feedback and ideas for improvement. In particular, Mr. Wilson said about faculty members:

I see the willingness make changes. In our cohort, they say: “Let’s get together. What do you think? What would you like? Go back to particular instructor, go back to a program.” I think it is genuine interest to improve, make better. They bring us together to make sure that they are meeting our expectations and, at the same time,
reminding us that we are students. This is the syllabus. These are notes. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Tammy Harris, graduate assistant and doctoral student at the Leadership Department, discussed how faculty members engage students into discussions on the content of the courses:

They throw the ideas to the classroom, so students feel that they are part of the program [improvement]. They [faculty] understand that being here at the University that they work with practitioners and things have been changing and drastically changing in the field. So, they bring these concerns to students: “What can we bring from other disciplines? What can we do to make this program better? How can we make this program more beneficial?” (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

There is evidence of the work of faculty and their graduate assistant that goes beyond the traditional assigned roles and functions. Several faculty members at the Leadership Department, who worked with the same graduate assistant, decided to meet together as a group every other week in order to combine their tasks and coordinate the assignments given to their graduate assistant. Ms. Harris said:

Before, each faculty member worked separately with the graduate assistants… This year, my three professors decided: “Let’s meet every two weeks, and we know what everyone is doing, and how much work Tammy has. Let’s kind of work together and see what happens…” (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

This approach appeared to be challenging for both the graduate assistant and the faculty members. However, according to Ms. Harris, everyone on the team is excited about
the new opportunities which have opened up because of their collaborative work. Ms. Harris was impressed by the fact that the faculty members treat her as a professional colleague. She stated:

When we meet, I am the first person in the agenda. I give them my activity report. I am working on this project for Dr. Brown, and I am on this state, and I had finished the literature review for Dr. Black. So they all hear what I do and what all of them do. And I am sharing the position of co-facilitator. And I am a student. They are going to mentoring me all the way through. So it is such a wonderful thing. (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

This teamwork led to the extension of the team. The team members decided to invite interested faculty members from other departments to join them. Ms. Robinson, another graduate student, said the following:

We came up with the idea to create a multidisciplinary group of faculty and think together what we can do collaboratively to improve student learning. It is about best practices, holistic view, technology, student engagement. Each of them [faculty members] chose a course that needs to be updated and revised, and they are going to work collaboratively on that. We meet once every two weeks… And now, it is growing and including people from campus. So we have people coming from Teacher Education, from Broadcasting and Music. (Ms. Robinson, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

The idea to work with people from across campus turned into an innovative project. The team members asked the Faculty Development Center for financial support of their initiative. Their project was deemed important for the University, and, as a result, the
Faculty Development Center provided funding to support the project entitled: *Faculty Learning Community*. This project was advertised through the Faculty Development Center and departments in order to reach out to those faculty members across campus who might be interested in joining the initiative. Ms. Harris was excited about how people are interested in being a part of the interdisciplinary team. In particular, she said, “We announced through emails, through people who know people in other departments. And people responded back. A couple of people from Teacher Education Department are going to come” (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29, 2011).

**Faculty—faculty collaboration.** Participating faculty members in both academic departments tend to collaborate with each other and the faculty from other departments on projects. For example, a new master’s degree online program for Teacher Leaders was created by the Leadership Department under Dr. Barbara Martin’s leadership with the Teacher Education Department faculty. Dr. Martin shared about this collaboration, “Our new program is a collaborative program with Teacher Ed Department. We want them to teach a couple of courses. We developed together with Teacher Ed Department” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Highlighting the importance of collaborative work, Dr. Martin said, “If you want to achieve many things, you cannot work in isolation” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Dr. David Jones, another faculty member from the Leadership Department who was a main developer and director for the master’s degree online program for Charter School Leaders, also pointed out the importance of working with people across campus. As the program director, Dr. Jones sees his role in connecting people from different departments to work together on his project. In particular, he said:
We have a lot of resources here, in the University, for off-campus programs. We have online course development, Center for instruction design, profit, and the Charter School Office. It is a part of me, as the Program Director, to gather all of those people together to see what we are thinking about, what they can do for us. I have Department approval to do all these things. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Daniel White, faculty at the Leadership Department, initiated the creation of an interdepartmental *Global Study Committee* to formalize work in the area of internationalization at the School of Education. He said:

> It was my initiative to form the Global Studies Committee. I have met with the Dean. I have met with other department heads, and I presented to the college. At the department level, I have taken the initiative to try to get us to work together. At the college level, I have taken the initiative by meeting with the Dean, by presenting at a college-wide meeting on a panel dealing with international activities. My big message to the audience was: “You and your departments need to do what we are doing with the committee and work together so that we can all work together for the good of the School.” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

This initiative was implemented with the Teacher Education Department. Sharing the example of collaborative work, Dr. White relayed a situation when the Teacher Education Department faced a managerial problem with one of the study abroad programs in Australia and was planning to cancel a student trip to that country. Faculty members at the Leadership Department assisted with their contacts in Australia which helped the Teacher Education Department rescue the trip and even make it successful. The interviewee pointed out that the
Leadership Department faculty members were driven by collaborative responsibilities and concerned about the reputation and the quality of the programs offered by the School of Education (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011).

Charter School Office staff members—faculty members collaboration. Mr. Timothy Taylor, the Charter School Office representative, discussed the developing collaborations between the Charter School Office and departments in the School of Education; “Historically, it was not a lot of relationships because of friction. Now it is completely flipped… Several of us [Charter School Office staff members] teach classes. So, we contribute to classes on campus now what we did not in the past” (personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Collaboration with the academic departments at the School of Education was improved since the Charter School Office moved to the newly constructed building two years ago. Mr. Taylor emphasized that the push for collaboration originated from the University leadership. Mr. Taylor said, “We were told to move here” (personal communication, July 5, 2011). According to Mr. Taylor, the collaborative work between the Charter School Office and the academic departments is also a goal articulated by the University’s president. Mr. Taylor said:

We actively integrate our experiences with the School of Education. The University president has in his mission to make a stronger connection from pre-school through 60 charter schools. So, it is on his list. He has an obligation to cause things to happen. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

According to Mr. Taylor, the Charter School Office recognizes and tries to address the University objectives for interdepartmental collaboration:
What we try to do is to show the success and ability of our staff to contribute. And we need the University seeing us because we are a part of the University and the School of Education. So, when we do things, we are trying to link things up. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Due to the collaborative work with the departments at the School of Education, Mr. Taylor sees positive change in the professional relationships: “I think that things started to change. Many people started to see charter schools as an opportunity. Student resistance is getting less” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

One of the evidences of the work with the Leadership Department is the online master’s degree program for Charter School Leaders that was designed by faculty members from the Leadership Department and staff members from the Charter Schools Office. Dr. Jones, director of the Charter School Leadership program said about collaboration with the Charter School Office, “It is part of me, as Program Director, to gather all of those people together to see what we are thinking about, what they can do for us. I have department approval to do anything (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011). Mr. Taylor added to this information by saying the following:

We have a master’s degree [program]. Dr. Jones from the Leadership [Department] is running it. We helped him to create a leadership program for charter schools. It is in-class, and it is online. So, there will be people in the world who take the online classes. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Mr. Taylor also shared the following about collaboration with the Teacher Education Department, “We have students [teaching] in charter schools. We have charter schools that
hire student teachers, our graduates. We try to connect our student population to charters. There is a very large demand for hiring” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Another evidence of collaborations is that the Charter Schools Office staff members teach sections on charter schools in the introductory courses in the Teacher Education program. Mr. Taylor stated:

We do [teach] components of classes. For example, entry level 107 class. Every University student who wants to be in the Teacher Education program has to take 107 first. It has a lot of different components, so we have a charter school component. We are trying to show them [students] a spectrum. We come in and talk about policy, and how charter schools are connected, and what is going on in the environment right now. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

In order to facilitate their collaborations, the Charter School Office has monthly meetings with the Teacher Education Department. The Charter School Office also participates in University activities and events. Citing up the following as an example, Mr. Taylor explained:

We try to tie things together, and even diverse things. The University has an annual International Film Festival in April. This year, we created an education track at this festival. We had a documentary there. So, we are trying different ways to support what the School of Education does and to achieve a common goal with the School and the University. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Faculty Development Center staff members—faculty members collaboration.**

Dr. James Parker, the director of the Faculty Development Center, believes that teamwork is an attribute critical for success. He views the role of the Faculty Development Center to
break the “silo walls” between departments and to find ways for faculty across the campus to work together for “innovative teaching” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 21, 2011).

Evidences of collaboration of the departments with both the Faculty Development Center and the Center for Off-Campus Programs were mentioned by the majority of interviewees. Dr. Parker said the following about his work with the School of Education:

I had a couple departmental-wide meetings with them. So I met with them and presented what the Faculty Development Center does. I had worked with several individual faculty from the School of Education. I just had lunch today with a faculty member from the Teaching Education Department. There is a high interest in teaching improvement over there, and the Dean is very supportive. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 21, 2011)

Dr. Barbara Martin from the Leadership Department said, “The Faculty Development Center provides phenomenal services. All their activities are innovative. If you look at the mission to prepare graduates for the 21st century, we have to be innovative” (personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Mr. Jeff Wilson, doctoral student at the Leadership Department who is a member of the advisory council for the Faculty Development Center, said:

The Faculty Development Center addresses faculty needs through workshops, provides presentations. Any faculty can come over there for any help in their teaching, for example, to teach online or to go through the syllabus. I think the reputation of the Center is getting better. Some faculty can come up with something and get the Faculty Development Center to come in and help. We have in our
committee five-six people. Usually, we start at the beginning of the semester with questions such as “Where the Faculty Development Center should go? What needs we can identify and address?” (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. James Parker, Director of the Faculty Development Center, has been working at the University for the past two years. Being new to campus, his first goal was to build trusting and friendly relationships with those faculty members who are open to non-traditional teaching activities. Dr. Parker told the researcher that he applied a club approach in identifying those faculty members on campus who are interested in working in interdepartmental teams. Dr. Parker initiated an idea that he called At 7 on a 7th. Dr. Parker explained the meaning of this initiative and its name:

The At 7 on a 7th means that we meet at a local restaurant for breakfast at 7:00 A.M. on a day of a month that has 7 in it. For example, June 7th, 17th, and 27th. The purpose for these meetings was advertised as having discussions about innovative teaching while having a meal. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

Per interviewee, this very informal gathering for breakfast and conversation brought together faculty members interested in learning about new approaches in teaching and in developing their teaching skills. Dr. Parker shared, “People came to the restaurant, got acquainted with their peers from other departments, shared meals, and had inspiring conversations with their colleagues about the best practices in the classroom” (personal communication, July 28, 2011).

The Scholar Learning Community is an official program at the Faculty Development Center which also encourages teamwork of faculty members. The purpose of this honor reward program is to identify those faculty members who work together in teams with the
goal to increase student learning. The rewarded faculty members receive recognitions from the Faculty Development Center and from their departments.

Dr. Parker believes that it is important for everyone to be proactive in seeking opportunities for teamwork. He stated, “collaboration with the people who are external to your professional field is crucial for solving problems” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 28, 2011). Then Dr. Parker continued:

We want to be multi-disciplinary to solve problems. You cannot solve problems in one discipline, no matter what it is. Opening that up, let’s deemphasize being an expert. Let’s make sure that we have some generalists… because in education, we have all these different disciplines, all these different personalities. The generalist path will help to build community, draw people together, make relationships, and break down the “silo.” Bring people to network, collaborative kind of community. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

**Center for Off-Campus Programs staff members—faculty members collaboration.** Many of the study participants mentioned the Center for Off-Campus Programs. Consider, “We have a lot of resources here in the [Center for] Off-Campus Programs. I work with a couple of people from marketing [department]…” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011), or “We have a lot of branches, the Off-Campus [Programs] Center. They handle many off-campus programs and initiatives” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Dr. Campbell said about the Center for Off-Campus Programs:

We have another arm of the university. It is the Professional Education. We call it Off-Campus Programs, and they are those who coordinate all off-campus sites. They
have a number of them established. They would be open to our department talking to them. So, we think that we have key sites that we would like to develop, and they might not open up for us a big professional building, site, but they might assist us to open a program from the university that is nearby. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

When Dr. Mary Carter, director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, discussed the involvement of different departments across campus to off-campus programs, she emphasized that the Teacher Education Department and the Leadership Department “are easy” to work with (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 29, 2011). Evidence of this successful collaboration is the online master’s degree programs created and launched as the joint work of the Center and these two academic departments at the School of Education. Describing her experience of working with different departments across campus, Dr. Mary Carter noticed that:

Some departments are easy. Some kind of all come together in general. Some are bifurcated. You have some people who support and you have some people who say “no, we want to stay absolutely here, do what we do in our building, the programs that we have had and courses that we have had.” For the most, they are somewhere in the middle. (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

External Collaborations: “We Will Go There and Establish a Long-Term Relationship”

The data analysis revealed that external collaborations play an essential role in the lives of the explored academic as well as non-academic departments at the University. The Leadership Department and the Teacher Education Department create and maintain partnerships with organizations in the state, nation, and in selected countries overseas. While
collaborations with organizations on the state level (i.e., public and charter schools) were considered by the interviewees as traditional activities for their academic departments, the national and international collaborations were viewed as a relatively new and evolving type of activities.

**Collaboration with charter schools in the state.** The Charter Schools Office collaborates with two charter schools located in the local area of the University and with more than 50 charter schools throughout the state (University’s website). According to Mr. Taylor, representative from the Charter School Office, the Office has more authorized urban schools than rural schools and continuously tries to expand the number of authorized charter schools in the metropolitan areas. Urban schools are considered as a great resource for this University (University’s website). In the urban schools, students who are in the Teacher Education program may experience the diversity through their student teaching and later if they become employed by charter schools. Mr. Taylor shared:

> Our students come mostly from suburban schools, and they want to become teachers, but the problem is that they saw only their suburban schools. We try to let them see different charter, non-charter, urban, rural schools. These students have to have all these experiences, and right now, we are trying to figure out how to make our students get to the schools. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Another way of collaboration with the schools is aimed to promote the University and attract potential students. The Charter School Office organizes trips for children from the authorized charter school to visit the University. Mr. Taylor said:

> We are bringing up urban kids on buses… they come to visit the university. That is a significant event in their lives. Most of the kids have never been out of their places.
They have a university and college image from a movie version. They do not really know how it looks like. You can see how they change their understanding while taking them around, talking to university students. Planting these seeds earlier…

They say: “Maybe I can do that.” So, trying to take our University things into their schools and making connections…inviting them to football games, so they can see what that means… When the University has admission events, inviting them to admission events. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Working with the schools throughout the state requires the Charter School Office to have staff members who live close to the clusters of the authorized charter schools.

According to Mr. Taylor, many staff members, who live and work away from the main campus, participate in departmental meetings via teleconference.

The Leadership and the Teacher Education departments also actively collaborate with the schools in the state directly and indirectly through preparing teachers and administrators. Addressing the question about those who teach in the Charter School Leadership program, Dr. Jones said, “It is a mix of faculty and people who tend to be in Charter school world. They know what they are doing. They are willing to learn how to teach online” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011). He pointed out that many adjunct faculty members work for charter schools as administrators, lawyers, and other professionals.

Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, said about the students at her Department who study on campus and at off-campus sites in the state: “We know our students. We know school districts where they work” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). Dr. Larry Smith, head of the Teacher Education
Department, told the researcher about how the Department recruits new students and finds partners and contributors:

We have a person that does a lot of recruiting and sort of connecting people with people. For example, if we are looking to do Professional Development in Science with students and teachers in the area. What she will do is the recruiting, and she may find or know some financial contributors which may be individuals or corporations. There are also organizations or other individuals that are interested in supporting Teacher Education. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Partnerships with businesses and the government.** The artifact analysis shows that the Charter School Office has numerous collaborations with business enterprises and the state government. The Charter School Office has created many products and services through collaborations with the businesses. Mr. Taylor shared that many concepts that are used at the Charter School Office were borrowed from business organizations. Consider the following sayings:

We have been working through this for a very long, long time because we tend to leverage through business concepts and we studied entrepreneurship. We studied computer companies that were taking off. A lot of those traditional business theories and concepts, we use those in our daily work. If you look at our stuff, you will see a lot of those traditional business entrepreneurial concepts. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Campbell mentioned in her interview that politics in the state is an integral part of the School of Education collaborations. Dr. Smith, head of the Teacher Education Department, also pointed out that their relations with the state are truly important, “If they do
not approve our program, we can't get students in the program and we're nonexistent at that point” (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

The Charter School Office has always been very involved in politics throughout the state. According to Mr. Taylor, collaboration with local government is necessary for “predicting further directions in charter school movement” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Political involvement also gives the Charter School Office an opportunity to be a part of the processes that impact the charter school movement in the state. The close collaboration with the state government is reflected in this saying by Mr. Taylor: “In early days, people just stop by; the governor showed up in the office without announcements” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

**National collaborations.** The Charter School Office partners with many charter school authors across the nation. Programs, policies, documentations, regulations, and technology support systems, which were created by this Charter Schools Office, became in demand in the national market. Growing competition among charter school authors and similar challenges that the authors experience throughout the country lead to the need for authors to join efforts and exchange resources. There are 110 charter school authors listed on the website of the National Association of Charter School Authors (NACSA) (NACSA-a, n.d.) that are members of the NACSA and are obligated to follow the rules and requirements of the Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing that were established in 2004 (NACSA-b, n.d.). The Charter School Office at the selected University is one of the members of the NACSA. Mr. Taylor described how the Charter School Office operates on the regional and national levels:
Before the National Association of Charter Schools Authorizers (NACSA) was created, we along with other charter school authorizers came together and tried to solve each other problems. If you see around at other states, you will see a lot of our stuff used by charter schools and authorizers because we were on the front… (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, in describing the work of the Leadership Department on the national level, made an explicit point regarding the importance of collaborations with the large nation-wide known organizations. In particular, she said:

The Leadership [Department] seeks and establishes partnerships to promote its programs to the wide audience. The recent agreement with the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD, n.d.) opens new perspectives for the Department growth… People know ASCD internationally. This name is very well-known. When you say that you are a partner of the ASCD, it is—WOW! I suspect that mostly it would be national people, teachers who will partner with us, but, certainly, it will be opened up internationally. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

This collaboration initiative was also undertaken by the Leadership Department in order to strengthen the potential of the new master’s degree online program in Teacher Leadership. Partnership with the ASCD brings high expectations with a larger number of students who will be introduced through the ASCD to this program nationally and internationally (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

Another example adds evidence of collaboration of the University’s departments with
the large national organizations. Thus, due to the Faculty Development Center work with the Carnegie Foundation and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), several professors of the University received very prestigious national awards from these organizations (University’s website, n.d.). These nationally recognized teachers speak to the University faculty at the annual event that the Faculty Development Center organizes. Dr. Parker said the following, “We have outstanding teachers. We have a faculty orientation, and they stay in front of teachers and talk about their stories what they have done with their teaching, what they think is more valuable. Some of them are award winning teachers, some of them are recognized nationally” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 22, 2011).

**Collaborations with the U.S. universities.** The Leadership Department works with other universities in the United States. For example, the Department runs the specialist and doctoral programs at off-campus sites in partnership with another Midwestern University. Dr. Campbell said, “The programs that we have off-campus right now are the doctoral program at [name of a partnering university] and we just started what we call a *Ladder Program*, a doctoral and a specialist programs tied together” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

Another evidence of collaborations with the U.S. universities refers to the partnership with a university in Virginia on a study abroad program. Dr. Barbara Martin shared about one of the study abroad trips:

We are doing this one [study abroad program] in connection with another university in Virginia. There is a woman there; I talked to her. This is a good relationship, and we have enough students to go. That is an interchange between our students and students from the other university. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28,
Participants of this study abroad program acquire new knowledge and experiences not only from their international trips, but also from the interactions and friendships with their peers who study at the partnering U.S. university (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

**International collaborations for study abroad programs.** International collaboration was found to be very extensive at the School of Education. The fact that the Leadership Department created the Global Studies Committee a few years ago is evidence that faculty members made a commitment to work extensively in developing and promoting programs and collaborations with international partners (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 21, 2011). Now, the Leadership Department is planning to open programs in several countries where they have stable and strong partnerships (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Study abroad programs require faculty in the Leadership Department to invest a lot of time and effort in these international projects. Dr. Martin said the following about the preparation for international trips and the importance of having good partners, “It takes time to go there, to make sure that lodging is good, transportation, meetings. When you collaborate with other countries, it makes the world smaller” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Relations with people in other states and other countries are not easy to establish and maintain. Dr. White stated that relationships are built between people rather than between organizations:
It is possible to describe in detail how you organized a trip abroad, however, it will be a good travel book. It's a good reference manual, but you cannot build those personal relationships. There is a tremendous amount of trust and interaction that occurs for those affiliations. It is about trust and building relationships. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

When a group is traveling abroad, international partners are the key to success. When Dr. Campbell shared about their recent trip to China, she said:

We stayed at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. We had 13 graduate students. They were all levels: masters, specialist, and doctoral. We went to different universities. We went to the Politechnical University, to City University. We had a lecture from our [American] colleague who is in Hong Kong Institute and working with us. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

International contacts and partnerships are shared with other departments at the University. For example, existing relationships with international partners established by the Leadership Department in Costa Rica has been extended to the Marketing Department at the School of Business. Mr. Jeff Wilson, doctoral student in the Educational Leadership program and a full-time lecturer with the School of Business established new partnerships between his Department at the School of Business and local farmers during his trip on the Educational Leadership study abroad program to Costa Rica. Due to this new collaboration, MBA students will have their internships at coffee farms in Costa Rica (Dr. White, personal communication, July 22, 2011; Mr. Jeff Wilson, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

The Teacher Education Department offers from seven to nine study abroad programs each semester. The faculty members who lead overseas these programs collaborate with the
governmental and non-governmental organizations in the partnering countries. Faculty members travel abroad on faculty exchange programs in order to explore international markets and prepare student trips overseas (Annual Report, 2010). Speaking about international partners, Dr. Smith said:

They help us with locations to go and to place students, and we have found this to be very successful. We have gone to other cultures and other places. Now, we are planning a study trip to Costa Rica, where some of those homes are not really prepared to take care of our students, so we will probably be staying in residence facilities there and then taking a bus to the schools as a group. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The importance of relationships with people was also articulated by Dr. Smith who said:

It [study abroad programs] is more people oriented or directed than it is anything else. What we have found is that, if we have a faculty member that takes charge, they do the contacts; they do the travel, and those kind of things. We have had a pretty good success rate of being able to develop these programs because of people working on it. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The Teacher Education Department establishes partnerships with governmental, educational, and nonprofit organizations overseas and seeks their assistance in placing students at schools and communities. Dr. Larry Smith shared:

We contact these organizations saying that we would like to develop a partnership with them and that they would help us to place students in schools and also help to place them in homes, so we would not have to use hotels, residence halls, or anything
like that. We have found that to be very successful because there is another part of
the culture, another part of how students live, and what it is like to live with a family.
(Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

It is important in international collaborations that both partners benefit from working
together. Dr. Lee described her partnerships with faculty members at Russian universities
and how her Russian colleagues benefited from the collaborations:

Russian colleagues wanted to continue working with me. They wanted to participate
in classes I taught for my American students in Russia during their study abroad
program. I always had several Russians who were sitting in the class and
participating in discussions with my students. Russians did not pay, did not earn any
credits. They wanted to participate to gain experience and practice language. (Dr.
Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

International scholars who visit the University campus are considered as resources for
future study abroad trips. Faculty members purposely establish relationships with those who
visit the campus. Dr. Smith, head of the Teacher Education Department, shared an example
about how he makes contacts in countries where his Department has study abroad programs:

What we do ourselves is make some type of contact. For example, we may use
contacts that we have had before. In London, there was a group of Head Teachers or
Building Principals that came over here. I developed relationships, so I called them
and told them this is what I would like to do, who I talk with, so they gave me some
names and I made some contacts and took it from there. It is pretty much all who you
know, making contacts, and so on. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)
International partnership is also evident at the Charter School Office. According to Mr. Taylor, the Charter School Office has been collaborating with the Department for Education of the United Kingdom for the last five years. Approximately 20 British educators, teachers and administrators, come to the United States every year and visit the University and Charter Schools Office to learn about the growing charter school movement and participate in activities in the field. The Charter Schools Office shares many things with their British colleagues such as teaching them about the policies and proceedings that help charter schools to fulfill their missions and achieve their goals. These charter school methods are then taken to the United Kingdom and used for developing the so-called British “foundation schools” that are similar to charter schools in the United States (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Role of the Center for Off-Campus Programs in developing collaborations.

