

ENTREPRENEURIAL LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION:
DOES THE PRESIDENTIAL CAREER PATHWAY MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
PHILLIP DANIEL BYRNE
Dr. Barbara N. Martin, Dissertation Supervisor

December 2013

© Copyright by Phillip Daniel Byrne 2013

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

ENTREPRENEURIAL LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION:
DOES THE PRESIDENTIAL CAREER PATHWAY MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

presented by Phillip Daniel Byrne,

a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Barbara Martin, Major Advisor

Dr. Carolyn McKnight

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson

Dr. Jennifer Robins

DEDICATION

I could not have completed this dissertation without the love of my life, Daria. She provided constant encouragement, editorial direction, and understanding throughout the long and delayed writing process. I tend to be a procrastinator, therefore, Daria kept me focused on the dissertation throughout all the changes in our life including a new job, a house move (with renovations), and the birth of our two wonderful boys (Finnegan Robert and Lochlan McConnell).

Finally, I never would have dreamed one day to attain a doctoral degree. It was a step just to attend undergraduate education, so I encourage others to keep working towards a lifelong education. I learned so much from my doctoral faculty and colleagues which shaped my career direction and educational growth.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to the members of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Barbara Martin, Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dr. Jennifer Robins, and Dr. Carolyn McKnight. A special thank you to my dissertation Chair, Dr. Martin for her constant encouragement, positive attitude, endless reviews of my dissertation, friendship, and pushing me to not take the easy road. Her commitment to getting this done - I'll forever be in her debt!

My editor-in-chief and love, Daria McConnell Byrne, Ed.D who spent numerous hours reading my dissertation and provided constant APA style, as well as content improvements to the flow of the paper. I'm lucky to be married to an amazing and talented woman!

Finally, I would like to acknowledge our Cohort Six colleagues: Cathy, Jason, Jill, Karen, and Nick. It was a pleasure having such a fun and insightful group to explore the world of education. We had fun, but stayed on task, and always celebrated accomplishments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptual Underpinnings of the Study.....	9
Leadership.....	10
Entrepreneurship.....	11
Organizational Analysis.....	13
Knowledge Creation	14
Purpose of the Study.....	16
Research Questions.....	16
Limitations and Assumptions	17
Design Controls	18
Definitions of Key Terms	20
Summary.....	23
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Leadership.....	27
Leadership Agility	28
Other Leadership Theories.....	30

Yukl’s Leadership Classification	31
Participative Leadership Theory	33
Distributed or Shared Leadership Theory.....	35
Transformational Leadership Theory	36
Servant Leadership Theory	38
Entrepreneurism	39
Institutional Entrepreneurship.....	41
Social Entrepreneurism.....	44
Academic and Intellectual Entrepreneurism	46
Entrepreneurism Conclusion.....	48
Organizational Analysis.....	50
Culture Metaphor	51
Entrepreneurism and Culture	55
Knowledge Creation	58
Entrepreneurism and Knowledge Creation.....	61
Summary	62
3. RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY	68
Introduction.....	68
Overview of Purpose and Problem	69
Research Questions	70
Rationale for Use of a Dual Case Study	71
Qualitative Research	72
Case Study	76

Participants.....	76
Data Collection and Instruments.....	78
Interviews.....	79
Focus Groups	80
Document Analysis.....	81
Observation.....	81
Data Analysis	82
Artifact Analysis	83
Summary.....	83
4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	85
Introduction.....	85
Study Design.....	86
Data Collection Method.....	87
Conceptual Framework.....	88
Research Questions.....	89
Process of Data Analysis	90
Settings.....	91
Participants.....	93
Themes.....	96
Sense of Urgency	96
Leadership.....	98
Communication.....	102
Culture of Higher Education.....	104