Many interviewees pointed out that the Center for Off-Campus Programs does a lot of work in establishing and maintaining external partnerships. The Center for Off-Campus Programs is one of the most influential departments at the University. Evidences from the University website and from the interview narratives show that the Center explores the market demands and fosters academic departments to create new programs that can be delivered at many locations nationwide, overseas, and online.

According to Ms. Julia Moore (personal communication, October 29, 2011), staff member of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, the Center for Off-Campus Programs was established 40 years ago to serve the non-traditional students at off-campus sites. Today, the Center employs about 200 staff members who deliver online, face-to-face, and hybrid educational courses and programs at approximately 60 locations throughout the state, the
nation, and internationally.

Information retrieved from the website during data collection in October, 2011, shows that the Center delivers seven undergraduate programs, 12 master’s programs, one specialist program, two doctoral programs, one combined Specialist and Doctoral program, a so-called “ladder” program in Educational Leadership, one undergraduate certificate, ten graduate certificates, 21 professional development programs, and six personal enrichment programs.

The Center for Off-Campus Programs has many sub-units in its structure that allow the Center to act independently in many areas serving non-traditional remote students. Describing the Center, Dr. Mary Carter, director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, said:

We have Marketing and Communications; we have Academic programs. We have our own people who work on assessment, we have undergraduate programs director, who is here, we have faculty who will be able to work on any issues. We have a department for helping students to make a portfolio… We have start-up capital. A lot of times college cannot move further without that investment. We can cover that cost. (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

Besides the departments of the Center such as marketing, communication, and technology, there are other teams that handle student admissions and registrations, conduct faculty searches for off-campus and online teaching, participate in the hiring process along with the academic departments, and maintain delivery of educational programs in off-campus locations and online.
The Center works with external educational organizations that offer workshops. Partnerships between these organizations and the University allow workshop participants to earn credits from the University because “Credit is accepted by most school districts toward professional certificate renewal and may also be used to comply with the School Administrator continuing education requirement” (website, n.d.).

Another example of external collaboration is the professional development courses offered through the professional organization PBS TeacherLine (PBS TeacherLine, n.d.). By taking PBS TeacherLine courses, students also earn University credits. Among the traditional online courses for educators, there are some vocational courses (e.g., a driver education instructor certificate program). The other partnership with Education to Go (formerly Gatlin Education Services) offers online programs that develop the skills necessary for many in-demand occupations such as Business, IT, Health, Fitness, Green energy, and other fields (website, n.d.).

**Accredited Programs: “We Do What the State Wants Us to Do”**

The theme of traditional activities naturally emerged from conversations with department heads and the interim dean who are in charge of ensuring that their departments follow the state and accreditation agencies requirements. The interviewed Charter School Office representative also emphasized a significant role that the state regulations play in the Charter School Office operations. This section provides a description of the programs, services, and activities by the academic and non-academic departments of the School of Education to address the demands of the state and accreditation agencies. The following sub-themes were identified within the *Traditional activities* theme: (1) Programs offered by the academic departments; (2) New program standards and important requirements; (3) Off-
campus and online delivery; (4) Work of full-time faculty; (5) Work of adjunct faculty; and (6) Programs and services offered by the Charter School Office.

**Programs offered by the academic departments.** The *Leadership Department* offers graduate degree and certificate programs in Educational Leadership that are traditional for this academic field. Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, shared that her Department experiences a strong push from the state to work closely with the state Department of Education. Dr. Campbell emphasized, “[the] state requires us. Now, we have to apply to the state. We have a very large application that goes in for the master’s [degree] in School Principalship program and our Specialist in Education program (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

At the time of data collection, there were eight accredited programs and certificates identified by the researcher that were offered by the Leadership Department (University’s website, n.d.). Table 6 displays the list of these programs offered in 2010-2011.

**Table 6**

*Degree and certificate programs offered by Leadership Department*

| 1. | MA in Educational Leadership |
| 2. | MA in School Principalship |
| 3. | MA in Charter School Leadership |
| 4. | MA in Teacher Leadership |
| 5. | Ed.S. in General Educational Administration |
| 6. | Ed.D. in Educational Leadership with the concentration in: K-12 Leadership, K-12 Curriculum, Higher Education Administration, and Educational Technology |
| 7. | State required K-12 School Administrator Certification: Elementary and Secondary Administrator Endorsement and Central Office/Superintendent Endorsement |
| 8. | Graduate Certificate in College Teaching |
The Teacher Education Department offers *Initial certificate programs* for new teachers as well as *Continuing/Professional certificates* and *master's degree programs* for those who have already been working for schools. The Teacher Education programs offered by this Department have been granted the *Exemplary Performance* award the fourth consecutive year with by the state (University’s website, n.d.). At the time of data collection, the Teacher Education Department offered the following seven graduate programs: (a) Master of Arts in Educational Technology, (b) Master of Arts in Elementary Education - Classroom Teaching, (c) Master of Arts in Elementary Education - Early Childhood, (d) Master of Arts in Reading and Literacy, (e) Master of Arts in Middle Level Education, (f) Master of Arts in Secondary Education, and (g) Master of Arts in Special Education.

All these programs are offered because of the state and accreditation agencies regulations. Dr. Larry Smith, head of Teacher Education Department, commented on the work by the Teacher Education Department:

We will write a program. We will have all of the courses and all parts of the curriculum and all of those things that we think that are important to make a good teacher a quality teacher that needs to be approved by the state... We have to be sort of hand-in-glove with the state. If they [accreditation agencies] do not approve our program, we can't get students in the program, and we are nonexistent at that point (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

All graduate programs are designed by the Professional Education Unit that is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The accreditation work is considered as essential and time consuming for the faculty members at the Department. For example, Dr. Natalia Lee, professor with the Teacher Education Department, shared with the researcher that she was given a course release when she was
working on the departmental materials for the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011). According to information in the 2011 Annual Report, “All departments are very active in curricular activities including new course development, deleting old courses, course and program revisions, deleting low enrollment programs or those affected by state requirement changes, and online course and program development” (Annual Report, 2011).

Besides the degree and certificate programs, the Leadership Department and the Teacher Education Department offer many study abroad courses that are discussed in detail in the section entitled “Theme: Internationalization.”

**New program standards and important requirements.** Per an interviewee, revision of the courses had been one of the major tasks for the Leadership Department during the previous several years (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). The new performance based assessment that comes from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC Standards) shapes the leadership programs for school administrators. According to Dr. Campbell, recent standards tie closer “teaching to practice and real life” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). These new standards became challenging for many faculty at the Departments because “it was different from the way the courses were taught in the past” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

Further, Dr. Campbell explained:

I teach a Culture class within the [School] Principalship program. In the past, they [students] might write something about their school culture or climate and give a presentation. We totally changed that. Now, they go to the school… they have to do a so-called School Culture Audit. They identify key artifacts of the culture. They
interview several people to find out how and why they do things around here. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Dr. Campbell pointed out that these ISSLC Standards have made faculty members in the Department rethink and revise every single course and create rubrics to assess all “performance based assignments” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). She emphasized the point regarding the amount of time and effort that the faculty members at the Department have invested in obtaining accreditation. Specifically, she said, “both groups of faculty, those who teach Higher Education courses and those who teach K-12 courses, worked together to get the programs approved and certified by the state” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

**Off-campus and online delivery.** Like many university departments across the nation, the Leadership Department takes its programs to off-campus sites and online. Faculty members teach their courses on-campus and at many off-campus locations. They also teach in hybrid and fully online formats. At least seven off-campus locations were mentioned by the interviewees. Speaking about online education, Dr. Campbell said, “I think that the dawning has arrived. If I do not do that, what am I going to do? And that again is a huge paradigm shift in teaching” (personal communication, July 11, 2011).

In spite of the fact that online programs are making a significant shift in the Leadership Department, teaching online is still not mandatory for full-time faculty members. However, according to the interviewees, it is a strong survival push for the faculty to obtain new teaching skills and expertise in teaching online (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Dr. Campbell stated, “That is a huge paradigm shift in teaching, and faculty members realize that” (personal
communication, July 11, 2011). Some faculty members are good in designing and teaching online courses while others are taking training courses with the Faculty Development Center on online teaching.

Similar to the Leadership Department, online instruction at the Teacher Education Department is a fast growing approach in program delivery. Dr. Lee recalled that five years ago, when she started working for the Teacher Education Department, skills and knowledge in online instruction were not important to the instructors. Now, everyone is expected to develop the necessary expertise in this new type of teaching (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

The Teacher Education Department faculty members participate in trainings offered by the Faculty Development Center in order to learn how to teach in the new instructional virtual environment (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

The Center for Off-Campus Programs is the University unit whose primary aim is to expand programs regionally, nationally, and even internationally. The Center runs about 60 off-campus and several international sites where the programs are offered. Many of the off-campus sites are located at military bases where students gain their university degrees while serving in the armed services. Some military bases are located outside of the country which makes these sites to be considered as international (website, n.d.; Ms. Moore, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Ms. Moore, staff member of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, said:

We offer classes there [in the off-campus sites]. We send instructors to the students. This is one model that we have. We also have 50% of our students who come to us
are registered for online courses, and we also have students who are taking face-to-face courses in off-campus sites and their courses are also supplemented with online courses. (Ms. Moore, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

**Work of full-time faculty.** According to Dr. Campbell, the quality of the programs is important for the Leadership Department. In particular, she stated that the majority of the doctoral program classes in Educational Leadership that are offered at the off-campus sites are taught by full-time faculty. Dr. Martin mentioned that, at the time of data collection, she was teaching two classes, “I teach one class on campus, and I travel. We listen to the audience and go to where our audience is” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Dr. Campbell said about the doctoral program, “The doctoral program is taught by full-time faculty only. Rarely, we have an adjunct there. Maybe once or twice, but we keep it pretty tight” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). However, adjunct faculty members play an important role in the program delivery process because the resources of ten faculty members are limited. Dr. Campbell shared the following with the researcher:

When we launched a [master’s] School Principalship Program, when we offer a program, what we have to do is fifty percent of the professors from the main campus and fifty percent adjuncts. We cannot make all these work because we are not a very big department. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

**Work of adjunct faculty.** According to Dr. Campbell, the Leadership Department carefully selects and hires adjuncts and rarely asks the Center for Off-Campus Programs for
help. Dr. Jones shared about those who teach online classes in the Charter School Leadership program:

We have one lawyer. She is in the Department, but she is not a faculty for the Department, adjunct. Another person, she is a charter school administrator in California. She studied in our program. I liked how she studied, and I offered her to teach. She started very successfully. She has a wealth of knowledge. Another person graduated from our doctoral program. She is a school administrator over there in the state. She is good for research course. This is another person. He works for the Charter Schools Office at the University. He is not a faculty. He is doing his doctorate… They know what they are doing. They are willing to learn how to teach online. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011)

Dr. Campbell pointed out, “We control the quality because we know who we get in” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). Most of the adjuncts are graduates from the doctoral program of this Department. This fact makes the full-time faculty members believe that the adjuncts know the programs and understand the requirements and expectations regarding the quality of instruction.

The Leadership Department seeks a way to better accommodate adjuncts in their teaching and to maintain and control the required level of instructional quality. According to Dr. Campbell, the part-time faculty members receive a lot of attention from the department head and the full-time faculty. In order to prepare adjuncts for teaching courses, the Leadership Department created the so-called Representative Syllabi. Dr. Campbell explained about this type of documents:
We really need to train our adjuncts who are in the field. […] Master courses syllabi are pretty generic looking. So, we created these *representative syllabi* that we give to adjuncts. A *representative syllabus* includes the rubric and performance based pieces as a way to jump on board… It gives more flexibility, but we have to look at learning outcomes… So, it has really changed a lot. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

**Programs and services offered by the Charter School Office.** The Charter School Office offers authorization and service to those charter schools in the state that decide to be authorized by the Charter School Office at this University. The history of the Charter Schools Office goes back to 1993, the early era of the charter school movement, when the University Board of Regents recognized the opportunity and potential for an alternative education system in the market and created the Charter Schools Office (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). After two decades of operation, the Charter School Office became well-known in the state, the region, and nationally as a very proactive leading authorizer of charter schools (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011; Dr. Williams, personal communication, July 15, 2011).

The Charter School Office depends on the state because of the nature of how charter schools, along with their authorizers, have been created. A charter school authorizer receives funds from the state. The more the students that attend the authorized charter schools the more the public funds the authorizer gains for its operation. Mr. Taylor described what the Charter School Office does as the authorizer:

> It is our job to do authorizing or oversight to make sure the schools are taking care of the money, the public funds because the entire asset is a public fund of the state and
making sure that the children are learning. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

According to the interviewee, the charter school concept has a lot of similarities with the concepts of business organizations. Mr. Taylor explained, “By state law, our office takes 3% of Student Aid dollars. It is called oversight seeds. If you authorize, you can take up to 3% of Student Aid dollars to run oversight operations” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

To oversight academic performance, the Charter School Office signs performance contracts with schools. When a charter school does not meet the state requirements, the authorizer has a right to close it. Mr. Taylor explained:

School is a multi-million dollars business, and we can close them. We are closing schools now. Historically, at the early stages we closed schools for financial reasons. Now, we close the majority of them for academic performance. At most of them, the financial part has stabilized. People understand it better. Now, the academic performance is the main reason to close schools. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The more schools that are authorized and the longer they stay with their authorizer the more funding flows to the authorizer’s budget. According to the data from the charter school report, about 70% of schools stay with the Charter School Office for five-seven years which can be considered as a positive outcome for the given 20-year history of the Charter School Office (Charter School Office Report, 2010).
Research Activities: “It Takes the Researcher Outside of the Traditional Box”

The following sub-sections were identified under the theme “Research”: (1) Research as a promotional activity; (2) International comparative research; (3) Research aimed to improve teaching-learning; and (4) Planning large grant-supported research projects.

**Research as a promotional activity.** According to Dr. Smith, faculty members with the Teacher Education Department have done research “for re-appointment, promotion, and tenure” comparing different teacher education program requirements at universities and community colleges in other states. Dr. Smith said:

The faculty doing a comparison of University's colleges, community colleges, different states, different requirements, what is really important in earning tenure, what has changed over the years because they are doing, again, the work that somebody else has used in doing a comparison twenty years later. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Research that involves comparison among institutions and practice oriented was also identified at the Leadership Department. Ms. Harris, doctoral student and graduate assistant, stated that while being a graduate assistant she was involved in the “Research-based work.” She explained:

It is a combination of K-12 and Higher Ed. One of the researches is about cheating internationally in K-12 by using technologies. Another is about inductive vs. deductive thinking, when the paradigm shifted. I also have done a lit review on community colleges and students who transfer from community colleges to 4-year colleges. (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29, 2011)
Another graduate assistant Margaret Robinson described her experience of working with the faculty members at the Leadership Department:

I have already done a survey for all of the superintendents in the State, what does it take to be survivor in this turbulent time. They already collected all of the data. I am coding data, filling the research gaps and doing more literature on this. We did not think about school consolidations, and I am doing a search on that. (Ms. Robinson, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Dr. Barbara Martin (personal communication, October 28, 2011) advised the researcher that the Leadership Department has a policy known as 40-40-20. It means that 40 percent of the work by faculty must be done in Teaching, another 40 percent must be devoted to Research, and 20 percent of the time and effort must go toward Service. While working on developing new programs that are considered as Service, faculty members often try to tie their Research to what they do for Service.

According to information from the University’s website, faculty members have interests in following research areas: legal and ethical issues in education and educational policy, women in higher education, work/family issues, student affairs satisfaction, effective practices in graduate education, methodological practices with qualitative data analysis software, college students' civic identity, leadership, civic engagement, diversity, international education, transformative learning; issues of access and affordability in higher education, community colleges, adult learning, student development theory, measuring undergraduate leadership education and student services, and social change theories (University’s website, n.d.).
**International comparative research.** Dr. Natalia Lee from the Teacher Education Department does her research in connection with international and exchange projects that she initiates at the Department. She develops her research ideas based on existing collaborations with universities in her home country Russia. Therefore, her applied research contributes not only to the body of knowledge, but also to the internationalization of the Department (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011). In particular, Dr. Lee stated:

I decided to use my connections with Russia and developed a research project in which students practicing at schools here, in the USA, and in Russia will record videos of their classes, will skype, interact via emails, and work together. I will collect data on how our students learn from these international collaborations. The students will develop their international competences and gain international experience. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Dr. Lee also mentioned that while conducting research with students who are actively involved, she also teaches them understanding and appreciation of another culture. Through her international comparative research, Dr. Lee maintains and strengthens the partnerships with the Russian universities (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

Dr. Smith is also doing his research in the area of internationalization. He explores how study abroad programs influence the attitudes of students toward different cultures. In particular, he said:

I am currently working on something with attitudinal changes in students after experiencing culture. I have a simple pre-test and post-test about attitude toward other ethnicity and other cultures. I do the pre-test here, and then they go overseas, they get experiences while there, and they take a post-test upon their return. I want to
see if there is a difference in their attitudes towards different cultures, different
ethnicities, different situations, and things like that. I have just finished pulling that
together, so now I am going to start doing some analyzing. (Dr. Smith, personal
communication, July 5, 2011)

**Research aimed to improve teaching-learning.** During the academic year when the
data for this study were collected, a group of faculty members at the Leadership Department
decided to work together in doing *Research*. They started to coordinate the assignments they
gave to Ms. Tammy Harris, their graduate assistant. Ms. Harris disclosed that the faculty
members asked her to collect data from universities across the country on how educational
leadership programs are taught. Specifically, the faculty wanted to know how other schools
do their comprehensive exams in Educational Leadership doctoral programs. According to
Ms. Harris, the faculty expressed the reason of their interest in the following statement:

> We need to do something different... We need to know how many courses they
> [doctoral students] are taking and what kind of research courses. Maybe we have to
> rethink how we teach research. (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29,
> 2011)

Another example from the interview with Ms. Harris refers to comparing different
Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership. Ms. Harris said:

> She [a faculty member] is looking at implementing Ph.D. programs at other
> universities in order to improve our doctoral program. So, she talked with me about
> where we go with that, what the process is at our University. She is sharing the
> research problem… She wants me to understand what to do and why... I am working
> to explore universities in the nation that have Ed.D. and/or Ph.D. programs and I want
to know the differences between these two programs. This is the assignment that she
gives to me. (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

Another example comes from the interview with Ms. Margaret Robinson. The
assignments that Ms. Robinson received from the faculty member referred to exploring
certain courses in other universities. That professor said Ms. Robinson:

I do not like how I teach this course. I do not know if I have to take this apart, maybe
I need to keep these topics together… Can you look at other syllabi and see how
other people [at other universities] are doing this topic? (Ms. Robinson, personal
communication, October 28, 2011)

The international comparative research conducted by Dr. Lee, which was described
above, also had one of the objectives identifying the best practices student learning about
internationalization in order to implement the findings in future activities with the students
(Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

**Planning large grant-supported research projects.** Dr. Campbell, head of the
Leadership Department, pointed out that most faculty members in the Department conduct
their research in different areas of leadership. However, during the past years, the
Department has built a foundation and infrastructure to work on large research projects. In
the near future, the Department is planning to attract grants from external grant-making
organizations and develop larger research projects. In discussion about big research projects
with external funding, Dr. Campbell said:

It has not been on a large scale. When I look at the goals of our department, it is
definitely the next step. This last year, we put a lot of infrastructure here. We had to
do program prioritization, state application; we just did a lot of ground work. Now,
when you have it in place, we are able to go to the next step. This ASCD piece might be part of that. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Another issue that emerged from the discussions about research reflects how research grants are important for a researcher and the department. Collaboration with and recognition from external organizations build the “bridges with the world” and “takes the researcher outside of the traditional box” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011).

Dr. White emphasized the importance of the ability of a person to apply for grants that support research ideas. He encourages doctoral students to step outside the requirements of the position and, on their own time, try to setup external grant funding. He tells them, “If you go out and get a grant, you can support your research. You then can support your creativity, and you can promote your travel” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011). Dr. White started his professional career as a researcher with the support of grants. He said, “I had quite a reserve of discretionary travel money because I was very good at grants. Because I had this grant reserve of discretionary funds, I traveled a great deal” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011).

The ability of professionals in academia to attract external grants for research projects is the criteria that Dr. White uses when he participates in a hiring committee that considers candidates for faculty positions. He looks for “how they express their creativity other than the very boring traditional ways of doing their job and that is one of the big indicators for me. What they are doing with their partnerships, their professional networks, and their professional funding to support those agendas” (Dr. White, personal communication, October 28, 2011).
Unique Activities: “No One Else Does It”

The online Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines uniqueness as being the only one or unusual (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). Zelinsky (2001) argued that “every place or event, every person or social entity, any physical object can claim at least a modicum of uniqueness” (p. 565). In this study, the researcher considers uniqueness as unusual or non-traditional programs, services, or activities on certain levels of comparison like the departmental level, school level, university level, or region and nation.

Data collected for this study show that the study participants within the School of Education, as well as in the supporting centers at the University level, (i.e., the Faculty Development Center and the Center for Off-Campus Programs) believe that some of the programs, as well as services and activities, are unique in their professional fields. Some programs and activities are considered as unique or unusual on the level of the departments, when the faculty or staff members compare what they do among other departments within the same School or across the University. Other programs and activities are recognized as being unique among local competitors in the state, and some of the programs are found to be unique in the nation. In this theme, the researcher shares the data that refer to the Unique activities theme and its sub-themes that are as follows: (1) Uniqueness of the Charter School Office in the state; (2) Scholarships for students as a unique activity of the Charter School Office; (3) Uniqueness of the Charter School Office in the nation; (4) Creation of the Charter Schools Institute as a unique activity of the Charter School Office; (5) Uniqueness of the Teacher Education Department in the state; (6) Uniqueness of the Leadership Department in the state; (7) Uniqueness of the Leadership Department in the nation; (8) Uniqueness of the
Faculty Development Center in the state; and (9) Uniqueness of the Faculty Development Center in the nation.

**Uniqueness of the Charter School Office in the state.** The Charter School Office has the reputation as being the most entrepreneurial university unit within the School of Education (Dr. Williams, Dr. Jones, Mr. Taylor, personal communication, 2011). This Office monitors and provides services to almost 60 charter schools in the state in which the University is located (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011; University’s website, n.d.). The Charter School Office also serves as a resource center for many other charter school authorizers throughout the country (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Functions of the Charter School Office include activities related to the development of authorizer documentations, creating systems for data analysis, authorizing schools, monitoring and mentoring them, providing trainings for charter school board members, organizing tours to the University for charter school students, and participating in events for charter schools and authorizers.

The fact that the Charter School Office that serves the largest number of charter schools in the state and the region when compared to other authorizers is clear evidence of uniqueness that falls under the definition “no one else does it.” Every interviewee at the School of Education pointed out the uniqueness of the Charter School Office. Mr. Timothy Taylor, who represents the Office, described that the Charter School Office was one of the first in the field of the charter school movement and, therefore, used that opportunity to become one of the leading authorizers in the nation.

**Scholarships for students as a unique activity of the Charter School Office.**

Discussing the uniqueness of the Charter School Office, Mr. Taylor pointed out that the
Office has a scholarship program for students to study at the University in the education program with an emphasis on charter schools. He also stated that the staff of the Office is currently working on getting support from a Federal funded program “to start at about seventh grade and have dedicated counselors for kids all through the high school level to help them to get to college, and scholarships for getting into college. So we are doing things that a traditional district never does” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Uniqueness of the Charter School Office in the nation. Since the Charter School Office was established at the University, many programs, policies, documentations, regulations, and technology support systems were created by the Charter Schools Office and became in demand on the national market. He pointed out that the concept of the charter schools and the role that the Charter Schools Office plays in the state and the nation forces the Charter Schools Office to be entrepreneurial. Mr. Taylor emphasized that “people refer to us [Charter Schools Office] as being entrepreneurial or innovative” (personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Reputation in the state, region, and nation is a very significant asset of the Charter School Office. The interviewee described how the Office operates on the local and national levels:

In the charter [school] environment among other charter school authorizers, we were considered as a charter [school] leader. We were trying to help other institutions to be better authorizers. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Today, many things that have been created by this Charter School Office are in active use by not only the authorized charter schools, but also by other authorizers nationwide.
According to Mr. Taylor, the Charter Schools Office faces the challenges of how to share and how to sell products that were originally developed for internal use:

People from other universities said, “We have the same problem, can we use your system?” Yes, how can we do that? We need to figure out how to transfer knowledge. We started partnerships with the companies that do that. We had to do that because our job is authorizing, not software training, software installation and all this stuff. So, we did charge and this AOIS system is a revenue path, and it is still growing because the demand for that function is out there. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

One of the examples of the unique and innovative products is the Authorizers Oversight Information System (AOIS) that was developed by the Charter School Office in partnership with a computer company (University’s website, n.d.). The purpose of this system is to help K-12 teachers and administrators to file documents electronically that reflect school performance. Mr. Taylor said that the other products of the Charter School Office can be found in many schools and districts in the country:

If you look around other states, you will see a lot of our stuff used by charter schools and authorizers because we were on the front. We had time, and we had the staff to do that. You can see a lot of models that are very similar to what we did. It was a supply and demand issue. People needed it, and we were sharing because we had it. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Creation of the Charter Schools Institute.** In order to become more flexible in the market, the Charter School Office created the Charter Schools Institute (Charter Schools Institute’s website, n.d.; School of Education Annual report, 2010). This new entity is
independent of the University organization. It serves as a bridge between the public mission of the Charter School Office and the free charter school market that demands certain products at a certain time. According to the interviewee, the Charter School Institute allows the Charter School Office to distinguish public and non-public funds and extends flexibility for the Charter School Office to operate in the market through the delegation of some functions to the Charter School Institute. Mr. Taylor explained:

Charter School Institute is a spin-off of all tools we created… So, we create avenue, technologies and systems that would be effective. We transfer the knowledge, so the Charter School Institute could deliver it. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Uniqueness requirements for individual charter schools.** Mr. Taylor shared that the team at the Charter School Office recognizes and values their own uniqueness in the work they do within the state and the nation. The Charter School Office requires authorized charter schools to identify their uniqueness and dissimilarity from their neighboring schools. According to Mr. Taylor, the Charter School Office explains to the leaders at the authorized charter schools:

We do not want you [a charter school] to be like other schools. How to compare yourself with the neighbor down the street? We want you to be *unique*. You tell us what makes you *unique*. We will put it in the contract, and we are going to measure you against it. If you do Fine Arts school, you can deliver math in more Arts context... And we want you to not only tell us, but to show us how you are doing that. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Mr. Taylor concluded, “So, we wanted that each school has a creative idea to deliver
the State mandate curriculum in own unique way different that the neighbor down the street does” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Consider another quote about the uniqueness requirement from the interview with Mr. Taylor:

If you are a good institution, good company, you have a strong mission and strong values, from that everything comes down. Most traditional districts did not do that. When we started, we started with “What would make you different?” We noticed that some schools have some specific interests, let’s say, Fine Arts, Montessori, a lot of different educational models are there... Ethno-centered, Armenian focus culture, African culture, Palestinian, Arabic culture... And we said this is your mission, your vision, your uniqueness. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Uniqueness of the Teacher Education Department in the state.** The Teacher Education Department can be recognized as unique in the state because of the large number of enrolled students. For example, the MA in Education program enrolled over 1000 students during the 2009-2010 academic year through the Center for Off-Campus Programs and “the MA in Education continues to expand its offerings to sites across the U.S.” (Annual Report, 2010). During 2010-2011, graduate enrollment off-campus increased by 85% from the previous year. The annual report states that this increase is “a result of growth and popularity of the MA in Educational Technology… Increasing the online graduate offerings will result from the restructuring of almost all Teacher Education Department graduate programs” (Annual Report, 2011). More than 650 new teachers graduate each year from the Teacher Education programs at this University (Annual Report, 2010).
The online programs serve students not only nationwide but also internationally. Dr. Larry Smith, head of the Teacher Education Department, spoke about the recently launched master’s program in *Educational Technology* that is designed to prepare teachers who provide instruction utilizing new learning technologies that include multimedia, telecommunications, and distance learning. This MA program is offered nationwide as a fully online program as well as a face-to-face format at one off-campus site. It is interesting to note that the off-campus site is located in the area of another large Midwestern university that is recognized nationally as a highly ranked school. However, certain populations of non-traditional students that seek graduate degrees comprise the enrollment in the Educational Technology program through the off-campus site of the University that was explored for this dissertation study.

Dr. Smith said the following about this program, “[it] has expanded, it has just exploded. We’ve got international students from China, Europe, and Asia where they are part of the program and getting their master’s all online” (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

**Uniqueness of the Leadership Department in the state.** Uniqueness among local competitors of the *Leadership Department* was also identified from the data analysis. According to Dr. Campbell, the Leadership Department constantly works on new ideas to develop curriculum, retain students, and attract new ones. Dr. Campbell referred to several programs as “no one else does it” (personal communication, July 11, 2011) and that make the Department *unique* and successful in the field of training leaders for educational organizations (Dr. Williams, personal communication, June 15, 2011).
Dr. Campbell and the faculty members at the Leadership Department believe that the *Graduate Certificate in College Teaching* program and the *Ed.D. & Ed.S. Ladder Program* that ties the Specialist with the Doctoral program are considered as the *unique* programs that “nobody else is doing that…” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

The *Graduate Certificate in College Teaching* program was designed for individuals from different professional fields who pursue a new teaching career in higher education. Dr. Campbell said that many professionals in the current economic situation, who lost their jobs, want to be trained in order to teach their subject matters in higher education institutions. Faculty members at the Leadership Department estimate that the market demand for this new program is growing because of shifts in the economy and in society.

The program entitled *Ed.S. & Ed.D. Ladder Program* was designed so that most of the credits earned on a two-year Specialist program can be transferred to the Ed.D. program. This program structure encourages students in a Specialist degree program to move further toward their terminal degrees. It is important to note that the “Ladder” program was created and launched in collaboration with two other universities in the Midwestern region and is offered at off-campus sites in partnership with these universities. Dr. Campbell stated the following about the program:

We got some terrific niches of our own. The *Ladder* program concept, nobody else is doing that. We call it the *Ed.S. and Ed.D. Ladder Program*. What that means, that you finish your Ed.S., two-year cohort, 27 of the 33 credits will arrive to the doctoral program. We have those credits; we know exactly what they will be taking, and they like that idea. They sort of finish their electives upfront and they have their terminal
degree in-hand… That has been successful for us. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

The researcher did not aim to explore similar programs in the state or nation and, therefore, can assume that these programs are unique at least among main competitors in the area where the Department delivers these programs in face-to-face and hybrid formats.

Interviews with faculty members revealed that they are proud of their new doctoral course entitled Advanced Qualitative Analysis in Educational Leadership that was in the process of approval during the data collection (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011; Dr. White, personal communication, October 28, 2011). This course can also be considered as a unique course at the level of local competitors. According to the new course proposal, students will work with their own research data using analysis software. The qualitative data analysis software NVivo is one of the tools that are actively used by the faculty in the Leadership Department. Dr. Daniel White, one of the professors in the Leadership Program, had been a member of the international group of scholars who were trained to use the qualitative data analysis software. Dr. White said in his interview:

It was about 15 years ago. I was at a university in Florida, and my qualitative research was pulling me to the use of qualitative data analysis software… I could see that the use of the software in data analysis was really something to do. The technology was very attractive even though there is huge philosophical tension, even still, in qualitative theoretical orientations regarding the use of the software. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

Doctoral student, Mr. Jeff Wilson, shared with the researcher that all doctoral students in the Leadership Department are required to get familiar with NVivo. It helps them
to work with qualitative unstructured data like surveys, audio, video, pictures, and text documents. Mr. Wilson pointed out that he liked the classes on qualitative research because of the high level of instruction on NVivo. Specifically, Mr. Wilson said:

We are using NVivo, the software to analyze qualitative data. He [Dr. D. White] is an expert in that. Our advance Summer course was about qualitative research methods. We were learning and using NVivo. I liked this class. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Uniqueness of the Leadership Department in the Nation. The master’s degree fully online Charter School Leadership program was designed by the Leadership Department in collaboration with the Charter School Office. It is suggested that this program must be considered as a unique one at the levels of the region and even the nation.

According to many interviewees, it was a logical step for the Leadership Department and the Charter School Office that has authorized the largest number of charter schools in the region to start a degree program that helps educators to get prepared for leadership jobs in charter schools. Dr. David Jones, the Director of the Charter School Leaders program, shared about how the idea to create this program appeared at the Department of Leadership:

It was not difficult because of the demand. Charter schools at that time became a force in the state. Schools got authorized, came to existence, it was not before, and someone had to train charter school leaders. Charter schools were different enough from traditional public schools. Special training was needed and our University was the biggest authorizer for charter schools in the country. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011)

Dr. Jones described this program the following way:
This Master of Arts degree in Educational Leadership with emphasis on Charter School Leadership is a fully online degree program. It is a thirty-three credit/hours program. The purpose for this program, why we have it, is because people who want to be the charter school leaders… in any place in the country. We have students from coast to coast. Most of them are from our state, but that percentage gets smaller every year because it grows nationally. The online portion becomes more established, more accepted, better delivered. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

According to Dr. Campbell, charter school leaders were recently considered being “inexperienced people who were trying to manage new types of schools, whereas today, with the charter school movement and development nationally, the bar of requirements for Charter School leaders has been raised” (personal communication, July 11, 2011). Further, she said:

The program is really beneficial for potential charter school leaders. They come from different places, and I think that we see, for the first time, that a lot of things take place because of the economy. A lot of public school administrators are crossing over. This is a relatively new trend… or retired superintendents. They would say: “I will go and run a charter [school] because I have so much educational experience.” Traditionally, this was not a case. They were inexperienced people trying to manage this. We do not try to standardize the idea, but you have to have some skills and knowledge on how to manage and lead. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Four years ago, the Charter School Leadership master’s program was launched first in a face-to-face format, then, “the dry run” version was developed to a fully online program.
In his interview, Dr. Jones pointed out that the program has grown and quickly became successful at the national level. The Department has at least one new cohort each semester. The interviewee was proud to say, “At any given semester, we have four or five cohorts running” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011).

When the researcher asked Dr. Jones about the uniqueness of this program, he responded: “I think it is [unique]. I keep my eyes pretty close on this. There are a couple pretty similar... There are not many. I think we were the first who came up with this” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 22, 2011). Dr. Barbara Martin echoed, “We really are unique in [state name]. I knew about Charter School Leadership program before I came to this University, but I did not realize that nobody does that” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

The Annual Report of the School of Education (Annual Report, 2010) stated, “this program emphasis is one of only a few in the U.S.” According to the plan of the School of Education, the MA Charter School Leadership program had been scheduled to begin in the greater Washington, D.C., area in face-to-face and hybrid format in 2011 (Annual Report, 2010).

The emergence and success of the program for Charter School Leaders in online, hybrid, and face-to-face formats led to another fully online master’s degree program for Teacher Leaders. Designed by the Leadership Department in collaboration with the Teacher Education Department and the Center for Off-Campus Programs, the online MA Teacher Leadership program became another unique program that, according to the expectations of its authors and developers, has a lot of potential. Dr. Campbell, in her discussion about the Teacher Leadership program, emphasized, “Our biggest program is coming up” (personal
communication, July 11, 2011). The purpose of this new online program is to address the professional and educational needs of those teachers who want to develop their skills and extend their qualification as leaders in their classrooms. Dr. David Jones explained:

It is for teachers who do not want to be principals or administrators, but they want to be classroom leaders. A number of universities have developed Teacher Leadership MA degrees, but we do not know any that is offered fully online. This is the answer to the question if we do something similar to that [Charter School Leadership] program. We saw the demand in the field, and we are trying to respond to it. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

In regards to this new program, Dr. Campbell said:

Teacher Leadership is a brand new direction we are going in. It will be the first time when we are offering this degree, and, again, it comes from the demands in the field. When NCLB (No Child Left Behind) came along, instructional behaviors in the classroom really changed and expectations changed. They changed for teachers, they changed for principals, and now we need people who are leaders in the classroom and they will lead the instructional methodology. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Dr. Barbara Martin, director of this recently launched program, shared in her interview that the idea of creating a leadership program for teachers was discussed at the university where she worked prior to coming to this University. In particular, she said, “I was involved in a teacher leadership program at [name of the university]. They had teacher leadership program ideas, but they could not get started” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Comparing her past experiences in different places, she
concluded that this Leadership Department and this School of Education are different from other institutions. She said:

I believe that there are support networks here and the collegiality, and maybe expectations. Maybe it is not expected from other colleges to be innovative, but is more expected from us here. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

At her new workplace, Dr. Martin was given a chance to lead the process of developing this new program and launching it in the market. The Department expects that the Teacher Leadership master’s degree program will address not only the educational market in the United States but will be taught abroad also. China is considered as the first target for delivering this online program for leaders in classrooms (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

This new fully online master’s degree program for Teacher Leaders was ready to be launched in the 2012 Winter semester. At the time of the data collection during the fall of 2011, this new program had seven students enrolled (Ms. Moore, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

**Uniqueness of the Faculty Development Center in the state and the nation.** The Faculty Development Center offers many activities that, according to the director Dr. James Parker, make the Center unique among many other universities. Dr. James Parker initiated and implemented a new online conference format which he named *One-Hour Conference.* The idea for this format was borrowed from the existing One-Hour Webinar. Per the interviewee, this online gathering allows participants to attend sessions of their choice, move from one session to another, ask questions, and meet with other participants in the virtual environment (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011).
Dr. Parker employs a community building approach in his work as the Director of the Faculty Development Center. He developed a new program, named the *Community of Scholars*, that encourages and supports faculty members to work together in teams. Faculty members across the University build teams, discuss their successes and difficulties, and attempt to improve student learning through their collaborative work (Dr. Martin, Dr. Lee, Ms. Harris, and Ms. Robinson, personal communications, 2011).

Dr. Parker stated that the Faculty Development Center, through its work on integrating technology into teaching-learning process, made the University one of the largest users of *Clickers* and *Prezi* in the country. In particular, Dr. Parker said:

> I think that [name of the University] is seen by many people as one of the leaders in learning technology use. There are 4500 students here who use Clickers, so we may be the largest university, the largest user of Clickers. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Another passage from the interview with Dr. Parker describes the usage of *Prezi*:

Kind of a good story about one faculty who wrote me an email that his student used *Prezi*. He said, “I need to learn how to do that.” It was, probably, one of the largest attended workshops last year—*How to Use Prezi*. We overuse powerpoint. When we rely on one tool, we overuse it. We can overuse Prezi, if we use it too much. On the average, students see from eight to ten powerpoints every week. After that, they think, “Powerpoint again… I get sick of it.” There is one way with powerpoint: to explain one slide, then to explain another slide, and so on. It must be a mix of tools that faculty can use during the semester. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011)
Another current technology that is becoming more popular among the University community is called *IPod Touching Initiative*. It involves the usage of ipods by students during lectures and other in-class activities. Describing this technology, Dr. Parker explained:

Students can, using ipod, text their questions on the board and other students can vote for these questions. One hundred sixty students in the classroom… and the question that gets more votes rises to the top… an instructor sees that a lot of students have this question: “Let’s talk a little about this.” They do not interrupt the instructor. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

**Internationalization: “Students Need to Understand Globalization”**

The Study Abroad theme emerged from many narratives and shows the trend in the departments of the School of Education that occurs and grows in the area of internationalization (Altbach, 2004; Levin, 2001). According to the annual report, 90% of the students at the School of Education “have, or have made plans, to study abroad prior to graduation” (Annual Report, 2011). At the time of data collection, the researcher found that the Teacher Education Department offered study abroad programs in ten countries and the Leadership Department had programs in four countries. Table 6 reflects the Study Abroad programs by academic departments in 2010-2011.
Study abroad programs by academic departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic department</th>
<th>Study Abroad Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Togo (Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Department</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study abroad programs for undergraduate students. Dr. Smith, head of Teacher Education Department, described the study abroad trips the following way:

We now have programs in London for student teaching, a program in Australia for student teaching, a program in the Dominican Republic, and a program in Ghana, Africa for student teaching. We are going to Togo, Africa and then we have those other ones that we are planning on to Greece, Costa Rica, and Hong Kong. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The Teacher Education Department builds the study abroad programs in a way that allows students to spend part of their field experience at K-12 schools in the United States and another part at schools abroad. During their study abroad trips, students visit schools in their host countries, do observations, collect data for comparative papers, and practice teaching. The length of study abroad trips is from two to three weeks (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2012; Dr. Lee, July 11, 2011; University’s website, n.d.).
Most trips overseas are designed for those students who specialize in elementary education. According to Dr. Smith, head of the TE Department, about 30% of future elementary school teachers participate in the programs and the Department is working on developing programs for students who study in the secondary and high school teacher education programs also. Dr. Smith said, “Our ultimate goal, although we are not there yet, is for everybody to get an international or urban experience before they leave here” (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

**Promotion of study abroad programs.** In order to advertise and attract students to study abroad programs, the Teacher Education Department organizes Study Abroad Student Meetings each semester where participants of the programs share their overseas experiences with other students at the University (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Another promotional activity was observed during the data collection for this dissertation study. It was an open house event at the School of Education. When the researcher attended this event, it was easy to observe activities by faculty members from the Teacher Education Department who presented and advertised their study abroad programs. Those students who participated in the study abroad trips were also involved in the presentations and shared their exciting experiences overseas with the attendees. The study abroad presentations were overcrowded in comparison to the other booths displayed in the hallway at the School of Education during the open house event on July 22, 2011.

Orientation activities, as part of the preparation for study abroad tours, are offered to help students gain valuable and successful learning experience abroad. According to the information provided in the flier that describes Student Teaching in Australia, in order to participate in this program, students are required to attend all student teaching seminars
pertaining to their trip and also seminars that will be organized while students are in Australia (Student Teaching in Australia, n.d.). The flier also offers information about Financial Aid and scholarships for study abroad programs.

Study abroad programs are supported from the University’s budget. According to Dr. Smith, students at the Teacher Education Department can receive scholarships of $400-500 that help them participate in a study abroad tour. Those students who are granted scholarships are then required to present to other students during different events held by the School of Education and the University about their experiences (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011; Annual report, 2010).

**Study abroad programs for graduate students.** Similar to the Teacher Education Department, faculty and administrators with the Leadership Department also pay a lot of attention to study abroad programs for their graduate students. During the last few years, the Leadership Department organized several tours. Specifically, recently, a group of students were traveled to Costa Rica where besides gaining learning experiences, a partnership with the local farmers was established. Five years ago, one group went to Beijing, China; then, three years later, a group of students and faculty visited Ireland. During the Summer of 2011, one group visited Hong Kong and Beijing, China. Dr. Campbell described:

> It was 12-14 days total. It was 7 days in Hong Kong and 6 days in Beijing. Hong Kong trip was really created by my colleague and I. We stayed at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. We had 13 graduate students. They were of all levels: master’s, specialist, and doctoral. We went to different universities; we went to Polytechnic University, to City University. We went to the pre-school. And we
found a school principal who was very interested in creating a partnership with us for student teaching. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

In the Spring and Summer of 2010-2011 academic year, the Department has been organizing Study Abroad trips to Ireland and Australia (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). According to information from the flier that advertises a trip to Ireland, those students who want to participate are required to register for the Global Studies course or the Professional Studies course. Participants during their two-week trip to Ireland will have an opportunity “to visit educational institutions in K-12 and higher education within the context of Ireland’s rich history and culture” (Ireland flier, 2012).

Study abroad programs at the Leadership Department are open to a wide range of participants: those graduate students who seek credit hours, those who do not need academic credits but want to gain an international experience, and even those individuals who are family members of the student-participants. Dr. Campbell explained how the Department designed the programs to address the variety of needs by the participants. She said:

We went up to six [credit hours] because the administrators [graduate students] every five years have to have six credits. So, that was the reason to put it there, but you can take as few as one. Some of our students already took all their electives. They do not need, it but they wanted to go for an international experience. We even had two spouses go on this trip. One was a graduate from our department and his wife is currently in the department getting her doctorate. Other couple was retired K-12 teachers. So, it met different needs, and it was a good fit. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)
Before developing the content of the program, faculty members at the Leadership Department explore the needs of interested participants in order to fulfill their expectations. Dr. Campbell said, “What we had to do was to talk individually to our students about their ideas and about what they might do” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). Consider, “For example, I had one person who wanted to look at Hong Kong education system and NCLB [No Child Left Behind], how they match up. She did a lot of research before she left and gathered a lot while she was there (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

**Student experiences from the study abroad trips.** There are many evidences of the successful experiences that the students gained from their study abroad trips. Students at the Teacher Education Department who participated in the study abroad programs shared their exciting stories during the Open House event held July 22, 2011.

Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, shared the following about their recent trip to China with the students:

We went to the pre-school. It was fascinating and very hard to do, very hard to get there. One of our students told me that this was what the trip was about. She [student-participant] wants to open a charter school. Kids were very advanced, and it was a long waiting list for that private pre-school. It was fascinating. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Consider another example shared by Dr. Campbell:

The students who went on the trip [to China] had a variety of responses. Some of them just opening their eyes in creating a project as the result. They had journaling. They talked about how their world view has changed. What they have in the future…
some were doing assignments, presentations to bring back to their school districts, to
the work place. Others were concentrating on possibly doing a research. We had a
few individuals who have done research, because of which they were on the trip. (Dr.
Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Mr. Wilson, doctoral student at the Leadership Department, shared the lessons he
learned from his study abroad trip to Costa Rica:

I think in our culture we take many things for granted. Education is one of them…
Students there [in Costa Rica] would stay up late after the class talking and learning.
…They are very open in receiving ideas. They are very curious to learn. They
motivate, stimulate creativity. I used to blame our students that they did not get it…
The reality is if you make them excited about something, curious, they will learn. In
Costa Rica I started thinking that there are so many areas in those countries without
education… I started thinking how we use our resources that helping people in these
areas. Helping people around the world... (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July
11, 2011)

**Organization of the study abroad trips.** According to both department heads, all
study abroad programs offered by their departments are faculty led trips (e.g., Dr. Smith,
personal communication, July 5, 2011; Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11,
2011). International exchange programs are truly important for the University’s local and
international reputation and also for students that pay for their trips. Failures in organizing
international trips can lead to the dissatisfaction of participants and hosts and negatively
impact international partnerships between universities (Dr. Campbell, personal
communication, July 11, 2011).
Dr. Smith made it clear that the success of the trips abroad depend on relationships and collaborative work between concrete people who take this responsibility rather than between organizations. Dr. Smith said about how this work is done at the Teacher Education Department:

It is more people oriented or directed than it is anything else. What we have found is that if we have a faculty member that takes charge, they do the contacts; they do the travel, and these kinds of things. We have had a pretty good success rate of being able to develop these programs. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

In order to better organize the trips, faculty members at the Leadership Department work in pairs in which an experienced faculty member is a leader in organizing an international trip while his/her less experienced faculty fellow is gaining the required knowledge, understanding, and skills by helping the main leader. The following year, the assisting faculty member takes the leadership responsibility to prepare a new trip overseas, and another faculty member is assigned to assist, travel, and learn in order to lead the program the next time (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). Dr. Martin shared with the researcher in her interview that she participates in the meetings on preparation study abroad trips along with other faculty members at the Leadership Department (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

**Faculty members’ international experiences.** Personal international backgrounds play a very important role in the internationalization of the academic departments at the School of Education. Dr. Smith, head of the Teacher Education Department, said that all faculty members at the Department are involved in study abroad programs:
We did that [study abroad programs] ourselves. These programs are all faculty led. I have done some of this myself. I have been to London a number of times, and have also been doing some work in Hong Kong, and I will be going to the Dominican Republic here in October. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The researcher observed about 15 faculty members from the Teacher Education Department during the open house event when they presented at their booths about study abroad trips presenting photos, videos, and cultural artifacts and sharing their experiences with the crowd of attendees.