History and Traditions	106
Environment.....	109
Entrepreneurial Vision	112
21 st Century Higher Education.....	115
Institutional Platform and Innovation	119
Summary	123
5. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS.....	124
Introduction.....	124
Summary of Findings.....	125
Conclusions Derived from the Findings	142
Sense of Urgency	143
Culture of Higher Education.....	145
Entrepreneurial Vision	147
Limitations	151
Implications for Practice	153
Recommendations for Future Study	155
Concluding Overview	156
REFERENCES	159

APPENDICES	169
A. GATEKEEPER LETTER	169
B. IRB APPROVAL LETTER	170
C. CAMPUS EXECUTIVE INTERVIEWS/PROTOCOL	171
D. INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS/PROTOCOL	172
E. FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL.....	173
F. PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	176
VITA.....	177

ENTREPRENEURIAL LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION:
DOES THE PRESIDENTIAL CAREER PATHWAY MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Phillip Daniel Byrne

Dr. Barbara N. Martin, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

In the United States of America, the role and responsibilities for the University president in many institutions have undergone significant change for the 21st century. As noted by Duderstadt (2006) “[t]he American presidency has more of the character of a chief executive officer” (p. 249). Amey (2006) stated “[l]eaders are key to how organizations function, and there is little doubt that the leaders who are needed to guide postsecondary institutions in tomorrow’s complex environments have to think about their work differently than did their predecessors” (p. 58). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to gain understanding of two university presidents (one selected through the [traditional] academy career path and the other from the corporate business sector [nontraditional]) through an entrepreneurship lens. The researcher selected a dual case study to focus on discovery rather than hypothesis testing (Merriam, 1998). Data within the study were gathered from interviews, focus groups, and document review providing multiple perspectives by the study participants. The two campus presidents (n=2) were interviewed, along with an additional 19 individuals from the executive or cabinet leadership team.

Through analysis, it was determined that three main themes and six sub themes emerged: 1) Sense of Urgency, with subthemes of: a) Leadership, b) Communication; 2) Culture of Higher Education, with subthemes of: a) History and Traditions, b) Environment; and 3) *Entrepreneurial* Vision, with subthemes of: a) 21st Century Higher

Education, b) Institutional Platform and Innovation. Findings from the study indicate the sense of urgency for leadership transcends the higher education institution for the 21st century, and the career pathways for these Presidents did not reflect a difference in how these leaders approached the challenges of a rapidly changing environment. Yet, the president who worked his way up to the presidency through the traditional pathway of the academy appeared to be more hesitant to change the traditions of the academy. Conversely, the president who came up the ranks of business, viewed change as what was needed in the university and if that change did not occur, survival was an issue.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

In the United States of America, the role and responsibilities for the university president in many institutions have undergone significant change for the 21st century. As Duderstadt (2006) explained, “[t]he American presidency has more of the character of a chief executive officer” (p. 249). The complexity of the institutions demands a leader who can manage multiple functions of the organization. In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role, with the president guiding resource development including state, federal, private donors, intellectual property, land development, and many more revenue streams. The University of the 21st century requires leadership capable of responding to these as well as emerging global opportunities to deliver life-long learning across the world (Duderstadt, 2006).

Furthermore, Smith (2008) argued the leadership of higher education “[had] been encouraged to shift toward more executive styles of leadership and decision-making” (p. 240). Similarly, the institution of higher education in a knowledge-based society seeks dynamic visionary leadership (Smith). Likewise, Appadurai (2009) suggested higher education leadership has begun to recruit campus leaders from the business and political sectors. The entrepreneurial activities of the universities include economic development, healthcare management, and numerous other traditional corporate sectors distinctiveness (Appadurai). Furthermore, Yokoyama (2006) noted a strong leadership approach must be integrated in higher education to sustain the resources necessary in creating an entrepreneurial culture. The importance of university leadership in the American higher

education institutions requires strong entrepreneurial guidance during a time of great change (Yokoyama). Yet today, the environment on most American campuses does not support strong leadership, therefore turnover rates remain high (Duderstadt, 2006) implying it may be time for universities in America to become more entrepreneurial and for campus leaders to be identified as an entrepreneur.