According to Dr. Campbell, everyone in the Leadership Department has personal international experience. Some faculty members organize study abroad trips while other faculty members travel abroad for conferences. Dr. Campbell pointed out, “international trips are not for everyone. Some people cannot be responsible for other people, and I am not sure that I would be personally excited to do this for undergrads… I am spoiled by working with adults” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 21, 2011).

The role of the previous dean of the School of Education was described as very important in promoting internationalization of the school. Dr. Campbell shared her personal experiences of traveling with the dean to Hong Kong. In particular, she said:

I got to know the dean [name of the previous dean] quite well on this trip to Hong Kong. We went to different institutions; we visited a couple of schools, and we found a principal who had been transferred to India. He was very interested in creating a partnership with our School and the Teacher Ed Department for student teaching. We started so many things, and her untimely death, maybe four months later, so unexpected, so quick, really-really prevented them from happening. But it gave to me
a chance to be sort of student to see how things can be done, and how does somebody, who is a dean, reach across the table, share what we have to offer, try to nurture a partnership. So I feel that I really learned from a master, and it was exciting. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 21, 2011)

Dr. White, faculty member with the Leadership Department, who is recognized as the most experienced traveler, shared that, through his active participation in the American Educational Research Association (AERA), he was invited with a small group to come to Melbourne, Australia, and go through the training on the qualitative research software Nvivo. In particular, Dr. White shared the following:

When I started my travels throughout Australia, I became part of an international academic group that the people that were leaving and still engaged in this initiative draw from the Commonwealth and really opened up doors in England, South Africa, Australia, and India. Just started traveling with this contact group to international conferences, training, conducting seminars, publishing..., very involved throughout that whole circuit. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

**Creation of the infrastructure to promote internationalization.** Several years ago, the Leadership Department established the *Global Studies Committee* to focus on developing international partnerships and integrate global learning into the curriculum. This initiative was offered by Dr. White who saw the need at the Department and at the School of Education to coordinate activities by different faculty in study abroad programs and international exchanges. Dr. White said, “We realized that we needed to formalize a process for all of that work” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011). This initiative was supported at the Leadership Department. Dr. White said, “We formed a committee of faculty
members within the department who volunteered and had an interest” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011). Another interviewee confirmed that it was the first time in the history of the Department when faculty made an explicit commitment to promote internationalization (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011). In particular, she said:

We realized that, in Leadership, we need to include into the curriculum that students need to understand globalization, the world and to understand their roles as educational leaders. In their schools, they need to take the lead in terms that their students have to understand that we now live in a global world, and the competition is global. They need to make sure that their schools and communities understand this. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Faculty members of the Leadership Department understand that international collaboration requires serious commitment. Dr. Campbell disclosed that many universities in internationally active countries like China are not interested in hosting touring groups any longer; they expect long-term productive partnerships with American universities. According to Dr. White, those faculty members who sought free trips in international programs quickly became disappointed because of the amount of work that must be done in preparation for the international trip with students.

Successful partnerships with several countries allow faculty members at the Leadership Department to think about integrating their partners into joint programs. Dr. White said:

We have a partnership with a university in Australia that is building a relationship with a university in Hong Kong around the master’s in Teachers Leadership. We are
looking at a three-way partnership where master’s level students can move and pickup courses in any of the settings. So, you will have Hong Kong students in Australia or here. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

According to Dr. Martin, the Leadership Department is planning to open international centers and teach Educational Leadership in Australia, England, and New Zealand. She said, “We will have an opportunity for comparative research because teachers everywhere are facing challenges” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

**Charter School Office and internationalization.** The Charter School Office is also involved in internationalization. According to Mr. Timothy Taylor, staff member of the Charter School Office, there is collaboration with Great Britain. In particular, he said:

The British government sends about 15 British here. Britain is taking this charter school model and implements it in England. We are working with them for about 5 years now. They follow our model very closely because, part of that, they send people over, and they take back our stuff. Teachers came over, and they went to our new charter schools that have not been created before. They have, in Britain, the exact problems as we do here. If to look at other European models, we have very similar problems. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

According to Mr. Taylor, the Charter School Center has been invited by the Saudi Arabia government to authorize and oversee schools in Saudi Arabia. He said, “Dubai, Saudi Arabia, they wanted us to be their authorizers. We were excited by that. Then we said, “Who wants to move to Saudi Arabia?” It is difficult. It sounds exciting, but it is hard to do” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).
University Support: “I Know the Door to Knock On When I Need Help”

In this section, the researcher describes the building, funding streams, grants, and non-academic University departments that provide monetary as well as non-monetary support to the departments of the School of Education.

New constructed building of the School of Education. The School of Education is located in the recently constructed building which was built with green technology (University’s website, n.d., Annual report, 2010). Mr. Wilson, doctoral student at the Leadership Department and lecturer at the School of Business, described the building of the School of Education:

When I started, it [the School of Education] was in the old building. The environment is better in this new building. I think the environment makes a difference. We can get together in this building, and we did not in the old one. It is more flexible here, more of a possibility to write on the white board, to collaborate. From this surface, from this artifact, it is prominent, recognized. It is a very prestigious building not only for the college [School of Education], but also for campus. In the School of Business, they say, “We want [a building] like the School of Education has.” (Mr. Wilson, personal communications, July 11, 2011)

Consider Dr. Campbell’s statement about the building:

What I like about this building—you just walk here and have a sense of pride. If you go to different education buildings in the state, you will see that most of them are old. So, we are very fortunate here. (Dr. Campbell, personal communications, July 11, 2011)
A representative of the Charter School Office Mr. Taylor expressed his appreciation of the fact that the Charter School Office works in this new facility. He told the researcher how the building plays an important role in the professional image of the Office as well as in partnerships that the Charter School Office maintains with other departments in the School of Education. He said, “We [the Charter School Office] needed to be very professional. When they built this new building, we were told, not asked that we would move back on campus. Now, we actively integrate our experiences with the School of Education” (Mr. Taylor, personal communications, July 5, 2011).

Dr. James Parker, the director of the Faculty Development Center, expressed his opinion about the building of the School of Education:

This is a really interesting learning environment, over there at the School of Education, and it is a beautiful auditorium. We have annual regional conference in that building. It was last May, and it went really well. People love that place a lot.

(Dr. Parker, personal communications, July 21, 2011)

**Fundraising at the School of Education.** The administration of the School of Education works proactively to attract external funding. According to the annual report of 2011, the fundraising goal of $7.5 million was set up in 2005. By June 2011, the School of Education secured over $7,100,000. Later, the School of Education received a grant from the Kresge Foundation in the amount of $800,000. Donations to the School of Education in 2010-2011 were accomplished at 80% of the goal for the 2010-2011 fiscal year. According to information in the annual report, the School did not reach the goal for 2010-2011 because an annual gift of $300,000 to the Charter School Office was transferred to the National
Charter Schools Institute which is neither affiliated with the School nor the University (Annual Report, 2011).

**Internal grant programs at the School of Education.** In 2010-2011, the Dean’s Office at the School of Education provided over $16,000 to support individual faculty members’ and departmental projects, $6,000 more than the previous year. Over $45,000 was spent in 2010-2011 to support conferences and speakers at the School of Education. This expenditure doubled in comparison to the prior year (2009-2010) when the School of Education spent $22,000 for similar activities. Each new faculty member at the School of Education is allocated $4,000 of the professional development fund for his/her research and teaching (Annual Report, 2010; Annual Report, 2011).

The annual report described large grants that the School of Education received during 2010-2011. In particular, the graduate program in Special Education received a scholarship endowment of $300,000 to support graduate studies. The staff from a non-academic department received a $75,000 Provost Award to upgrade the interior design. Another non-academic center at the School of Education which provides professional learning experiences for teachers and administrators from more than 70 schools throughout the state received a grant from the state’s Department of Education in the amount of $2.1 million (Annual Report, 2011).

The Teacher Education Department has its own grant programs available for both faculty members and students. For example, Dr. Lee from the Teacher Education Department stated that departmental funds were created from private contributions to support research and international initiatives. Every year, approximately $12,000 is distributed
among faculty members of the Teacher Education Department in order to support their projects. Dr. Lee shared the following about this resource:

There is a grant at our college. These funds were private contributions. It supports research and international initiatives. Every year, faculty members receive about $12,000 for their projects. Only for Teacher Education grants. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

The Teacher Education Department supports students with different types of scholarships. The annual report stated that the Teacher Education Department “awarded 27 scholarships to 36 students in teacher education for an award total of $57,680” (Annual Report, 2011). Student scholarships are also offered to participants of study abroad programs. Dr. Larry Smith, the department head, said:

Our students can get a $400 or $500 scholarship to go overseas or to do something international. They are required to speak as to what they learned and what they have done during their trips. So these students, when they come back, will talk at these open houses; they will talk at these receptions and things like that, so that is the way they pay back the time that they are gone. (Dr. Smith, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Grant-writing activities.** The School of Education set the 2010-2011 goal for the faculty which was aimed to “increase participation of more units across the school in grant-writing activity” (Annual Report, 2011). The report shows that four out of five departments have received new external funding over the past year and “have been very successful in securing significant grants and contracts” (Annual Report, 2011). During the 2010-2011 academic years, School of Education faculty submitted 41 grant proposals. Thirty three
(80%) of those proposals were funded in comparison to 25 (83%) funded grants of 30 submitted in 2009-2010 (Annual Report, 2011).

A majority of faculty members interviewed for this study have extensive experience in grant writing. For example, every year during her five years with the Teacher Education Department, Dr. Natalie Lee received internal and external grants to support her research and international projects. She shared that the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the University helps and guides the faculty with their research ideas. This Office provides small grants to help faculty members obtain a “course release” and work on their research projects.

Dr. Lee stated:

It is a force to receive grants for research. In order to be paid for your research, you have to create an activity to collect data. […] There is an institute, called the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. If you have an idea, you can call them. They meet with you, support and guide you in your idea implementation. They help you to find the information that you need. They are very helpful. They give grants for research. They inspired me to conduct a pilot study and then apply for a big grant. With their help I received a larger grant from an outside organization. They helped me with my grant application that I prepared. They read through my application and suggested improvement. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

It was also found that grant-writing is very valuable for the Leadership Department. For example, a group of faculty members from the Leadership Department received a grant from the Faculty Development Center to support activities on an interdisciplinary project (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Dr. Barbara Martin (personal communication, October 28, 2011) has experience in working with grant-makers at the state
level as well as Dr. Daniel White also has extremely extensive grant-writing experience. Dr. White stated the following about himself, “Really, that is how I started it all. I had quite a reserve of discretionary travel money because I was very good at grants. Because I had this grant reserve of discretionary funds, I traveled a great deal” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 21, 2011).

Dr. Elizabeth Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, stated that grant-writing for large projects is the next step in their Department. She explained that the faculty members of the Department have created an infrastructure in order to support the innovative work of the Department. She continued, “Now when you have it in place we are able to go to the next step in grant projects” (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

**Charter School Office.** The collected data shows that the Charter School Office is a resourceful and active creator of new revenue streams. The Charter School Office staff uses different sources of funding and continuously work to build new flows of funds.

The main income, allowing the Charter School Office to exist and operate successfully, is drawn from the Federal budget. As a legitimate charter school authorizer, the Charter School Office receives three percent of Student Aid federal dollars. Approximately 60 charter schools authorized by this Office create a sustainable income. Using these funds, the Charter Schools Office runs smoothly and independently from the budget of the University and the School of Education. Mr. Timothy Taylor, staff member of the Charter School Office, stated that the Office pays ten percent of its Federal allocation to the University for use of its systems and services. The interviewee pointed out that the Charter School Office generates additional revenue from the programs and services that it has created.
and now delivers to external consumers throughout the state, nationally, and even internationally.

Per the interviewee, the Charter School Office does not seek funding from grantmakers in order to preclude itself from undue influence of external organizations. Mr. Taylor said, “If the big foundations would give us money, they will tell us what to do and how…” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

In addition, the Office does not seek private donations although the interviewee admitted that one unplanned donation was received. An attendee at an event organized by the Charter School Office donated funds to help the Charter School Office in creating an efficient data system (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

The Charter School Office collaborates with the Teacher Education Department providing job and student-teaching placements to students in authorized charter schools (Dr. Smith, Mr. Taylor, personal communication, 2011). The Charter School Office staff members organize trips for high school students attending the University campus as potential college students. The staff members also teach sections on charter schools in the Teacher Education courses. The Charter School Office also partners with the Leadership Department; for example, the master’s degree program for Charter School Leaders was created by the Leadership Department in collaboration with the Charter School Office.

**Faculty Development Center.** Initially, the researcher did not plan to explore activities organized for faculty members by the Faculty Development Center. The fact that many of the interviewees frequently referred to the Center encouraged the researcher to look closer at this unit. It was found that the Faculty Development Center plays a very important role for faculty members across campus. According to information from the Faculty
Development Center website, the Center stimulates the faculty to initiate ideas for non-traditional teaching to increase student learning (website, n.d.).

Dr. James Parker, Director of the Faculty Development Center, remarked that the Center is “independent of any college and department” of the University. The Center was created ten years ago as a “one-person shop” but it now has six full-time staff and two part-time staff members of which one works remotely from California. Staff members’ goals are to bring relevant information, knowledge, and learning technologies from outside to the University to promote the development of the instruction across the University to positively impact student learning (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

When Dr. Natalia Lee from the Teacher Education Department described her experiences with the Faculty Development Center, she said:

I know the door to knock on when I need help to use technology. Now, it is a requirement to teach online. When I came to the university, it was not required. Now, it is a force. The Faculty Development Center helps with workshops for teaching online. They help me to build my personal webpage. They also help with all new technologies… (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

The Faculty Development Center is also known on campus as the Center for Innovative Teaching. This name reflects the proactive approach of the Center to reach out to faculty, departments, and programs across campus (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011). A welcoming note on the Faculty Development Center website states, “Overall, we can assist you with just about any aspect of teaching and learning that you can imagine, from classroom observations to Blackboard to organizing digital information to moving beyond PowerPoint presentations” (University’s website, n.d.).
The Faculty Development Center offers training that involves teaching both basic skills and advanced knowledge of usage of the learning technologies. Dr. Parker explained, “It is not only how to use the technology… Clickers, for example… not only know how to technically use them, but about the appropriate teaching-learning way how to use them, how to combine learning technology with the instructional design” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

According to Dr. James Parker, the Faculty Development Center attempts to reach out to all departments and programs to increase their involvement in faculty development programs. In particular, he said:

We want to work not only with individuals and do consulting, class observations. We want to work with the departments. Let’s say all department faculty are here, around the table, and let’s explore what their teaching practices are. How do you want to move forward to a continuous improvement model? There are about 40 departments [at the University], and there are programs within the departments, about 300 programs. So, we want to work with the programs, their courses. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Faculty members participate in conferences and workshops organized by the Faculty Development Center. According to the University’s website, the Faculty Development Center serves approximately 500 university faculty members annually. The calendar of the Center is overfilled with the activities. For instance, during the 2011 Winter semester (January-April), more than 100 educational events were offered for the faculty and staff. During the month of September 2011, a total of 31 training sessions and workshops were held. These professional activities are open to everyone affiliated with the University as well
as external attendees. The researcher participated in a webinar in which there were 20 other active participants. The “Less than an Hour Webinar” on the topic “Got Engagement?” was on the topic of integrating service learning into academic courses.

The Faculty Development Center supports joint faculty activities with grants and collects data from participants to explore how faculty-faculty teamwork impacts student achievements and their motivation in learning. Every year, innovative faculty members receive annual awards from the Faculty Development Center for their work with students (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

The Faculty Development Center emphasizes innovative teaching. Many video presentations recorded by the Center are posted on its website. Some of these videos show actual classrooms where faculty members introduce teaching techniques with a high level of student engagement. The other videos show recorded workshops on usage learning technologies.

Every year, the Faculty Development Center sponsors a regional conference on Teaching and Learning. These conferences take place in the School of Education building because this new facility is equipped with all of the new technologies that allow the organizers to run conferences with a high level of quality. According to the School of Education annual report, more than 500 students from the Teacher Education Department participated in the conference in 2010. The theme of the conference held in 2012 was Are Your Students Learning?: Identifying and Building Optimal Learning Environments (University’s website, n.d.).

The Faculty Development Center offers two grant programs for faculty members at the University. Through the professional growth grant program, the Faculty Development
Center encourages faculty members to apply their creativity, develop innovative instructional techniques, and disseminate their innovative ideas among the larger academic community. In order to be eligible for funding, the applicants must “focus on innovations in instructional development. The innovations must be applicable at the collegiate level” (University’s website, n.d.).

Another small grant program supports faculty travel to other institutions for the purpose of identifying the best practices in service learning in order to bring these practices back to the University and integrate them into academic courses.

The Faculty Development Center also encourages grant-writing, offering letters of support for faculty members who seek external or internal funding for a research or an action project which involves student learning (University’s website, n.d.).

**Center for Off-Campus Programs.** The Center for Off-Campus Programs is an important unit; it provides support to academic departments to launch programs in off-campus locations and/or to develop an online format for the programs. Ms. Moore, staff member at the Center for Off-Campus Programs, described the resources that the Center has:

We have about 200 employees, and we deliver the courses all across the US as well as in Canada and Mexico. This department is the organization that develops online courses and delivers online courses. We do have a kind of own admission group, registration group, financial aid group that focus on serving non-traditional off-campus and online students. […] We work with administrators of colleges to find out what programs are attractive to students off-campus; then we work with that department to see what we can offer. (Ms. Moore, personal communication, October 28, 2011)
Dr. Mary Carter, the director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, called the Center an *innovative arm* of the University. She said that the Center has investment funds that are used to start new off-campus and online programs. Dr. Carter said:

We have start–up capital. A lot of times schools cannot move further without that investment. If the idea is attractive to market, we can cover the cost. They [schools] have to cover ongoing cost because revenue goes back to schools. So, we can help them with the initial part. Traditional colleges may be cautious about initial investments. They understand the ongoing cost, but they do not know about how to start. (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

As Dr. Carter pointed out, revenue from the programs goes directly to the academic departments where faculty members and department chairs make decisions on how to use those funds. This mechanism holds departments accountable for the quality of the content, the instruction of the off-campus and online programs, and encourages faculty to create new programs and make them successful in order to allocate more monetary resources (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

However, according to Dr. Carter, the opportunity to generate revenues does not always mean that the academic departments are ready and willing to work in this direction. Dr. Carter stated that the Center for Off-Campus Programs communicates actively with the academic departments and makes a lot of adjustments in collaborations and establishing “a common ground” (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Dr. Carter mentioned that the continuous re-structuring across campus is a direct result of frequent changes in leadership. Challenges in communication arise, when a department head is replaced by a new person, and the staff of the Center for Off-Campus Programs experiences a
need to rebuild the relationships with the department and reconsider the collaborative work; this adds extra time and efforts to develop, launch, or deliver programs (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011). Staff members urge departments to develop programs for off-campus sites and online students. They also offer training for faculty on how to work online and encourage initiatives by the departments in creating new programs. Dr. Carter said:

We have a pretty direct culture here. We can go in and talk to the department chair, and they start to work together again, and we can go forward. It is not really that easy to work, but we try to overcome these obstacles and work together. We are trying to find a balance and boundaries. The balance between academic freedom and what is going on with the class. We are always looking for that balance. (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Obstacles for Entrepreneurial Transformation: “It Was a Threat, a Threat to Change”

This section describes the challenges that the faculty and staff members of the School of Education and the University face while implementing their ideas related to the creation of new programs, services, or developing their external partnerships. The following sub-themes were identified under the theme of Obstacles for entrepreneurial transformation: (1) Charter School Office experience of resistance; (2) Individual risk of being away; (3) Resistance to change toward the market; (4) Institutional barriers for entrepreneurship; (5) Difficulties with licensing programs and services.

Charter School Office experience of resistance. The section provides information received from only one source. Because this study involved only one representative from the Charter School Office, it was not possible to triangulate these data.
Charter School Office is a department that represents a new alternative avenue to traditional public education. At the beginning of its existence, the Office experienced a lot of tension within and outside of the University. Mr. Taylor recalled the following:

At that time, the public education industry was very negative of charters. It was a threat, a threat to change, a threat to who they were because they felt that traditional districts were so ingrained in cement and that they could not change. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

The conflict that came from outside of the University was caused by political tensions in the state. Mr. Taylor described:

In the very beginning, there was a lot of political heat. They [politicians] wanted to stop charter schools. So, some political entities got to the Attorney General to come in and audit us. They said, “Are you doing what you are supposed to?” and they do it all the time. The problem was when they came in that they could not tell us what we were supposed to do because they even did not know. They came to punish us. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Mr. Taylor continued the story:

They [audit] were here for two years, and at the end they said, “We cannot tell you if you are doing things right because we do not know what the right things are, but, in general, there are things that you are not doing…” What they did, they looked at their experiences as public institutions, what things that you have to have. This gave us a kind of road map. So, we used that as a road map of how to create policies, procedures, and mechanisms that sophisticated institutions have. We had to do that because we were creating public institutions in order to pass an audit. Then we
started doing business things, standardizing forms, and developing procedures. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Resistance also came from the school districts that did not want to accept the idea of charter schools. Consider what Mr. Taylor said about those schools: “There was a lot of friction. A lot of animosity and a lot of anger. There were a lot of threats. School districts refused to take student teachers that went to school here...” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

The internal conflict that the Charter School Office experienced came from the School of Education. Mr. Taylor said, “The School of Education had people who did not like what we were doing, and we were actually pushed to stay off-campus. They did not want to talk to us. They did not like us” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

The resistance to the Charter School Office and charter school movement was accompanied by miscommunications. In order to deal with miscommunications and misunderstandings, the Charter School Office conducted trainings for its employees. Mr. Taylor recalled:

It is a very common concept where the threats on miscommunication are. The unions and associations kicked in and started to miss-feed information. In the old days, when we brought staff on, we would actually train people on how to handle that. That is another reason why we all wear suits. We are all very formal here because the idea is that we need to represent a more formal and professional environment to show that we are professionals. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

As a result of the tensions within the School of Education, the Charter School Office was placed in a building that was located off-campus. According to the interviewee:
What happened is that we were pushed off-campus. So, we built an environment that was more of a professional, law office, business like environment… That was very non-traditional in public education. We needed to be very professional. Over time, when the University built this new building, we were told, not asked, that we would move back to campus. At that time, the culture at the School of Education had changed. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2012)

Today, when the charter school movement has been proven over years and has spread nationally, the Charter School Office collaborates effectively with academic departments at the University as well as many external organizations.

**Individual risk of being away.** Those faculty members who build external networking may be challenged by their colleagues for not being physically present in the department for a period of time. Dr. Daniel White, Leadership Department faculty member, pointed out the potential risk for a faculty in spending time far away from colleagues in the Department. Dr. White said that it is important to know beforehand about this threat:

If you are going up for tenure and promotion and you are away from campus for what appears to be personal agenda interests, your colleagues may hold it against you because you are not there supporting them. There could also be a level of jealousy even though they did not step up to go. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2012)

**Resistance to change toward the market.** Resistance to change toward the market is still in place, and some academic departments at the University do not show the openness and readiness to change their traditional way of doing things. For example, Ms. Tammy Harris, graduate assistant with the Leadership Department, disclosed that her husband works
as a professor for another school of this University, and she knows from him, “there is no collaboration, open sharing at his department like it is here [at the Leadership Department]” (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 28, 2011). She said:

This is not always a case with my husband’s department. His department is more fragmented. In the Arts environment, when people are doing different arts, painting, sculpture, ceramics, other arts, people really stick to their own little piece. They are pushed to go through some change now, but it is painful. (Ms. Harris, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Dr. Carter, Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, stated that not all faculty members are willing to work for creating off-campus and online programs. Dr. Carter said, “We attend a lot of meetings, have coffee with faculty… Faculty [members] are very different. Some of them are motivated, others are not interested… some could say, ‘if you pay me extra I will do that’” (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

**Institutional barriers for entrepreneurship.** There are also some institutional barriers that faculty have to overcome in order to implement their innovative ideas. Dr. Daniel White stated that there are many University policies and requirements that a faculty member has to learn and follow prior to organizing a study abroad trip. He said:

Entrepreneurship is all about creativity, individual effort, and managing the risk as an individual. Organizational structures are all about preventing it [entrepreneurialism] in some degree. If you have a novice faculty who want to branch out and enter this world of entrepreneurial engagement of international experiences, they have to somehow overcome that barrier. It is a serious challenge. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)
Dr. White explained that all these policies and procedures exist to protect the University. He made the following point:

They [policies] are there to protect the University. They are not there for a faculty member. Their role is to protect the University, and there is a need for that. You do not want some faculty member, who is incompetent, to endanger students, or damage the reputation of the University. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

It was found that, occasionally, faculty members do not feel enough appreciation from the University for investing their personal time and efforts in building and maintaining the University prestige and reputation. Dr. Jones said the following:

It is a part of our work. There is no extra pay, no funding. It is part of our work to keep our Department running. […] I think this is a little frustrating. We, as program directors, build these programs for the University, build its prestige, reputation. We bring money, students, or state awards. We get nothing. I get hurt. Nobody holds a gun to my head making me do it. I cannot say that they make me do it, but I am at the point that I have done enough. People just do this as part of their job. (Dr. Jones, personal communications, July 11, 2011)

**Difficulties with licensing programs and services.** Another institutional obstacle that does not allow the Charter School Office to simply create products and sell them in the market is the fact that the University is a public institution with educational purposes and people have to implement the institutional mission. Mr. Taylor asked a rhetorical question, “How would you know that you are not going too far away from your missions?” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Mr. Taylor believes that one of the reasons for having problems with selling a product is the fact that the University “historically had not
done a lot of intellectual property licensing” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

Talking about the problems with licensing of new products that were created by the staff at the Charter School Office on public money, Mr. Taylor brought up the example of a digital phone service. This innovation came into demand by many organizations that are charter school authorizers and they wanted to purchase this digital phone service system. However, because of the public funding source, it was very difficult to find a way to sell the digital phone service to the external organizations. Mr. Taylor shared the following:

We wrote a license, and we have been doing that for 7-8 years. It has good revenue, but it is different from creating a vaccine. Money come from public funds and must be spent for the charter schools that we authorized. But what to do if others want this service too? We cannot simply give it to them for free, and we cannot sell it. So, we needed to figure it out. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture: “We Challenge Each Other in Our Department to See Where We Can Go for Our Market”**

This section describes the sub-themes in the theme of the organizational culture of the School of Education and the University. The following sub-themes were identified within the Organizational Culture: (1) Role of the former dean of the School of Education in creating the organizational culture; (2) Value of diversity of professional expertise; (3) Appreciation of the support system by faculty; (4) Supportive environment and proactive culture in the Teacher Education Department; (5) Entrepreneurial spirit in the Leadership Department; (6) Entrepreneurial culture of the Charter School Office; (7) Uniqueness requirements for individual charter schools; (8) Ongoing changes at the School of Education;
(9) Center for Off-Campus Programs and changes across campus; (10) Collaboration as personal responsibility; (11) Engaging Culture at the Faculty Development Center, and (12) Entrepreneurial language.

**Role of the former Dean in creating an organizational culture.** Several interviewees from the School of Education mentioned the former dean who unexpectedly passed away a few years ago. The interviewees recognized and appreciated the fact that the former dean created a supportive and creative atmosphere at the School of Education. Dr. Lee said:

> When I came to this university, we had another dean [name of the dean]. She was an amazing person. She had an ability to see the core of the things. She had a great vision. She was a very supportive person. She was able to recognize great ideas and support them. She established a culture for creativity at School [of Education]. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, told the researcher how she traveled abroad with the former dean to prepare a study abroad program. In particular, she said:

> We used the contacts that were established through the former dean. She always worried about how our students are doing. She even traveled to those locations. If students teach in Ghana, she travels to Ghana. She was nurturing those sorts of things. It was really nice. (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

**Appreciation of support system by faculty.** Faculty members and students recognize and appreciate the support services that are available for them at the University (Dr. Lee, Mr. Wilson, Dr. White, Dr. Martin, Dr. Jones, personal communications, 2011).
For example, Dr. Martin expressed her excitement regarding support on campus the following way:

If you have an idea, there are enough people here to listen to you and support you. Support comes from our Faculty Research Support Center, it is other things. […] We have amazing resources, off-campus librarian work for off-campus students. I feel that the support network for our programs is outstanding. (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Dr. Jones also pointed out the resources at the University that the faculty members use:

We have here the Faculty Research and Creative Endeavors Center. This is the place where people ask for money to support their ideas. That means that they have done the research, and they need support to go to the conferences to present, or publish, or whatever they need to do. We have several programs for research that are available for faculty. (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Consider another example by Dr. Jones regarding available resources on campus that help faculty members explore the market and promote their programs: “We have a huge Marketing department for off-campus. We have a couple of people who work full-time in Marketing there, and I meet with them often. This is their job, and they know how to do that” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

**Supportive environment at the Teacher Education Department.** Interviewees from the Teacher Education Department and the faculty members and students, who were interviewed during the open house event at the School of Education, expressed similar
thoughts regarding the atmosphere at the Teacher Education Department. Dr. Natalia Lee said the following about the Teacher Education Department:

I feel that the atmosphere here is very good, very supportive. I feel very comfortable here. From the beginning, I felt that people here treat me as a human. At my previous institution, it was different. Everything was very ruled, determined. Everyone was busy with his or her own stuff. People did not pay attention to others very much. It was a very bureaucratic organization. It is very different here. Here, everyone has been nurturing. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 22, 2011)

A sophomore student who was interviewed during the open house event said:
I like to be here… There are many things that you can do here… They [Teacher Education Department] have many study abroad programs. You can be a leader in many projects for students… Like here, I am responsible for this booth, so I can practice communicating with people. They [faculty members] really want me to become a good teacher and help me with everything I need.” (University student, personal communication, July 21, 2011)

Dr. Larry Smith, head of the Teacher Education Department, discussed the very proactive attitude of the faculty at his Department. Dr. Natalia Lee confirmed the very proactive attitude of faculty members by sharing the following about herself as a researcher, faculty, and organizer of the international exchange programs. She said about her work:

This year, I choose to teach a master’s course on Foundations of Assessment and Performance. It is a challenging class for students because this course is very advanced and difficult for students to understand because it is filled in with scholar terminology, assumptions, and new theories. I also decided to challenge myself with
the new format of teaching called Lecture and Practice at Schools. With my little children, to pick an advanced class was probably not a very good decision, but I felt bored to teach same classes where I teach smoothly, and have all the materials and activities ready. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 22, 2011)

According Dr. Lee, she experiences support outside of her Department when she communicates with other University units. For example, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs supports faculty research ideas in many ways. Dr. Lee shared her experience in collaborating with the Office of Research:

If you have an idea, you can call them. They meet with you, support and guide you in your idea implementation. They help you to find the information you need. They are very helpful. They give grants for research. They inspired me to conduct a pilot study and then apply it for a big [external] grant. What amazed me was that they remembered my name and recognized me by my voice when I called them. (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

**Entrepreneurial spirit at the Leadership Department.** All interviewees from the Leadership Department expressed their excitement of working in a creative environment. Dr. Martin described people at the Leadership Department the following way:

My head spins every time I come here. I need to learn how to say “No” to something, but this is a group of unique personalities. Everybody has something. Everybody has the heart of a learner. This is a core, and that means that everyone thinks: “What do I have to do to make things happen?” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)
She also said, “The spirit in this Department is about: “What else can I do? What can I help with?” People are not stopped with publishing an article that is required for tenure” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011). In discussing the creativity and entrepreneurialism at the Department, Dr. Daniel White said:

In our department, we promote creativity. It is leadership… We deal with the culture and change. For creativity, culture, and change we are talking about the foundational elements of entrepreneurship. We do not use the term “entrepreneurship,” but we are definitely engaging it in practice. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

Dr. David Jones, another faculty member, stated what he feels about the Department: I am excited to be here. I like this entrepreneurial focus we have here. This is about the world as it is. I am trying to do what I can do. I am trying to find something in what I am interested in and at what I am good. It is about Charter School [online master’s degree] program, and now we are doing Teacher Leadership [online master’s degree program]. (Dr. Jones, personal communications, July 11, 2011)

Consider another quote from the interview with Dr. Jones, “I have always been interested in entrepreneurial spirit … I think that spirit that you see here is somewhat unique” (Dr. Jones, personal communications, July 11, 2011).

Dr. Campbell, head of the department, said that she is proud of the work that the people in the Department do, “It is pretty amazing when you think that ten people do all of this…” (Dr. Campbell, personal communications, July 11, 2011). Dr. Daniel White, in particular, said:

We challenge each other in our department to see where we can go for our market.
We are not competing with other local universities; we are competing with ourselves. It is a big world out there. What do we want to be and what do we want to do? (Dr. White, personal communications, July 28, 2011)

According to Dr. Martin, people in the Leadership Department trust each other and respect each other’s work. She said, “I like the very strong work ethics here. You work not because someone looks over your shoulder. Nobody does” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Faculty members expressed confidence that their future programs will also be successful. Speaking about Charter School Leadership online master’s degree program and Teacher Leadership master’s degree program, Dr. David Jones said, “I do not know what will be the next step after these two programs, but there must be something. We need to keep in-depth in the market, especially, with the technology is part of it (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011).

The following quote from the interview with Dr. Barbara Martin contributes to the evidence of the supportive environment for innovative ideas that the people experience in the School of Education: “The best thing that we can do is to give wings to someone’s idea, so it can fly” (Dr. Barbara Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Students also feel support, encouragement, and trust while working with the faculty members on departmental projects. Margaret Robinson, doctoral student and graduate assistant, shared her thoughts and impressions, “They [faculty] put high expectations; they provide support and understand our limitations. I did not expect that they would think that I can do all the things. It is a lot of trust” (Ms. Robinson, personal conversation, October 28, 2011).
When faculty members select a faculty candidate for the Department, they expect that this person is able and has experiences in collaboration with different organizations. Dr. Daniel White said:

When I am on a hiring committee, I look for how they [candidates] express their creativity other than the very boring traditional ways of doing their jobs. That is one of the big indicators for me. What they are doing with their partnerships, their professional networks, and their professional funding to support those agendas. (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

Dr. White pointed out that successful grant experience of a faculty candidate “shows that this person is capable of reaching outside the traditional organization. They [candidates] see their roles beyond those walls, and they are bringing this other world into their world” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 22, 2011).

Mr. Jeff Wilson, doctoral student in the Leadership Department and a lecturer at the School of Business, compared these two departments. He pointed out that the Leadership Departments is more entrepreneurial and innovative than the department where he works at the School of Business. Mr. Wilson told the researcher that from his point of view:

The School of Business is dramatically different from the School of Education because they [people at the School of Business] have kind of different perspective. They always focused on a business. Everything is for-profit. Food product, food services, health care – all about profit. Ironically saying, before, I never thought about students and education. Here is a completely different perspective. Even, I am a student; I did not think about this. (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 5, 2011)
Mr. Jeff Wilson concluded that the atmosphere is more creative and entrepreneurial at the School of Education than at the School of Business. He said:

The culture over there [at the School of Business] is more about serving clients, customers. And I am not sure whether it is good or bad. I think it is more *business-like* relationships. Here, at the School of Education, it is more embraced and focused on how students learn. I think that it is more flexible here, in [School of] Education… creative and entrepreneurial. (Mr. Wilson, personal communications, July 11, 2011)

**Entrepreneurial culture of the Charter School Office.** According to Mr. Timothy Taylor, the Charter Schools Office has been an *entrepreneurial unit* from the beginning of its creation. The staff of the Office is represented by professionals from different fields such as finance, accounting, travel industry, science, law, and business. This diversity maintains the business culture in the Office. Per Mr. Taylor, the Charter Schools Office has a business dress code. He stated, “We do not have casual Fridays. You always wear suits” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). The people at the Charter School Office work closely together for the common goals. Mr. Taylor said:

Everyone wanted it to happen. People, who knew what curriculum looks like, and people, who understand finance, were very tied together. We have different people at the table because everything is so intertwined in public education. Everyone has to work together in order to move on. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Mr. Taylor emphasized that the people at the Office are very creative and entrepreneurial:
We always were entrepreneurial. We change things very, very quickly. We would get together as a whole group and talk a lot about “Why is this not happening?” or “How do we want to be perceived?” or “What is the value?” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

Mr. Taylor believes that for new organizational members, it is important to understand the culture of the Charter School Office and expectations. The interviewee said:

A great entrepreneurial environment has great stories, and stories are a part of the culture, and the culture is a part of the big process. People, who did not live through it, hear these stories and kind of feel themselves as a part of it, and they know what we are, and why we are what we are. (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011)

**Ongoing changes across the Campus.** It was found that the culture at the School of Education is open to constant and ongoing changes. Describing their current state, the head of the Leadership Department pointed out:

We have been a department in transition, at many levels, for many years… In recent years, what we had to do is to significantly change our practice… What we did was we started going off-campus. So, now we are in all over the place… We are in different areas… all over… We are very proud of ourselves. And it is pretty amazing when you think that ten people do all of this… (Dr. Campbell, personal communication, July 11, 2011)

Another interviewee echoed:

We have a lot of changes. Many of them because of demands of the field which is, if to get back to that entrepreneurial piece, that if [you] do not function in this way, you
are not going to exist… So, I have been very fortunate to be in the Department which is creative and looks at things and says, “We can do it.” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Other departments of the University also experience changes and move toward creating new programs and taking the programs off-campus. Dr. Carter, Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, disclosed how different departments across campus are involved in the process of creating of non-traditional programs:

Some departments are easy. Some kind of all come together, in general. Some are bifurcated. You have some people who support, and you have some people who say, “No, we want to stay absolutely here and do what we do in our building, the programs we have had, and the courses we have had.” For the most, they are somewhere in the middle. (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

According to Dr. Carter, more innovative ideas come to the Center for Off-Campus Programs from departments across campus. Consider:

Even the Arts are starting to say, “Wait a minute, there is a big field for this.”

Traditionally, it was more in a Business Administration field, but it goes more in the soft sciences. It also goes to the lab sciences now… to have a lab in a box… It is truly everywhere now. (Dr. Carter, personal communication, October 29, 2011)

Collaboration as personal responsibility. The collected data show that collaborations and interactions across departments within and beyond the School of Education are common for people who work there. Many of the interviewees feel that it is their personal responsibility to establish and maintain collaborations with people across campus. Consider what Mr. Timothy Taylor, staff with the Charter School Office said, “This
is also a part of my job to make all these connections” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Also consider the saying by Dr. Jones from the Leadership Department who said, “It is a part of me, as Program Director, to gather all of those people to see what we are thinking about, what they can do for us” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Another example refers to Dr. Daniel White who, several years ago, initiated the creation of a Global Studies Committee that focuses on developing internationalization on the level of departments and the School of Education. Dr. White shared:

It is in my nature, as a professional, to try to build networks and relationships. It was my initiative to form the Global Studies Committee. I have met with the Dean; I have met with other department heads, and I presented to the School. At the department level, I have taken the initiative to try to get us to work together. At the school level, I have taken the initiative by meeting with the Dean, by presenting at a school-wide meeting on a panel dealing with international activities. My big message to the audience was: “You and your departments need to do what we are doing with the committee and work together so that we can all work together for the good of the school.” (Dr. White, personal communication, July 28, 2011)

While working together, people on campus develop a collaborative and supportive culture. Ms. Margaret Harris, graduate assistant with the Leadership Department, pointed out, “We want to move more towards learning community. And being a true learning community, you have to involve everyone. The input by people is very valuable” (Mr. Harris, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Dr. Parker made a clear point that it is impossible to achieve the goals in academia by acting alone. He said, “A leader needs a team” and explained that many of the programs at
the Faculty Development Center focus on creating communities such as a community of scholars and community of learners (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 22, 2011). In his work environment, Dr. Parker uses brainstorming meetings with his subordinates “to test whether they accept, understand, and support the ideas” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 22, 2011). This tactic helps him reduce the resistance of co-workers. Dr. Parker pointed out that it was necessary to create the conditions that engage people in the decision-making process by allowing them to try new things. When an innovative idea comes from a person who has an authority, it is important that subordinates support the idea and are willing to invest their time and efforts to turn the idea to a program or service. Dr. Parker said:

I am new here for 2 years. There is always some skepticism about my ideas. I like to brainstorm: “What do you think about this idea?” “Hmmm… We are not sure that we want to do that…” When I came up with this one-hour conference, I said: “Let’s do a one-hour conference instead of three-day time…” They were not too sure about that. The staff is good, but you have to build some trust among your colleagues.

Once your idea got working, when people see that the idea works, it goes further. (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 22, 2011)

**Entrepreneurial language.** Because language is one of the most important elements of a culture (Clark, 2004; Etzkowitz, 2003; Gibb, 2000; Mair, 2005; Stevenson, 2000), the researcher drew 18 key words and their synonyms that comprise an *entrepreneurial language* from the relevant literature and screened the interviewees’ narratives for frequencies of use of the *entrepreneurial vocabulary*. The analyzed words were the following: 1) Create/Creativity, 2) Idea, 3) Innovate/Innovation, 4) Change, 5) International/Global, 6)
Entrepreneurial, 7) Market, 8) Business, 9) Opportunity, 10) Unique/Different, 11) Grant/Research, 13) Support, 14) Money/Revenue/Funding, 15) Competition, 16) Collaboration/Partnership, 17) Sources/Resources, 18) Team/Teamwork. The chart below (Figure 9) shows the frequency of the entrepreneurial words in the interviews with study participants.

Figure 9. Frequency of usage of the entrepreneurial language.

Consider some examples from the interviews. Mr. Wilson while describing the Leadership Department said, “I think they are trying new ideas and different things… I think Dr. Campbell is really innovative” (Mr. Wilson, personal communication, July 11, 2011). Dr. David Jones noted, “I am excited to be here. I like this entrepreneurial focus we have here. This is about the world as it is” (Dr. Jones, personal communication, July 11, 2011). Mr. Taylor was very explicit in the entrepreneurial terms. He said, “People refer to us [the Charter School Office] as being entrepreneurial and innovative... We constantly changed our organization, literally, every month… Great entrepreneurial environment…” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011).
According to Mr. Taylor, the Charter School Office asks the leaders and administrators of their charter schools, “If you do the same as others, then how different are you? […] What are you creating that is going to be innovative? […] We wanted each school to have a creative idea to deliver the state mandate curriculum in their own unique way which is different than the neighbor down the street does” (Mr. Taylor, personal communication, July 5, 2011). Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, used the words create, creative, and creativity 15 times in her interview. Dr. Parker, the Director of the Faculty Development Center, repeated the word innovation 24 times in different contexts during his one-hour interview.

Besides the entrepreneurial words, the interviewees brought up the metaphors. For example, Dr. Barbara Martin said, “When an idea is thrown up, we need to give it wings, so it can fly. The best thing that we can do is to give wings to someone’s idea…” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).
Chapter 5: Conclusions

For this dissertation study, the researcher developed a working definition of an entrepreneurial university which can be found in Chapter 1 and which is repeated here: An entrepreneurial university is a higher educational organization that actively participates in the global market addressing educational, social, and economic demands of society by transferring knowledge to innovations and by preparing students to succeed in the globalizing world. The wider definition suggests that an entrepreneurial university is a self-steering, self-reliant, and progressive higher education institution that is reflective to the external demands of competitive and changeable markets. An entrepreneurial university is an organization that recognizes the complexities of the globalizing world and develops an organizational culture that supports and encourages faculty, staff, and students to work creatively in identifying and pursuing opportunities to transfer knowledge to innovations, products and services that obtain economic and social values that are in demand by society. An entrepreneurial university seeks ways to allocate those resources, which traditionally are considered as unreachable. An entrepreneurial university prepares students to succeed in the globalizing world. It is important to notice that this definition was built on scholarly contributions by Altbach (2004), Clark (2004), Etzkowitz (2003, 2004), Kuratko (2005), Stevenson (2000), Gibb (2000), Mair (2005), and others.

The purpose of this Chapter is three-fold: first, the researcher attempted to conduct an analysis of the core emergent themes among the others; second, to analyze the collected data and emergent themes in relation to the theoretical concepts that were used in building the definition of an entrepreneurial university, and, finally, to address the guiding research questions formulated for this study.
In the previous Chapter, the researcher described the qualitative data using the thematic analysis. A review of 14 emergent themes led to the establishment of five major categories: (1) Entrepreneurial Individuals; (2) Environmental Factors; (3) Organizational Behaviors; (4) Organizational Outcomes; and (5) Organizational Systems.

The first category *Entrepreneurial Individuals* contains three following themes: “Entrepreneurial Individuals as Key in the Organization,” “Diversity of Personal and Professional Experiences and Expertise,” and “Entrepreneurial Reputation.” The category *Environmental Factors* contains one theme which is “Location and Expansion.” The category *Organizational Behaviors* is comprised of three themes: “Business-Like Behaviors,” “Teamwork and Internal Collaborations,” and “External Collaborations.” The category *Organizational Outcomes* includes the following four themes: “Accredited Programs,” “Research Activities,” “Unique Programs and Services,” and “Internationalization.” The last category *Organizational Systems* covers two following themes: “University Support” and “Obstacles for Entrepreneurial Transformation.” The theme “Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture” is placed underneath of all of the themes (see Table 8) because the organizational culture is embedded in all of the themes. In this particular scheme, “Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture” refers to underlying beliefs and assumptions that are located at the lowest level of the organizational cultural model developed by Schein (1990).

Analysis of the emergent themes showed that they are not equal in their content and importance for the study participants. Four core themes that are more important than the others were identified in this study. These four themes have closer connections among the other themes and carry the content to which the data refer more often than to the rest of the
themes. These core themes are as following: “Diversity of Personal and Professional Experiences and Expertise,” “Teamwork and Internal Collaborations,” “Unique Programs and Services,” and “Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture” (see Table 8).

Table 8

Fourteen emergent themes and four core themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial Individuals</th>
<th>Environmental Factors</th>
<th>Organizational Behaviors</th>
<th>Organizational Outcomes</th>
<th>Organizational Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergent Themes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneural</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Individuals as Key in the Organization</td>
<td>Location and Expansion</td>
<td>Business-Like Activities</td>
<td>Accredited Programs</td>
<td>University Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Diversity of Personal &amp; Professional Experiences &amp; Expertise*</td>
<td>Teamwork and Internal Collaborations*</td>
<td>Unique Programs and Services*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Reputation</td>
<td>External Collaborations</td>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>Obstacles for Entrepreneurial Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * - core theme.

The four core themes can be called entrepreneurial transformation elements. They create a qualitative study “story” that emerged from the data. This “story” represents a cycling process (see Figure 10).
Figure 10. Cycle of the core elements of the entrepreneurial transformation.

Everything starts with the entrepreneurial element labeled “Diversity.” It explains that the organizational members have diverse backgrounds, experiences, and expertise. They come together in different teams and collaborate to achieve organizational goals. Thus, “Teamwork” is the second element in the entrepreneurial transformation. People work on projects that go beyond their departments to across the campus, to the partnering organizations in the state, region, nation, and overseas. The organizational members scan the market and conduct research on the best practices at other higher education institutions. The next element labeled “Outcomes” explains that, during the collaborative processes, the organizational members choose ideas for their new projects and improvements of the existing programs and services. They work hard with determination and passion to turn the ideas to innovative products. The innovative programs and services are considered as unique or novel products that may be new at the level of departments, school of education, university, among local universities, or at the national level. All of the processes at the selected departments contribute to the last entrepreneurial element “Culture” that was identified as achievement oriented (McClelland, 1961). This culture is supportive to new ideas, values
hard work, team collaborations, and risk-taking. The organizational culture is fluid and runny because it always requires a fresh input. Cultural fluctuation causes a lot of restructuring that is on-going at the University. Therefore, the cycling process (Figure 10) moves to the “Diversity” element. When the departments hire new faculty and staff they seek candidates for diversity of personal and professional experiences and expertise by which newly hired individuals contribute to entrepreneurial changes at the organization.

The analysis of the data suggested that the relations among the emergent themes as well as within the themes and the theoretical concepts are non-linear but rather complex and cross-cutting. The researcher found that theories that were originally used for building the conceptual framework for this study were not sufficient to explain the phenomenon of the entrepreneurial transformation; therefore, a few other theoretical perspectives were added to the analysis (e.g., McClelland, 1961; Chell, 2008; Bird, 1989).

The further discussion has organized with the use of the funnel model as the main framework developed by the researcher at the beginning of this dissertation work (see Figure 1). In previous chapters, the discussion of relevant theories began with the concept of globalization, narrowed down to organizational behaviors, and went to the individual entrepreneurial characteristics. The analysis of the data performed in this Chapter suggests the opposite direction for the discussion (Figure 11). It starts with a close look at the individual entrepreneurial characteristics - Level 1; the discussion continues at the level of the University departments - Level 2; it moves to the level of the University as an entity - Level 3, and the discussion concludes with a view of the University from a globalization theory perspective - Level 4.
Level 1: Entrepreneurial Individuals in the Organization

Entrepreneurial needs/motives of individuals. One of the most known concepts proposed by David C. McClelland (1961), which influenced the entrepreneurial discourse in the business literature, is the concept of individual needs or motives that allow entrepreneurial individuals to succeed. McClelland named these individual motives as “need for Achievement” ($n$-Achievement), “need for Power” ($n$-Power), and “need for Affiliation” ($n$-Affiliation).

According to McClelland (1961), social expectations are that individuals with a high $n$-Achievement set higher standards for themselves and take relevant actions to address their own expectations. McClelland said, “People with strong achievement motives would seek out situations in which they could get achievement satisfaction” (p. 40). The data analysis allows the researcher to propose that a high $n$-Achievement of individuals is the main drive at the School of Education. Many examples of the emergent themes that reflect the $n$-Achievement can be found in Chapter 4. The examples include: “Entrepreneurial Individuals as Key in the Organization,” “Entrepreneurial Reputation,” and “Business-Like Behaviors.”

Figure 11. Funnel theoretical framework for data analysis.
The following datum refers to the n-Achievement motive: Dr. Lee, in spite of her busy schedule, challenged herself by deciding to teach new classes, supervise students, and conduct a new international research project. While talking about why she initiated all these new activities, Dr. Lee explained that she was driven by a “desire to learn more, to explore new things,” and develop her professional skills. She pointed out, “It is just a habit to try new things” (Dr. Lee, personal communication, July 11, 2011).

The narrative of the Charter School Office representative flashes with the repeating phrases about the people at the Charter School Office who were the pioneers in the charter school movement and created many innovative things to serve their authorized schools and help other authorizers across the nation.

Another example refers to the Leadership Department. Dr. Martin explicitly stated that everyone in the Department does something that goes beyond traditional work requirements. Dr. Campbell stressed a few times throughout her interview: “We can do it.” Dr. White stated that he values in his colleagues their curiosity that drives them to reach out to other people and other organizations. He pointed out that his colleagues, faculty and administrators, at the School of Education in their extraordinary work compete not only against similar departments, schools, and universities in the state and the region, but they also compete against themselves by testing how far they can go in to market.

The data allows the researcher to conclude that the second strongest motive at the School of Education is the high need for Power. McClelland (1961) used this term to explain the achievements by those individuals who have a desire to influence and impact other people. McClelland pointed out that, in organizations, people with the high n-Power focus on achieving an organizational success but not his or her own. Many interviewees of this
study explicitly expressed their intentions to be “the first” in the market and in their fields and, therefore, make an impact on the situation in the state, region, and even the nation (e.g., theme “Unique Programs and Services”). For example, when Dr. Campbell said, “We are everywhere,” this was evidence that the Leadership Department attempts to be noticeable and influential in the market. Dr. Campbell pointed out the importance for her Department to be proactive and offer programs “quicker and better” than similar departments do at other universities.

The need for Power has also been identified at the Charter School Office. This University’s unit is very assertive in collaborations with many external organizations and in influencing the charter school movement in the region and nation. From the collected data, the researcher sees that the people in the Charter School Office, who have a business and entrepreneurial background and had already achieved national recognition, possess the power to positively influence many of their colleagues.

The motive named by McClelland as a need for Affiliation was also found important for individuals at the School of Education. According to McClelland (1961), the $n$-Affiliation refers to individuals who strive to work with a group and be accepted by group members. Gibb (1998) and Mair (2005) also described this essential attribute of entrepreneurs who work in teams and collaborate effectively in their networks.

This study shows that a majority of the interviewees emphasized the importance for them to work in teams. The theme “Teamwork and Internal Collaboration” is confirmation of the high need for Affiliation by individuals at the selected departments. Dr. Campbell, Dr. Martin, Dr. Parker, and other interviewees, in their narratives, mentioned that it would be impossible to achieve many things in academia if working in isolation. Data demonstrate
that most teams at the University are built naturally based on shared needs and interests (e.g., Faculty Learning Community interdisciplinary project, Global Study Committee in the Leadership Department, At 7 on a 7th, and the Community of Scholars at the Faculty Development Center), whereas some of the teams are built intentionally by the departments (e.g., doctoral students mentoring program). Many of the interviewees connect with each other through the programs and activities run by the departments, School of Education, and University.

The interviewed study participants expressed their excitement of working together, learning from one another, and achieving organizational goals. Ms. Harris stressed the fact that participation in their interdisciplinary team is encouraged, and everyone, who is interested, is welcome to join. Working together in teams, individuals within the School of Education share similar values, views, and understanding of the mission of the university and their departments.

Correlation between the need for achievement and the use of technologies.
McClelland (1961) argued that the n-Achievement motive has a direct correlation with the use of technologies. McClelland pointed out, “Higher n-Achievement should be associated with higher technological development” (p. 65) because individuals with n-Achievement tend to use tools for achieving better results. This study demonstrated that technology is a significant part of activities at the academic and non-academic departments at the University. The “Unique Programs and Services” and “University Support” themes describe the newly created online programs such as Charter School Leadership, Teacher Leadership, and Educational Technology. These programs require the developers (e.g., faculty and
technology professionals) to possess the necessary skills in order to make their programs highly competitive in the national market.

It was found that all of the explored departments perform the advanced level of the use of technologies: the academic departments experience growing demands in the hybrid and fully online format; the Charter School Office creates digital services for authorized charter schools; the Faculty Development Center promotes the use of learning technologies in classrooms. The fact that the University is one of the leading institutions in the use of clickers is a proof of the priority that the University places on technology.

Many researchers (e.g., Levin, 2001; Smathers, n.d; Larsen & Wigand, 1987; O’Shea et al., 2005) discussed that the use of technologies is one of the strongest forces in the development of higher education institutions. The connection easily can be drawn between McClelland’s concept of technology use by those entrepreneurs who have a high n-Achievement and Levin’s (2001) concept of the global behaviors of higher education institutions where the Information (Electronic) Technologies is one of the global organizational behaviors.

**Entrepreneurial behaviors, attributes, and skills.** Gibb (1998) proposed to consider the entrepreneurial characteristics of individuals in organizations in the following categories: entrepreneurial behaviors, entrepreneurial attitudes, and entrepreneurial skills. Table 2 (Entrepreneurial behaviors, attributes, and skills by A. Gibb), used in Chapter 2, displays these characteristics. Similar characteristics of individuals in an organizational context are also recognized by many other scholars (e.g., Chiasson & Saunders, 2005; Mair, 2005; McClelland, 1961). Collected data reflect many of the individual entrepreneurial
characteristics listed in Table 2. The sections below offer a discussion on some of these individual characteristics and how they play out at the selected departments.

**Grasping opportunities and taking initiatives.** Per Chiasson and Saunders (2005), opportunities are independent of entrepreneurs and available to all; however, exploitation of opportunities depends upon who recognizes them and takes the initiative. The themes labeled “Unique Programs and Services” and “External Collaborations” provide many evidences that administrators and faculty, who participated in this study, are those people who constantly scan the market in order to identify and exploit opportunities. According to Dr. Carter, Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, people in the Leadership Department and the Teacher Education Department are very proactive in creating new programs. The taking initiative behavior has been spreading across the campus engaging more people at more departments in innovative activities. Dr. Jones pointed out that they, in the Leadership Department, are not going to lose an opportunity in the market.

**Ownership and individual responsibility.** The concept of ownership discussed by Gibb (2005) and Mair (2005) echoes the concept of individual responsibility proposed by McClelland (1961). In this study, it was discovered that several of the interviewed faculty members have carried fully the responsibilities for certain programs. They started from the initial ideas and led the projects further through the entire process of designing, improving, launching, and running these programs. The theme titled “Business-Like Behaviors” in Chapter 4 offers many evidences of the innovative programs and their creators/directors. For example, the online master’s program for Charter School Leaders is associated with Dr. Jones’s name, who has been the Director of this program for over four years. The Teacher Leadership master’s program is associated with Dr. Martin. The Community of Faculty
initiative is tied to Dr. Parker, Director of the Faculty Development Center. The theme of “Internationalization” describes the faculty and staff members at the School of Education who create, maintain, and lead certain study abroad programs. These faculty responsibilities also refer to their ownership of certain study abroad programs.

It is important that the ownership of programs is institutionalized in the departments at the School of Education. The notion is that ownership refers to a particular individual; however, the department makes a decision and takes responsibility to create a certain program. The process of a program creation will not stop if the person responsible for the process leaves, but it will be continued by the other individuals who are assigned by the department.

**Determination and commitment.** Determination, hard work, and personal commitment in accomplishing tasks are necessary attributes of the entrepreneurial behavior of people in an organization (Gibb, 1998; Mair, 2005). Observations and interviews provided the researcher with solid evidence that the faculty and administrators of two academic departments, the staff member of the Charter School Office, and the Interim Dean of the School of Education demonstrate hard work and commitment to the development of high-quality programs and services. In their triangulated narratives, the interviewed individuals drew many connections between the work they do and the reputation of their departments and the University as a whole. The “Entrepreneurial Reputation” and “Business-Like Behaviors” themes provide relevant evidence.

According to the head of the Leadership Department, the Department “controls quality” by selecting adjunct faculty from a pool of its own doctoral graduates. Those adjuncts as former students know the program, requirements, and expectations of the
Department from their own personal experiences. In addition to the personal experiences of the adjuncts, the Department trains part-time faculty and provides them with representative syllabi.

**Taking moderate risk.** Risk is an integral part of any venture. Globalizing economy brings more uncertainty and increases the risks that entrepreneurs take when they start a new business, program, or service (e.g., Kuratko, 2005; Stevenson, 2000). Taking a moderate, or calculated risk means that the risk is estimated (which is opposite to gambling) by experienced professionals who work in the market (e.g., Bird, 1998; Chell, 2008; Gibb, 2005; McClelland, 1961). The fact that the study participants rarely referred to the notion of risk should be interpreted that the risk for success of new programs/services is distributed among those professionals at the University who have experiences in relevant fields such as marketing, recruiting, admissions, financing, technologies, and others. The theme labeled “University Support Systems” provides the description of how professionals, who work for the Center for Off-Campus Programs, take responsibilities to explore different areas across the country and estimate potential opportunities and risks for off-campus and online programs. The support systems of the University (e.g., Center for Off-Campus Programs, Faculty Development Center, Study Abroad office, Research Center, and other departments) provide protection and minimize the risk for academic departments. The Center for Off-Campus Programs financially supports new programs at the stage of creation and launching. In cooperation with the Faculty Development Center, the Center for Off-Campus Programs trains the administrators and faculty from the academic departments to develop and run online programs. In situations of low enrollment, the Center for Off-Campus Programs reschedules courses and works with the registered students to accommodate them with other
courses in their programs that are available at that time. Revenue from the programs that are offered through the Center for Off-Campus Programs flows to the academic departments and stimulates the departments to strengthen existing and create new programs.

**Recognizing the threat of uncertainty and proactive entrepreneurial response.**

Literature suggests that *uncertainty* is one of the strongest forces that drive entrepreneurial types of individuals in organizations to seek new ideas in the market (e.g., Clark, 2000; Gibb, 2005; Schramm, 2006). The “Business-Like Behaviors” theme describes how interviewed individuals recognize *uncertainty of the globalizing market* and understand that growing competition is inevitable and that only strong and more creative organizations will survive and succeed.

The interviewees demonstrated their capabilities to be successful in the competition. Their confidence is based on the positive experiences that they have already gained through the process of creating programs and services. Per B. Clark (2000), attributes such as openness to new ideas, exploration of new ways to succeed, flexibility, and proactive participation in the global market reduces a fear of uncertainty. The researcher witnessed that the interviewed individuals are excited about what they have achieved, what they do, and, as it was pointed out by Clark, they enjoy dealing with uncertainty and complexity of the market.

The analysis above aligns with B. Bird’s (1989) description of the entrepreneurial behavior of individuals in the organizational context who are “opportunistic, value-driven, value-adding, risk-accepting, creative activity where ideas take the form of organizational birth, growth, or transformation” (p. 6). Table 9 below summarizes some evidences of the entrepreneurial behaviors performed by individuals in the selected departments.
**Table 9**  
*Summary of entrepreneurial behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Entrepreneurial Behaviors</strong></th>
<th><strong>Leadership Departments</strong></th>
<th><strong>Teacher Education Departments</strong></th>
<th><strong>Charter School Office</strong></th>
<th><strong>Center for Off-Campus Programs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Faculty Development Center</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grasping opportunity &amp; taking initiative</strong></td>
<td>Online MA degree programs for Charter School Leaders and for Teacher Leaders; Ed.D. &amp; Ed.S. Ladder Program; Graduate Certificate in College Teaching; Global Studies Committee; Interdisciplinary group Faculty Learning Community.</td>
<td>Created new study abroad programs in 6-8 countries.</td>
<td>Authorizes the largest number of schools in the state and region; Created National Institute for Charter Schools.</td>
<td>Initiates, creates, develops, delivers programs in 60 off-campus locations and online.</td>
<td>Created One-Hour Conference format; Created the Community of Scholars program for innovative teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeing things through; putting things together creatively or innovations as combinations of existing things</strong></td>
<td>Built a foundation for further entrepreneurial endeavors; Established partnership with ASCD; Plan to start searching for research grants and contracts; Developing new study abroad programs; Impact of globalization and importance of being proactive is explicitly articulated.</td>
<td>Globalization is very explicit phenomenon for the department; Offers many Study Abroad programs; Definition of diversity includes international/global diversity.</td>
<td>Staff is comprised of professionals from different industries; Working with the government to predict the legislature and prepare for changes.</td>
<td>Staff is comprised of professionals from different industries; Working throughout the nation and internationally; Scanning market for opportunities.</td>
<td>Working with universities, professional associations, foundations, and IT companies throughout the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taking responsibility for, and ownership of things</strong></td>
<td>Faculty members take responsibility to design, develop, improve, manage the degree programs and study abroad programs. They promote, advertise the programs, and recruit students. Faculty members establish and maintain partnerships with external organizations and individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Created infrastructure to authorize and oversee charter schools; Created digital systems for charter schools and other authorizers.</td>
<td>Staff of 200 people accomplish all necessary tasks related to off-campus and online programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taking calculated/moderate risk</strong></td>
<td>Faculty and administrators use internal networking to calculate risk; they consult with other departments on new study abroad programs; they work closely with the Center for Off-Campus Programs to start new online programs or face-to-face program in off-campus locations.</td>
<td>Applies the expertise and experiences of the staff members who represent different professional fields. Consults with the departments across the University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking effectively to manage interdependence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive collaborations among academic and non-academic departments; Creating interdepartmental teams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entrepreneurship from leadership theory perspective. Leadership is very essential for any organization. Scholarly literature offers many overlapping and interchangeable definitions of the terms leader and entrepreneur (e.g., Bash, 2003; Bird, 1989; Chell, 2008; Gibb, 1998; Stevenson, 2000; Yukl, 2012), which allow the researcher to define these two terms as synonyms and use them in interchangeable ways.

Barbara Bird (1989), in her book *Entrepreneurial Behavior*, explored the phenomenon of entrepreneurship and pointed out that the leaders and entrepreneurs share the same traits and skills as compared to managers who do not. For example, the leaders and entrepreneurs “think and act strategically (i.e., do the right things) while managers are concerned with daily operations (i.e., do things right)” (Bird, 1989, p. 326).

The observations and interviews demonstrated strong leadership/entrepreneurial traits in the study participants. These traits include but are not limited to the abilities and skills to organize groups toward a shared goal, influence people in the organization, articulate a vision, embody values, create the environment to accomplish innovative ideas, and make significant second-order changes (Argyris & Schön, 1974).

This study revealed that people at the selected departments think of themselves as being entrepreneurial, creative, and innovative individuals. The analysis of the interviewees’ vocabulary shows that those individuals, who work at the non-academic departments, freely use the words entrepreneurial and innovative while their colleagues in the academic departments prefer to use words such as leaders, making changes, and being creative. It appeared to the researcher that in the minds of the people at the academic departments of the School of Education that the word entrepreneurial is mostly associated with the business field, profit, and creating new businesses. However, the follow-up conversations with the study participants about
these terms revealed that the word entrepreneur is also understood as an innovative and creative individual, not only as someone who starts a new business. As it was described in Chapter 4, Dr. White explicitly stated that the people at the Leadership Department do not use words like entrepreneurialism; however, their activities fall under this term.

**Level 2: Entrepreneurial Organization (University Units)**

**Entrepreneurial culture of the organization.** This portion of the analysis focuses on how people in the organization share common values, beliefs, and assumptions, and how they work together to achieve shared goals. Schein (2004) defined organizational culture as:

[A] pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 17)

This definition of an organizational culture helps explain the institutionalized processes in the departments explored in this study. Gorges (2001) argued that the activities should be considered as institutionalized practices when they have strong links with institutional change and raise no questions in the minds of the organizational members regarding appropriateness or meaningful behavior. When individual characteristics fit the organizational expectations and organizational culture, a behavior of individuals in the organization becomes institutionalized. Zucker (1987) in his work *Institutional Theories of Organization* provided the definition of institutionalization in organizations and proposed indicators of institutionalization. Zucker defines institutionalization in organizations as “(a) a rule-like, social fact quality of an organized pattern of action (exterior), and (b) an embedding in formal structures, such as formal aspects of organizations that are not tied to particular actors or situations (non-personal/objective)” (p. 444).
To understand institutionalization of the entrepreneurial activities at the School of Education, it is helpful to apply the definition by Zucker (1987). The first part of the definition refers to actions that occur in an organization by *rules*: people act a certain way because they always do it. The second part of the definition refers to the fact that the institutionalized processes in an organization occur independently regardless of the involvement of the particular people. Organizational members support institutionalized practices without questioning or comparing them to alternatives (Gorges, 2001).

Evidence of the institutionalized organizational behavior is the fact that the former leaders at the School of Education, who established many study abroad programs, are no longer the members of the organization, but the organization continues to do what was set up by those leaders. Another example of an institutionalized behavior refers to the situation described in the section “Internationalization,” when a study abroad trip at the Teacher Education Department was almost cancelled, and the Leadership Department helped to save the trip by sharing resources. Successful practices continue their existence regardless of individual interests or resources (e.g., committed time) because the organizational members are interested in having them, and leadership will be passed to another person in situations when the primary leader is not able to continue the practice.

Clark (2004) called the culture at entrepreneurial universities *integrated and institution-wide entrepreneurial culture*. Clark stated that while the culture is “always ephemeral, often wispy to the touch […] it escapes empirical identification” (p. 361). The researcher suggests that all of the emergent themes, which reflect accomplishments by individuals at the School of Education, should be considered as evidences of *empirical identification* (Clark, 2004) of the values, beliefs, and underlying assumptions of the organizational members (Schein, 1990, 2004).
The “Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture” theme allowed the researcher to identify the sub-themes that describe the role of leaders, supportive organizational environment, proactive attitude, entrepreneurial spirit, uniqueness, value of diversity of professional expertise, ongoing collaborations, innovative activities, openness toward changes, and an entrepreneurial language of the members of the organization. Dr. Martin described the atmosphere at the Leadership Department in the following words, “The spirit in this Department is about: ‘What else can I do? What can I help with?’” (Dr. Martin, personal communication, October 28, 2011).

It is evident that the people at the selected departments intend to accomplish many tasks in a fast pace in order to sustain their leading positions in the market. Themes “Business-Like Behaviors” and “Unique Programs and Services” contribute to this conclusion. The interviewed individuals agreed that the people in their departments value the reputation they earned in the state and region. They are proud to be a part of the aggressively growing University and its programs (e.g., theme “Entrepreneurial Reputation”). It is important for the people in the School of Education that in the challenging economy they experience excitement of being active in the market and do not fear it. The study participants feel themselves as winners in a situation of recessed contemporary economy, and they do not want to give up a privilege to be among the leading departments in their fields.

It is also apparent that the organizational members learned over time from solving the “problems of external adaptation and internal integration,” and they teach new members the “correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 2004, p. 9). Dr. Martin as a new faculty member at the Leadership Department and doctoral students Ms. Harris and Ms. Robinson serve as the examples of those who are taught entrepreneurial organizational
culture and who are excited about being a part of this creative and innovative group of people at the University.

**Diversity in the organization.** Diversity is a very important entrepreneurial component discovered in this study. Several kinds of diversity emerged from the data: diversity accreditation requirements, global diversity goals of the University and the benchmarks that the academic departments set up for themselves, diversity of personal experiences and professional expertise of the members of the organization.

Nehring and Puppe (2002) in their article about diversity proposed to consider *dissimilarity* as the key element of diversity. Dr. Smith, head of the Teacher Education Department, speaking on behalf of the faculty, emphasized that their definition of diversity in regard to accreditation requirements refers not to only traditional attributes such as race and ethnicity but includes the characteristics of communities, social groups, and geographic regions, which is becoming very important because the campus community is predominately homogeneous. Table 10 adapted from the University enrollment report on the University’s website demonstrates that the University student population is mostly comprised of the “White, Non-Hispanic students.” It is also important to note that all of the participants, interviewed for this study, represented the Caucasian category of people.
Table 10

The University undergraduate enrollment report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B2</th>
<th>Degree-Seeking First-Time First Year</th>
<th>Degree-Seeking Undergraduates (include first-time first-year)</th>
<th>Total Undergraduates (both degree- and non-degree-seeking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident aliens</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>17,046</td>
<td>17,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,698</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table adapted from the University website. The report was retrieved December 26, 2012.

The collected data show that the location of the University in a rural area influences the diversification at the School of Education with the focus on diversity of geographic location and communities (i.e., urban, rural, and international). The administrators at the School of Education in their attempts to meet the diversity accreditation requirements as well as to address the strategic objectives of the University are seeking the ways to take their faculty and students outside of the University’s walls. For example, the Teacher Education Department urges those students who came from rural areas to gain student teaching experience in urban schools and also offers many study abroad programs that allow students to experience teaching overseas. Dr. Smith emphasized that teaching in another country is a life changing experience for the students. During study abroad trips, students learn about different social economic systems and classes, racial and ethnical diversity, language, other school systems, and environments (e.g., themes
Internationalization is another strong trend at the explored academic and non-academic departments. Faculty and administrators in the Teacher Education Department work hard to increase the number of students who participate in the study abroad programs and international comparative research projects. Dr. Campbell, head of the Leadership Department, believes that participation in study abroad programs must be a requirement for all doctoral students in the Leadership program. The Leadership Department constantly tries to identify potential student populations in other countries in order to start delivery of their leadership degree and certificate programs in those countries.

Diversity of the personal experiences and professional expertise are also important components of the entrepreneurial phenomenon. B. Bird (1989) stated that “previous experience with entrepreneurship is an important factor in looking at current or future performance” (p. 62). The data demonstrate that all explored departments recognize the value of the professional diversity and actively develop it to achieve organizational objectives. Through study abroad programs and travelling abroad for international projects, faculty members gain valuable global experience. Some of the faculty members have a foreign origin or extensive international background of studying, living, and working abroad.

It is also critical for the organization that its members possess experience in working for different organizations. The Charter School Office is comprised of the staff members who represent different professional fields and have personal experience in working in business industries. The Center for Off-Campus Programs uses professional expertise of about 200
employees to effectively work in the market (e.g., themes “Teamwork and Internal Collaborations,” “External Collaborations,” and “Business-Like Behaviors”).

Defining a concept of entrepreneurial innovations, Mair (2005) stated that innovations are “a set of activities and practices by which individuals at multiple levels autonomously generate and use innovative resource combinations to identify and pursue opportunities” (p. 51). One of the entrepreneurial attributes discussed by Gibb (2005) refers to an ability of individuals to “put things together creatively” and leads to an expectation that in order to create a new product it is necessary to obtain the things that will be re-organized in a new way. The researcher believes that diversity of individual expertise and professional backgrounds should be considered as those “existing things” that are used for new and better combinations. The more things are available the better and more unique combinations they can create.

The interview narrators stated that the members of the organization “do not innovate anything;” they simply apply what they already know to create a new program or service. For example, Dr. Jones admitted that it was easy to come with the idea of creating a master’s degree program for charter school leaders because the Charter School Office works “downstairs,” and faculty members interact actively with the Charter School Office staff and recognize a potential of the growing charter school movement and, therefore, the market in the country. According to the interviewees, it was easy for them to see the niche in the market for a degree program for charter school leaders. Another example refers to the situations when the Charter School Office faces a problem. The experiences of the staff members who came from different professional fields are utilized to fix a problem. The interviewee from the Charter School Office, Mr. Taylor, pointed out that it is a key for success to let the people with diverse professional backgrounds to share their experiences and find the best solution.
Partnership with many external organizations adds the diversity of expertise to the process of innovations. Cohen and Levinthal (1990) discussed when an organization recognizes the value of the external information it increases the organizational capabilities to innovate. In particular, these researchers said, “the ability to exploit external knowledge is thus a critical component of innovative capabilities” (p. 128). Bird (1989), in her work, also emphasized the value of partnerships for innovation. In particular, she said, “Partnership synergy is the transformation of individual contributions into a product that is greater than the sum of the separate contributions” (p. 230). One of the interviewees, Dr. Parker, pointed out several times that there was not very much new that he created; he simply applied what he already knew from other fields and areas of his experiences. In his interview, Dr. Parker defined innovation as “new developed ideas of existing things or adaptation of existing ideas for other types of activities” (Dr. Parker, personal communication, July 21, 2011). For example, he built the idea for One-Hour Conference on the existing format of the One-Hour Workshop. Another example, the Community of Scholars project designed for the faculty members was rooted in Dr. Parker’s observation of kindergarten and elementary school teachers who work together, support one another, and help each other in improving teaching and learning.

Entrepreneurial organizational behaviors. The entrepreneurial behaviors concept is overlapping and interchangeable with the concept of business-like behaviors proposed by Skloot (1987) who defined it as “sustained activity, related, but not customary to the organization, designed to earn money” (p. 381). In spite of the public purposes of most higher education organizations in the United States, commercialization of higher education institutions has been observed and discussed in the scholarly literature (e.g., Holbrook, 2004). The interviewee, Dr. Jones, said that his Department “is not going to lose money;” and another interviewee, Dr.
Martin, emphasized that they at the School of Education “do business” (Dr. Jones, Dr. Martin, personal communications, 2011). However, it is important to consider that according to many researchers, money is for many entrepreneurs a way of “keeping score, rather than a goal” (Bird, 1989, p. 104). Dr. Jones confirmed that concept by saying that faculty members, at his department, do not receive any monetary rewards for their non-traditional for their field work. Creation of study abroad programs and programs for off-campus and online delivery has become a routine institutionalized practice and part of the responsibilities of faculty members.

**Entrepreneurial behaviors of the organizational members.** Mair (2005) stated that “opportunities to act entrepreneurially arise within and outside the organization” (p. 51). This sub-section provides a discussion on entrepreneurial behaviors of the organizational members.

It was apparent to the researcher that leadership positions at the School of Education are filled by the individuals who are confident in approaching the globalizing market, exploring and addressing the needs of actual and prospective students, and using technology in instruction, communication, and organization of their work. Each of the interviewed administrators at the explored departments is recognized at the University by his/her proactive attitude and support. For example, the Interim Dean, Dr. Williams, maintains a tradition of creativity and openness to new ideas in the School of Education and supports collaborations between the School of Education and other University’s units. Dr. Smith, head of the Teacher Education Department, is very active in expanding Study Abroad programs. Dr. Campbell, the Leadership Department head, has a strategic vision for the future directions for the organizational development and growth, and she also has many ideas for new programs and projects. Dr. Parker, director of the Faculty Development Center, promotes creativity and innovations in teaching across the campus.
Entrepreneurial behavior is also evident in the activities by the interviewed faculty and staff members. They scan higher education institutions across the country for market needs and valuable ideas to develop their own programs and services. They create new study abroad programs and lead student trips overseas. Faculty and staff at the Leadership Department see their role in supporting each other’s ideas and giving them “wings,” so “ideas can fly.”

Faculty members admit that their responsibilities are not traditional for their positions. For example, the interviewee, Dr. Martin, stated that it was never assumed that today the faculty members would do what they considered was not their job. Many interviewed faculty mentioned that their work is not only doing teaching and research, but they do “business in education.”

**Energetic and/or novel instrumental activity.** One of the characteristics that McClelland (1961) discussed in regards to entrepreneurial behavior is *energetic and/or novel instrumental activity*. Applying this concept to available data, it is obvious that the online master’s degree program for Charter School Leaders and the master’s degree program for Teacher Leaders are novel in the national market. The interviewee, Dr. Martin, said that another university, where she worked before, “was thinking” about creating a teacher leadership program but was not able to implement this idea; whereas, this University did everything in order to be the first responding to the demand in the market. The high pace of identifying the niches in the market and creating programs and services that fill these niches puts the people at the School of Education in the position of experts who are expected to create new unique programs. Dr. Jones said that even though, at this time, the faculty members do not know what their next program will be, they firmly believe that there “must be something.” This proactive attitude is aligned to
what Hage (1999) said, “Innovations reflect a critical way in which organizations respond to either technological or market challenges” (p. 599).

When one project is successfully accomplished, the following projects come quicker and easier for the developers. The first online program (i.e., master’s degree Charter School Leadership program) served as a model for the next program (i.e., master’s degree Teacher Leadership program) and sparked the idea for the next possible program (i.e., master’s degree program for Green School Leaders). Programs and services produced by the universities become more similar and homogeneous.

**Economic and social value of innovations.** One of the definitions of innovations refers to new products that possess market value and can be sold in the market (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009; Atkins & Anderson, 1999). The scholars in the field of social entrepreneurship propose that entrepreneurial products also possess a social value and are utilized by the public, or a target population, in exchange for the well-being of the society (Shaw & Carter, 2007). While a business approach to entrepreneurship is associated with making profit, social entrepreneurship focuses on a positive impact on society as a return for used social entrepreneurial products. In this study, these two definitions of values of entrepreneurial products intertwine. The concept of a social value refers to a public mission of the University and the public purposes of education as a whole; whereas, the market value is important to understand when consider the competition that forces the University’s departments to get more resources/students.

The market value associated directly with monetary return can be recognized in most programs and services that are “sold” to external clients (e.g., master’s degree online and off-campus programs), while those programs and projects that address the internal audience’s needs (e.g., Faculty Learning Community project) possess more of a social value because they are not
associated with the direct monetary benefits; however, indirectly, they increase marketability of the university.

When educational organization is actively involved in the market, the concepts of commodification and marketization become everyday practice. According to Levin (2001), \textit{commodification} refers to creation by education institutions of products and services in order to sell them. The Charter School Office develops the services to the level of products for charter schools, charter schools authorizers, and state agencies. The Leadership Department creates fully online programs as products that are “sold” nationally. Faculty members and the department heads consider their participation in the conferences outside of the University as part of advertisement and marketization of their programs.

The National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE) suggests that \textit{innovation} is a process of “creating and exploiting opportunities for new ways of doing things resulting in better products and services, systems and ways of managing people and organizations” (NCGE, n.d.). This definition is helpful in understanding improvements as evidences of entrepreneurialism that includes changes to develop and improve the existing programs, their delivery, the way that the clients are served, and the way that the people work. For example, changing of the head of the Leadership Department can be considered as a necessary step taken by the faculty and staff of the Leadership Department in order to make the Department more entrepreneurial.

\textbf{Internationalization or reaching out globally.} Clark (2001) defined entrepreneurial universities as “those universities that want to be a viable, competitive part of the rapidly emerging international world of learning” (p. 11). Internationalization activities at the University reflect the concepts of \textit{internationalization} and \textit{multiculturalism} discussed by Levin (2001) in his
theory on global behaviors of higher educational institutions. Levin (2001) argued and other literature (e.g., Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Teichler, 2001) supports the notion that internationalization and multiculturalism have become integral parts of higher education institutions across the nation and in many other countries.

In Chapter 4 (theme “Internationalization”), the researcher offered data that show that the academic departments implement different international activities. In order to develop internationalization, the faculty and staff from the academic departments created the Global Studies committee to collaborate more effectively within the School of Education and support each other with resources. Through study abroad programs, the academic departments implement the University’s Global Vision diversity requirement for students. The academic departments set up the ambitious goals to have each student obtain international/global experience prior to graduation.

Multiculturalism as the other global behavior concept (Levin, 2001) can be seen in diversity of departmental and University requirements to expose students to cultures different from their own. The academic departments at the School of Education expand student population through their work with non-traditional students who are working professionals, people serving in the U.S. army, and international individuals.

**Entrepreneurial transformation of organizational identity.** According to Tajfel and Turner (1986), social identity is constructed not only from individual characteristics but from the characteristics of the group members. All non-traditional activities by the administrators, staff, and faculty at the School of Education and their intensive collaborations influence how these people see themselves in their organizational context. Because of the changing nature of work that the faculty, administrators, and staffs do, their academic identity becomes unclear. The
theme “Entrepreneurial Reputation” describes this transformation of the organizational identity. Consider the following: Mr. Taylor, representative of the Charter Schools Office, emphasized that the Charter School Office is not an industry, it is not education, but it is “many things that overlap.” Dr. Martin and Dr. Jones pointed out that they “do business in education.” This new identity reflects the entrepreneurial nature of the organization which incorporates features of the three spheres: Academy, Industry, and Government (Etzkowitz, 2003), which is discussed further in the following section.

**Level 3: Entrepreneurial University**

**The Triple Helix concept and external collaborations.** Scholars argue that evidence of the emergence of an entrepreneurial university is establishment of many partnerships with the external organizations to attract students and relocate external resources for its own use (Etzkowitz & Klofsten, 2005; Stevenson, 2000). External partnerships also allow the university to promote its reputation among the organizational partners, individual clients/students, and in the community.

Etzkowitz (2003) through the Triple Helix model pointed out that evolutionary relationships between universities, government, and industry tend to become more intense over time. The data collected for this study show strong linkages between the University departments and external professional organizations, business companies, and regulatory governmental agencies. The increase in numbers of the study abroad programs, as well as programs that are offered at off-campus sites and online correlates with growing partnerships of the University. Theme *External Collaborations* describes many relevant findings. For example, in order to attract students in the nation, the Leadership Department established official partnership with the nationally recognized Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
Another example refers to the Charter School Office which is an active participant of the Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA); this partnership is aimed to promote the Charter School Office itself and the products created by the Office. The Center for Off-Campus and Online Programs is very active in partnering with many organizations across the nation. Through these collaborations, the Center opens and maintains the University’s off-campus sites. The Faculty Development Center works with many universities, professional organizations, and businesses in the field of information technology. The partners of the Faculty Development Center are sources for new teaching-learning methods and techniques that the Center promotes across the campus.

The primary role of some University departments is to serve as “tri-lateral networking organizations” (Etzkowitz (2003). The Charter Schools Office, the Center for Off-Campus Programs, and the Faculty Development Center are the liaisons that tie the School of Education and the entire University to external organizations.

**Loosely coupled relationships at the University.** Theory of *loosely coupled systems* (Ingersoll, 1993; Orton & Weick, 1990) explains the simultaneous existence of rationality and uncertainty in the relationships among the University’s departments explored in this study. For example, loosely coupled relationship is observed between the Charter School Office and the University itself: funds come to the Charter School Office from the Federal budget and the Office pays a percentage to the University for using its systems. Another example shows that the already loosely coupled Charter School Office tends to loosen the ties with the University in order to operate more independently in the market. The University urges and expects that the Charter School Office creates services that are in demand in the national educational market; however, the public nature of the University does not support profitable participation in the
market. In order to obtain more flexibility to operate in the free economy, the Charter School Office creates an independent organization called the National Center for Charter Schools and supports the new start-up with the annual endowment fund of $300,000.

The relations between the academic departments and the off-campus sites and programs also can be considered as loosely coupled: the Leadership Department attempts to keep control over the programs delivered off-campus and online through its adjunct faculty; the Teacher Education Department has even looser relationships with its off-campus sites when compared to the Leadership Department because the responsibility to recruit and hire adjuncts is given to the Center for Off-Campus Programs.

The Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs pointed out that the Center tries to manage all of the relationships with more than 60 off-campus sites. According to the interviewee, the Center keeps control and balance between the number of students and the quality of the programs and services that are provided. The examples described above reflect a feature of the loosely coupled systems in which “elements are responsive, but retain evidence of separateness” (Orton & Weick, 1990, p. 203).

**Five elements of an entrepreneurial University.** Clark’s (1995, 1998-a, 1998-b, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004) theory of an entrepreneurial university explains the phenomenon as a combination of five major elements that can be present in different degrees at different institutions. Clark stated that a strong sustained entrepreneurial university has its own unique way to succeed in the competitive market. The following sub-sections offer analysis of the way that the selected University pursues its operations, and how each of the five entrepreneurial elements play out at the University.
**Diversified Funding Base.** While this study did not aim to explore the financial flows at the University and the School of Education, nor to identify the exact funding sources, some evidences related to funding emerged from the collected data. The first of three main streams of a university’s income identified by Clark (1998) is the governmental support. The explored University is a public university and receives annually funding from the state government. The second stream refers to funding from the private sector. The data described in the theme “University Support” (Chapter 4) demonstrate that the departments at the School of Education have a variety of scholarships that come from individuals and private foundations. Finally, the third stream refers to the funds from business organizations and from individuals as tuitions and program fees. Many fundraising activities are constantly going on at the School of Education and the University. A lot of raised funds are invested in a newly constructed building of the School of Education. The Center for Off-Campus Programs provides academic departments across campus with the funds to start their off-campus and online programs. Revenue generated from the programs delivered off-campus and online goes back to the departments and stimulates them to produce new programs. Most interviews demonstrated that the people in the academic departments and in the Charter School Office feel it is their personal responsibility to generate revenue. Besides creating and running off-campus and online programs, academic departments seek additional revenue from new professional development and certificate programs. The Faculty Development Center contributes to the *Diversifying Funding Base* by stimulating and supporting University faculty members to participate in attracting both internal and external grants. The Charter School Office trains the authorizer charter school board members who directly influence decision making and the charter school operations. Table 11 summarizes some of the funding sources of the explored departments at the School of Education.
Table 11

Identified funding sources in the School of Education

| Department of Leadership | • Online programs  
|                         | • Off-campus programs  
|                         | • Certification programs  
|                         | • Study Abroad programs  
| Teacher Education Department | • Online programs  
|                         | • Off-campus programs  
|                         | • Study Abroad programs  
| Charter School Office | • Federal budget  
|                         | • Services for external educational organizations and charter school authorizers  

**Strengthened Steering Core.** By the strengthened steering core Clark (1998) suggested to recognize the fact that diversification of the funding sources of a university leads to the state when more groups of people who bring those funds play a more significant role in steering the organization. The data provide many evidences to confirm this concept as an important one for the entrepreneurial transformation of the selected University. The non-academic departments that were explored in this study represent the interest groups that bring funds to the university. The Center for Off-Campus Programs and the Charter Schools Office have goals to continuously explore the market, identify emerging needs, and quickly respond with new programs and services. It is also clearly evident that the people feel confident and proud of what the University does, and how aggressively it goes to the market. The visions of the departments are aligned with the University objectives.

Clark (2004) stated that entrepreneurial universities are neither extremely centralized nor decentralized. He pointed out that entrepreneurial universities have “professionalized clusters of change-oriented administrators at all levels” (Clark, 2004, p. 359); they are strong on all levels
and are led by people who “impact steering university process.” The researcher found the alignment of the data with this centralization/decentralization state of entrepreneurial universities discussed by Clark. Although, for this study the researcher did not aim to communicate with the top leaders of the University, it is proposed to consider that the interviewed administrators of non-academic University’s centers, heads of the academic departments and the Interim Dean serve as the translators of the University’s vision and organizational objectives to the lower levels of the University hierarchy. The narratives of the interviews with the administrators and the data collected from the University’s website show the evidence of constant, strong, and increasing top-bottom push and encouragement toward creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurialism.

The administration of the University through the non-academic centers urges the academic departments to develop off-campus and online programs; in their turn, the academic departments create teams and initiate new programs. For example, the Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs pointed out that the Leadership Department and the Teacher Education Department are among those University’s units that are active in creating new programs for off-campus delivery. This shows the change that was described by Clark (2004) when “some departments can and will move faster than others in understanding the benefit of entrepreneurial actions” (p. 360). Clark claimed that in spite of the fact that in most cases “science and technology departments lead the change” (p. 360), there are evidences when soft departments make the first step in entrepreneurial transformation.

It is a long-term strategy of the University to push the departments toward entrepreneurial activities. According to information on the University’s website, one of the University’s goals is to “identify and enhance the quality of academic programs, particularly in the areas of focus,
strength and in emerging areas of interest… Provide initiatives for and encouragement of entrepreneurship…” (University website, n.d.). Thus, the University official documents and the interview narratives confirm the fact that the entrepreneurial approach had been chosen as a long-term objective to achieve success and recognition on the national scale.

**Expanded Developmental Periphery.** External collaborations of the Center for Off-Campus Programs, Charter School Office, and Faculty Development Center at the University reflect also the concept of Expanded Developmental Periphery (Clark, 2004). The metaphor of an “innovative arm of the University” expressed by the Director of the Center for Off-Campus Programs describes the main purpose of each of these departments. These “innovative arms” of the University establish and develop the connections with external organizations, explore the niches in the market, and transfer knowledge to new programs and services.

In order to make all adjustments to better fit the external environment, the University constantly goes through restructuring processes within its schools and the departments. Levin (2001) identified *restructuring* behavior as transformations that occur in higher education as a response to global forces. The explored academic departments and the Charter School Office create reorganizational changes in order to make their work more *productive/effective* (Levin, 2001). Creation of new sub-units, sub-divisions, programs and services inevitably lead to relocation of the resources and reorganizing the structure of the departments and the way of their operation. A competitive market brings a lot of instability and increases labor alteration (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004; Levin, 2001).

**Stimulated Academic Heartland.** Clark (2004) described a stimulated academic heartland as the process that engages faculty, staff, and students in the liberal arts departments in the entrepreneurial change. Entrepreneurial attitude and behavior of individuals at the School of
Education fit Clark’s theory. The study showed that the faculty, staff, and the students working together explore the world and the market; they aim to identify the best practices as well as the niches for their programs and projects. The organizational members initiate national and international research projects, create new programs and services, and, finally, sell their entrepreneurial “products” in the market and fully participate in advertising, promoting, and delivering.

**Integrated Entrepreneurial Culture.** An integrated entrepreneurial culture is the fifth element in Clark’s (2004) model of an entrepreneurial university. According to Clark, one important issue of an organizational culture is the fact that an entrepreneurial university with the integrated entrepreneurial culture does not see its way back to traditional operation. When creativity, innovations, and competitiveness become a part of the University’s identity, entrepreneurial transformation cannot be stopped or slowed (Clark, 2004). The data demonstrate that the organizational members at the selected departments are excited about what they do and admit that their work is different from the work of their peers at many universities around the country. They learn, borrow, and implement ideas from other universities because they believe that it is the only way to be successful in the conditions of growing competition for prestige, students, and resources.

Another cultural component described by Clark (2004) is a “story-saga” of the university which is successful in a “harsh environment” (p. 17). All explored departments have their stories and develop them. For example, the Charter School Office representative explicitly stated that new members have to be told the stories of the organization to become a real part of it.

**Obstacles.** Chell (2008) proposed that “entrepreneurial behavior is constrained (and at times facilitated) by institutional, market, and socio-cultural structures” (p. 61). The subsection
below offers the discussion that addresses three kinds of obstacles that emerged from the data. The framework by Chell is used here to organize the discussion.

**Market obstacles.** The free market is recognized as an extremely complex and rapidly changing environment in which successful work requires expertise in many specific areas and a proactive attitude. The Center for Off-Campus Programs has a main responsibility to explore the market for risk and obstacles in order to launch new programs. In situations when enrollment is not sufficient, the Center for Off-Campus Programs makes decisions to cancel or reschedule classes and provide the students with the other options in accordance with their programs. The academic departments are also actively involved in exploring the market. Faculty members at the Leadership Department conduct comparative research collecting data from institutions across the country. They identify both the best practices and challenges in their fields in the market. It is important for the members of the organization to be fast and to offer the programs that are in demand.

**Institutional obstacles.** The available data demonstrate that while the University and its departments urge the individuals to display an entrepreneurial attitude, the University’s reward system is not sufficient, and the policies do not fully support the faculty in their participation in innovation. For example, a faculty tenure system does not fully recognize the innovative work by the faculty members. Dr. Jones complained that most of his activities on developing, launching, and running the innovative and nationally recognized master’s degree program for Charter School Leaders were implemented voluntarily. His time consuming work on an innovative program brings reputation and money to the University and the Department, and he feels that these activities must be counted for a tenured professorship. The faculty members are not offered any monetary rewards for their work that is beyond their regular responsibilities.
Emotionally they may feel burnout and loss of interest to be active participants of the entrepreneurial process.

Another institutional obstacle that emerged from the collected data can be called *bureaucratization of entrepreneurial process*. According to the interviewee who represented the Center for Charter Schools, the Center at the beginning of its existence was more *entrepreneurial* and more creative. After the main goals of establishing the infrastructure for charter schools were achieved, and the Charter School Office received state-wide and nation-wide recognition, the *entrepreneurial* attitude declined and turned to more bureaucratized routine process.

**Socio-cultural obstacles.** There is evidence of a traditional *Ivory Tower* attitude at the University. According to several interviewees, some academic departments are still resistant to changes and are trying to avoid active collaborations across the University and beyond it. The researcher assumes that there are also those in the School of Education who are not interested in organizational changes; however, the narratives show no visible resistance at the explored academic departments. According to the interviewees, those people, who are resistant to change, work somewhere in the “other departments.” This can be interpreted that entrepreneurialism has deeply penetrated into the School of Education and became a dominant organizational culture.

The theme “Obstacles to Entrepreneurial Transformation” describes resistance that the Charter School Office experienced at the beginning of its existence. The narratives also show that sometimes faculty members see their personal challenges in communication with their colleagues, and/or lack of trust.

**Level 4: Globalizing Environment and Universities**

**Concept of evolution of an entrepreneurial university.** Etzkowitz (2003, 2004) proposed that all universities due to evolutionary process become more entrepreneurial. It is
obvious that now higher education institutions serve not only those traditional clients who walk into the door of a “brick and mortar” university but also those who never physically visited the organization. Danneels (2002) pointed out that “organizations need to continuously renew themselves if they are to survive and prosper in dynamic environments” (p. 1095). Many other researchers stated that external changes lead to internal organizational adjustments in strategy, structure, and operational methods (Emery & Trist, 1965; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Morris & Jones, 1999; Thompson, 1965; Shoemaker, 1971; Whipp & Clark, 1986). These conceptual underpinnings of an entrepreneurial university are supported by the data collected from the University. Specifically, all explored departments experience pressures that come from the state and national politics, as well as from the higher education market, technology, and cultural shifts in society. The accreditation agencies and the Department of Education represent the political force. The political heat is increasing every year, and the University experiences this hit through changes in the accreditation and state requirements. This political pressure was described by the interviewees as the major force for many changes. Market demand is another factor that stimulates the entrepreneurial transformation. The phrase “We are not going to lose money…” by Dr. Jones describes fully the connections between the educational market at the national scale and the activities at the academic departments. The most recent computer technologies are integrated in all new programs and services, which is also evidence of global force and entrepreneurial transformation.

**University location, size, and expansion.** The fact that the University is located in a rural area explains the need of the University to reach out. Delerue and Lejeune (2012) suggested that “larger size may maximize the location options ventures have for internationalizing operations to reduce dependence on the local environment, and may be most
beneficial for ensuring firms possess the resources they need to operate on a global level” (p. 284). The scholars stated that expansion across multiple regional areas minimize the effects of competition in the local region. International experience opens the door for innovations sooner for those who possess it. This study also shows that internationalization increases the “ability to recognize and exploit the available international opportunities that arise” (p. 284). Entrepreneurs with less international experience “limit their international activities to those regions with which they are most familiar” (p. 284). Studies show that location of universities in metropolitan areas where the highly qualified labor is allocated and industrial firms are clustered does not make organizations active in international collaborations. When universities are active internationally that means that they expand operations over the traditional boundaries. According to Delerue and Lejeune (2012), the important factors that influence the capacity of an organization to act internationally are the size of the organization and international experience of top managers.

The world becomes small and flat (Friedman, 2005) for this University and the investigated departments. The interviewed study participants articulated clearly that they do not feel comfortable to be isolated from the world and prefer to be active and be present in many places across the country and internationally.

**Global behaviors of the University.** Levin (2001), in his work, identified as common for many higher educational institutions changes that he named *global behaviors*. Many of those global behaviors that reflect “how institutions (their members) respond to global forces as well as to the behaviors of the state in its responses to global forces such as global competitiveness” (Levin, 2001, p. 240) were found at the University academic and non-academic departments. The findings support Levin’s notion that the global economy forced educational institutions to change their focus toward market. Specifically, Levin wrote, “These alterations in effect moved
colleges away from local community social needs towards local market needs and in line with national and international agendas of dominant influencers such as governments and businesses” (p. 238).

There are many evidences that show that the University strategically forms a market oriented culture and market relative values. The University through its website also emphasizes the market oriented educational programs and services provided to students. For example, the quotes of testimonies have been posted online in which one graduate who completed her master’s degree in an off-campus site located in the Southeastern region hundreds miles from the main location of the university, said: “I wanted to be up-to-speed with everybody else… I wanted to get paid well, and I wanted to have more information and knowledge and better ways to be a teacher.” Another quote from the advertising page is a saying by a graduate: “Since I finished my degree, I have recently been nominated and accepted into the Executive Leadership Program and a lot of doors have opened up for me.”

Levin’s (2001) concept that describes global behaviors explains entrepreneurial transformation at the explored departments. Levin pointed out that higher educational institutions focusing on economic development become “more entrepreneurial in their behaviors” (Levin, 2001, p. 239). Some findings of global behaviors discovered in this study are displayed in Table 12.
Table 12

Global behaviors in the University’s departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Department</th>
<th>Teacher Education Department</th>
<th>Charter School Office</th>
<th>Faculty Development Center</th>
<th>Center for Off-Campus Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Global Studies Committee, Study abroad programs, international students, teaching overseas, planning to deliver degree programs abroad</td>
<td>Partnership with the UK.</td>
<td>Diversity of personal professional backgrounds.</td>
<td>Off-campus sites overseas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Focus on global diversity</td>
<td>Student teaching in diverse settings</td>
<td>Professionals from different fields</td>
<td>Professionals from different fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOM</td>
<td>Courses and programs are homogenized. Homogenized programs are important to control educational processes in remote locations and online.</td>
<td>Programs and services are highly homogenized in policies, rules, instructions, directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Online courses and degree programs.</td>
<td>Online services, data bases.</td>
<td>Trainings, webinars for internal and external audience</td>
<td>Online and off-campus programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRK</td>
<td>Programs and courses are advertised on the University’s website, at conferences, through students, by spreading a word. The University pays Google for advertising on the search pages in google.com.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>The department makes changes in the structure and leadership. The responsibility roles are switching among faculty members and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/E</td>
<td>All changes are performed to increase productivity and efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/A</td>
<td>Adjunct faculty teach many off campus and online classes.</td>
<td>Several staff members work remotely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Faculty and staff use internet technologies. They create online degree programs and hybrid courses. They use technologies for video conferences with colleagues and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviation codes (Levin, 2001):

Internationalization – I; Multiculturalism – MC; Homogenization – HOM; Commodification – COM; Marketization – MRK; Restructuring – R; Productivity/Efficiency – P/E; Labor Alteration – LA; Information Technologies – ET
Addressing the Guiding Research Questions

The first research question for this study was formulated in the following way: “What evidences of entrepreneurialism such as entrepreneurial behaviors and entrepreneurial products can be identified at the selected departments?” The inductive analysis of the emergent themes shows many evidences of entrepreneurial (creative, innovative, proactive) behaviors that result with entrepreneurial products such as innovative programs and services that the departments at the School of Education create and “sell” in the state, region, nation, and internationally. 

Entrepreneurial behaviors were defined as characteristics of individuals observed in the organization (e.g., pursuing an opportunity, taking risk, holistic view, putting things together creatively, etc.) and as institutionalized practices that are deeply embedded in the organizational culture (e.g., study abroad programs, new online courses, interdisciplinary and interdepartmental collaboration, scanning the market for the needs, etc.) (Gibb, 2000).

The term an entrepreneurial product was defined as knowledge transfer to programs and/or services to “be sold” in the market (e.g., Berchem, 1991; Clark, 2001; Geiger, 2005). Several entrepreneurial products, academic programs and services, that were identified and discussed in this study are listed here: (1) master’s degree online program for charter school leaders, (2) master’s degree online program for teachers as classroom leaders, (3) online master’s calendar for charter schools, state agencies, and the authorizers, and (4) digital databases and phone service for schools, state agencies, and the authorizers.

The following emergent themes address the first research question: “Entrepreneurial Individuals as Key in the Organization,” “Entrepreneurial Reputation,” “Diversity of Personal and Professional Experiences and Expertize,” “Teamwork and Internal Collaborations,” “External Collaborations,” “Business-Like Behaviors,” “Unique Programs and Services,”
“Internationalization,” “Research Activities,” “Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture,” and “University Support.”

The second research question was: “What entrepreneurial elements (Clark, 2004) and global behaviors (Levin, 2001) can be identified at the selected departments?” Many evidences discussed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 demonstrate the alignment of data to each of the listed theoretical underpinnings. It was found that the investigated University has many funding streams and works intentionally to expand them (i.e., a diversified funding base element) (Clark, 2004). There are many interest groups that bring these funds and impact steering their departments, the School of Education, and the entire University (i.e., a strengthened steering core element). Administrators, staff, faculty, and students collaborate in many departmental and cross-departmental teams to explore the needs in the market and create programs and services to address these needs. The University’s non-academic centers work aggressively to connect the academic departments from across the campus and at the School of Education to numerous external organizations to help them better reach out, attract, and retain their prospective and current students and partners (i.e., a stimulated academic heartland element). The non-academic centers and newly created units obtain more flexibility in their collaborations with the external organizations and individuals. The relations within the University, among the departments, become more loosely coupled (i.e., an expanded developmental periphery element) (Clark, 2004). The University culture and infrastructure support innovative activities of the organizational members and encourage them to go beyond their traditional walls (i.e., an integrated entrepreneurial culture element).

The nine global behaviors (Levin, 2001) were also evident at the University. Data collected for this study demonstrate that the global behaviors do not play equal roles in the
University operation. *Internationalization* was found to be the most important behavior at the School of Education. Students and faculty are exposed to issues of *multiculturalism* through their participation in study abroad programs and collaborations with organizations throughout the state. Numerous programs offered across the nation are evidence of *commodification*. While the process of “selling” the degree and certificate programs by the academic departments is supported by the Center for Off-Campus programs, the Charter School Office had to establish the Charter School Institute in order to become more independent while “selling” its services in the market. *Electronic communication and information* behavior can be easily observed on the surface. *Homogenization* is the other global behavior that refers to the fact that designed and developed programs become more structured. They applied the specific rubrics that make it easier to control the quality of performance. The more off-site locations the University has the more homogenized become the programs that are offered remotely and controlled from the University main campus. The University’s centers, academic departments, and individual faculty and staff are involved in *marketing*. The programs and services are advertised widely through multiple channels of information (e.g. youtube video, google, TV, Radio, through presentations at conferences and meetings, and so on). The fast pace of responses to internal processes and external forces urge the University to implement many *re-structuring* activities. During the period of time when this study was conducted (approximately 18 months), several noticeable changes were observed at the University such as the University’s website was changed completely, a new Dean was selected and hired at the School of Education, and the head of the Leadership Department took a leadership position in the Dean’s office. Changes of department heads and other leaders as well as hiring more adjuncts for off-campus sites reflect the *labor alterations*. All changes have been made to reach more *productivity and efficiency* of
the programs, services, and operations.

The last research question was formulated the following way: “How do the global behaviors, entrepreneurial behaviors, and entrepreneurial products impact the entrepreneurial transformation at the selected departments?” All of the processes at the selected departments that were defined as global and organizational entrepreneurial behaviors demonstrate that the study participants have a clear understanding of the direction for the future growth and development. The organizational members at all levels of the organizational hierarchy share the vision expressed by the University top-leaders. The top-down and bottom-up processes of entrepreneurial transformation that involve all levels of the University community were observed at the University. Leaders on the top promote entrepreneurialism across the campus and create institutional systems and mechanisms to support entrepreneurialism. The University’s community members, in their turn, demonstrate creativity and active engagement in the entrepreneurial processes.

Success in transferring knowledge to programs and services and the revenue from online and off-campus programs that come back to the departments stimulate administrators, staff, and faculty to create more and improve existing programs and services (Schramm, 2004). It is evident that the University’s leaders understand the impact of the global market on the University as the entire organization as well on every single department.

Entrepreneurial organizational culture supports individuals within the explored departments and encourages them to work in teams on different innovative projects. Activities and communications motivate organizational members to compete against external organizations, schools and departments within the University, and among each other within the departments. The organizational members see the value and uniqueness in their activities and
enjoy a new forming identity of being in a proactive, creative, innovative (i.e., entrepreneurial) organization (Kuratko, 2005; Vaira, 2004). The data prove that a stimulated heartland and a strengthening steering core (Clark, 2004) are recognized as strong elements of entrepreneurial transformation of the University that maintains and sustains the entrepreneurial achievement oriented organizational culture. The following four core themes addressed this research question: “Diversity of Personal and Professional Experiences and Expertise,” “Teamwork and Internal Collaborations,” “Unique Programs and Services,” and “Entrepreneurial Achievement Oriented Organizational Culture.”
Chapter 6: Implications

Implications for Theory and Suggestions for Future Research

Diversification as an entrepreneurial attribute of individuals (A. Gibb, 2000). The data from this study suggest that “diversity of experience/expertise” should be added to the list of entrepreneurial attributes developed by Gibb (2000). Gibb proposed the following entrepreneurial attributes of individuals: achievement orientation and ambition, self-confidence and self-esteem, perseverance, high internal locus of control (autonomy), action orientation, preference for learning by doing, hard work, and determination (Gibb, 1998). Chapter 4 (e.g., themes “Entrepreneurial Individuals as Key in the Organization,” “Teamwork and Internal Collaboration,” “Diversity of Personal and Professional Experiences and Expertise”) and Chapter 5 (e.g., section “Level 1: Entrepreneurial Individuals in the Organization”) provided discussions on many of entrepreneurial characteristics that the individuals perform at the explored organization. The attribute of the “diversity of experience/expertise” correlates with the behavior named by Gibb (1998) “putting things together creatively.” It should not be omitted in a list of entrepreneurial attributes. This dissertation study found that diverse experience and expertise impact positively the ability to create innovative combinations of “different things.” Consider the way of finding best solutions to problems that is employed by the Charter School Office when the professionals from different fields work together. Another example refers to Dr. Parker, director of the Faculty Development Center, who emphasized that most of the new things are combinations and applications of the existing practices and experiences. The more things/experiences/expertise an entrepreneur or organization possesses the more innovative combinations of the existing things can be created.

The discovered entrepreneurial attribute of “diversity of experience/expertise” revealed a
need to explore how *diversity of experience/expertise* plays out in the entrepreneurial process in organizations. Further research may be done on entrepreneurial behaviors, skills, and attributes of individuals (e.g., administrators, faculty members, students) and interest groups (e.g., interdisciplinary committees and project teams) in higher education institutions to identify how these attributes, skills, and behaviors impact and influence each other.

**Organizational culture as a dimension of entrepreneurial behavior (Bird, 1989).** In her book *Entrepreneurial behavior*, Barbara Bird (1989) discussed four dimensions/factors that comprise entrepreneurial behavior: (a) “individuals—the entrepreneurs—who set the process in motion and who direct the early stages of new ventures” (p. 1); (b) *organizational outcomes* of that process—the new organization, career, jobs, wealth, products, etc.; (c) the *process of entrepreneurship* itself—the conceiving, creating, organizing, promoting, and implementing of new organizations; and (d) *the environment of venturing* which refers to the larger social, economic, and political forces that support or restrict entrepreneurship. According to Bird, “Each of these four elements influences or conditions the others” (p. 2), and all together they shape entrepreneurial behavior (see Figure 12).

![Figure 12. Theoretical framework of entrepreneurial behavior. Adapted from: Bird, 1989.](image-url)
It was found that major categories of the emergent themes from the data collected for this study, which are shown in Table 8 (p. 205), reflect Bird’s (1989) concept (Figure 12). A closer look at Bird’s concept revealed that an organizational culture, one of the most important themes emerging from the data, does not appear in Bird’s theoretical framework. Bird identified an environmental context that supports, or restricts, entrepreneurialism as an important component in her theory. Environmental context refers to external forces and trends and should be distinguished from the internal organizational culture (e.g., Clark, 2004; García-Cabrera & García-Soto, 2008; Gibb, 2000; Held et al, 1999; Hofstede, 1997). This study shows that the concept of the entrepreneurial culture of an organization helps understand why some organizations are more proactive or entrepreneurial than others when they operate in the same environment and experience similar external forces. The researcher believes that the organizational culture is the most important drive for entrepreneurial transformation of an organization because the entrepreneurial culture as the pattern of behaviors mirrors what the organizational members learned overtime from the challenges they faced dealing with each other and with the environment change (Schein, 2004). When applying Bird’s entrepreneurial behavior framework, it is suggested to consider an organizational culture as one of the dimensions that impact entrepreneurialism at organizations.

Collaboration levels at the Triple Helix model (Etzkowitz, 2003). The Triple Helix model of University-Industry-Government collaborations proposed by Etzkowitz (2003) explains the growing interactions among these three spheres of society as an evolutionary process and emergence of tri-lateral networking organizations that appear because of and for the collaborations. Etzkowitz argued that these collaborations are the results of the natural societal process that makes higher education institutions become an integral part of society and serve it
not only through teaching and research but also through transferring knowledge to products and services.

This study found that entrepreneurial departments are very active in their collaborations with the organizations in the state, region, nation, and outside of the country. Besides study abroad programs and research projects, universities spread their branches overseas and deliver their programs in face-to-face as well as in online formats to students in their home countries (e.g., Altbach, 2004; Levin, 2001). Collected data demonstrate that the explored University and its academic departments are working in this direction of expanding their area of program delivery. It is suggested that the Triple Helix model should be developed with the levels of collaborations in all three spheres of the model. Figure 13 shows the proposed local, national, and international levels within each of the spheres.

![Figure 13. Triple Helix Model and collaboration levels.](image)

There are many evidences that the departments at the University build relationships with the government agencies, private and public organizations across the state, nation, and abroad. As the data suggest, an entrepreneurial university goes into its partnerships outside of its
traditional boundaries. The emphasis on expanding programs and services nationally and globally should be considered as a call for further research with application of the Triple Helix collaboration model.

**Technical core as an open system at entrepreneurial universities (Thompson, 1967).** Thompson (1967) argued that a *technical core* (i.e., what faculty traditionally do at their academic departments) in organizations serves as a *closed system* and tends to seek *certainty*, whereas the *institutional level* of an organization (i.e., what university administrators do to provide the legitimacy of the organization) are an *open system* that faces and deals with the *uncertainty* of the external task environment. Thompson described *managerial level* (i.e., what academic department administrators/managers do) as a *mediator* between the technical core (closed system) and the institutional level (open system) to balance their relationships and interactions (Figure 14).

![Organizational theory model](image)

*Figure 14. Organizational theory model. Adapted from Thompson, 1967.*

This study demonstrates that globalization forces the University to become more *open* to the environment at all organizational levels. Today, both the managerial and technical core levels deal with the market impact on the organization. The institutional level does not protect
the technical core from the environmental forces the way it was during previous eras (e.g., Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt, & Cantisano Terra, 2000), but, instead, creates organizational units (e.g., Charter School Office, Center for Off-Campus Programs) that allow the organizational members at all levels of University’s hierarchy interact with the market. Traditional boundaries between the university levels (i.e., core, managerial, institutional) become weaker and more transparent. The relationships between the organizational levels become more loosely coupled. The University’s departments get more autonomy and more responsibilities for their survival. Per the interviewee, “it is difficult to know how far you go from your mission” (Mr. Taylor, personal communications, July 5, 2011). While the department heads (managerial level) easier accept new responsibilities to deal with the market, the faculty members (technical core workers) take differently these new responsibilities to act in the business field. Entrepreneurial universities are able to find a way to create organizational mechanisms and an entrepreneurial culture to support and encourage the technical core workers to participate in the activities that traditionally were delegated to the managerial and institutional levels.

Future studies on entrepreneurial universities with the application of the organizational theory (Thompson, 1967) will be helpful to understand how globalization and institutional entrepreneurialism impact the organizational segments (i.e., technical core, managerial and institutional levels) and their traditional roles and functions.

**Entrepreneurial behavior as one of the global behaviors (Levin, 2001).** Levin (2001) proposed nine global behaviors of the post-secondary institutions that reflect how these organizations respond to global pressures. This study suggests two implications to Levin’s theory. The first implication is the recommendation to add Entrepreneurialism as an organizational behavior to the existing list of global behaviors, which are as follows: (1)
Internationalization, (2) Multiculturalism, (3) Commodification, (4) Homogenization, (5) Marketization, (6) Re-Structuring, (7) Labor Alterations, (8) Productivity and Efficiency, and (9) Electronic Communication and Information. Entrepreneurialism as a global behavior should be understood as a set of behaviors that involve creative actions, innovations, and knowledge transfer to products (programs and services) that have economic and social values and are sold in the market.

Another suggestion is to rank the global behaviors on their importance for entrepreneurial transformations and investigate the conditions in which certain global behaviors play a more profound role in entrepreneurial transformation of organizations. This study revealed that some of the global behaviors have less impact on and even can prevent entrepreneurialism while other behaviors stimulate the change process more effectively. Consider Homogenization and Labor Alteration. These two behaviors can be observed at any traditional university that intends to be more productive in its operation: programs become similar to each other and the opening positions are not filled with fulltime faculty and administrators, but the work load is distributed among part-time staff and adjunct faculty (Burgess, Lewis, & Mobbs, 2003). The other behaviors such as Internationalization and Commodification can be seen as strong drives at the University’s departments that are reaching out and allocating resources globally. Future research is needed to develop and clarify the concept of global behaviors and their roles in entrepreneurial transformation of the higher education institutions.

**Isomorphism (Etzkowitz, et al., 2000) vs. allomorphism (Vaira, 2004).** In future research, it is suggested to explore the concepts of organizational behavior and identify in the time of increasing uncertainty (challenging economic times) which of two behavioral strategies, *isomorphism* (Etzkowitz, et al., 2000) or *allomorphism* (Vaira, 2004), is the primary driving
force for the growth of entrepreneurial higher education organizations. While isomorphism refers to behaviors that can be observed when organizations mimic what other similar institutions have already successfully accomplished, allomorphism refers to the behaviors when organizations intentionally try to find their own way to succeed and to act differently in comparison to other similar institutions.

Homogenization behavior (Levin, 2001) as isomorphism, on one hand, may be a positive force for changes and would contribute to entrepreneurial transformation with the increase production process. However, on the other hand, entrepreneurialism is associated with uniqueness and creativity which refers to allomorphism. Allomorphism is the opposite approach to homogenization because allomorphic organizations seek their own unique way (Clark, 2000) to be successful in the market.

Further research is needed to identify the main driving force among these two types of behaviors and develop recommendations for higher education institutions for their strategy in mimicking and/or seeking their own unique ways to success.

Implications for Practice

This dissertation study gave the researcher an opportunity to develop in-depth expertise and understanding of the processes that occur at a higher educational organization at the level of individual, departmental, and university levels. At the end of the dissertation journey, the researcher feels professional confidence in articulating major trends and concepts in the area of entrepreneurialism in higher education.

The researcher believes that educational leaders, administrators and faculty members, as well as students have to understand and accept the fact that entrepreneurial transformation is inevitable process in higher education. It is time for the academic community to learn that
higher education moves from the Ivory Tower paradigm to active participation in all processes that occur in society. It is the job of educational leaders to promote change and build in their organizations an entrepreneurial culture that supports diversity, creativity, and innovation.

When applying the organizational theory (Thompson, 1967) in administrative work or teaching, the researcher recommends considering the concept of evolution of the universities (Etzkowitz, 2003, 2004). The theory of evolution of universities that are forced to become more and more entrepreneurial in order to succeed as well as the concepts of the emerging “conceptual age” (Pink, 2005) and rise of the “creative class” (Florida, 2002) are very valuable when they are incorporated into teaching the organizational theory, change theory, leadership theory, and human resource management theory. This perspective helps learners see the large picture of their organizations and the global trends that force their organizations in a particular direction. When learners understand these theories, it reduces their fear of uncertainty and unpredictability of the future of the organizations and the world itself.

The image of an entrepreneur, representative of the “creative class,” is helpful for college students to picture the traits, skills, dispositions of individuals/leaders that are in demand in the current job market. It is a suggestion for faculty and administrators to draw the connections between the terms “leadership” and “entrepreneurship” as synonyms because the characteristics of a leader and an entrepreneur cross-cut and overlap in scholar literature. This parallel between leadership and entrepreneurship helps bridging Educational Leadership discipline with many other academic fields.

While teaching about an organizational culture, it is also helpful to use a concept of an entrepreneurial culture which supports creativity, innovations, change, teamwork, holistic view, and flexibility. Students may have an assignment to look at the culture of their organizations
from the entrepreneurial perspective and assess whether organizational members are open for change and innovations. It is important for administrators/managers of educational organizations, whose role is to ensure stability of the organizational processes, to learn about an entrepreneurial type of organizations that allow some degree of untidiness and informality to support the flow of idea exchange and to encourage the engagement of all organizational members (Gibb, 2000).
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