Dudersadt (2006) postulated that the changes and challenges in our society require a dedicated higher education leader willing to keep pace with the private sector. Further arguing, the machine of higher education must allow a leader the creativity and authority to strengthen the resolve of the institution to move more rapidly (Duderstadt). Consequently, the effectiveness of a college or university can be directly related to the strength of the institution leadership (Whetten & Cameron, 1985). Such examples exist in Russia, Japan, Australia and other European countries that have significant culture shift to an entrepreneurial model. Grduzinskii (2005) posited:

One of the most fully worked out forms that are being used successfully by a number of universities in Europe and Russia is the entrepreneurial organization. Experience has shown that innovative entrepreneurial universities are successfully accomplishing the tasks of higher education, and that includes mass scientific research, which ensures high-quality teaching as well as the tasks of cooperation with the regions. (p. 21)

The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization. Therefore, leadership in higher education is characterized as an essential component and the campus leader must be the integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership (Amey, 2006). Yukl (2006) stated “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it

involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 3). Yet, Gardner (2000) identified leadership as the ability to strengthen the organization because “no individual has the skills...to carry out all the complex tasks of contemporary leadership” (p. 12). However, it is clear that the new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness “to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions” (Duderstadt, 2006, p. 257).

The university leaders who develop ways to operate efficiently and connect their programs to the university’s mission are more likely to maintain robust enrollments, provide excellent academic programs, balance budgets and prosper in the 21st century (Burnett & Collins, 2010). The leader operating in a capital and knowledge drive economy provides vision and strategy for the future. “The conditions resulting from scarce resources and conditions created by reductions in expected funding can force academics and higher education practitioners to become more entrepreneurial in how they approach, sustain, and expand their professional network” (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 21-22). Moreover, Amey (2006) stated “[l]eaders are key to how organizations function, and there is little doubt that the leaders who are needed to guide postsecondary institutions in tomorrow’s complex environments have to think about their work differently than did their predecessors” (p. 58). These institutions of higher education represent complex organizations operating in an era of scarce resources. “Applying entrepreneurial principles, concepts, and terminologies to academic activities warrants thoughtful consideration of the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of

entrepreneurship” (Mars & Metcalf, p. 1). These common interests bind entrepreneurship and higher education together in creativity and originality, “[t]herefore, entrepreneurship should be a pervasive approach to learning and to the management of universities” (Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation [EMKF], 2009, p. 112).

Entrepreneurship affords a new perspective for leaders in managing the higher education enterprise. The EMKF, within the *Kauffman Thoughtbook* (2009), posited: [f]our reasons justify a significant role for entrepreneurship in contemporary American higher education. First, entrepreneurship is critical to success in the contemporary global economy. Second, entrepreneurship is already an expanding area of American college learning. Third, through innovation and commercialization, entrepreneurship is becoming a basic part of what universities themselves do. Fourth, entrepreneurship achieves key goals of quality American undergraduate education. To neglect entrepreneurship distances university learning from the world it is supposed to help students learn to understand (p. 113).

The strategies of entrepreneurship resemble what the contemporary post secondary institution of higher learning aspires to model in an academic capacity. “Today’s postsecondary leaders need to guide their institutions into the future while providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organization culture and values” (Amey, 2006, p. 58). Organizational change strategies that engage entrepreneurship should include tangible recommendations for how entrepreneurial approaches can assist socially oriented fields. These approaches contribute to the wellbeing of institutions and surrounding communities in ways that

provide a socially responsible value (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 79). In addition, Amey (2006) speculated “[a]cademic leaders create learning environments that include cultural awareness, acceptance of multiple intelligences and ways of knowing, strategic thinking, engagement, and a sense of collective identity as collaborators in developing knowledge and active investigators into practice” (p. 56). While Burnett and Collins (2010) trusted higher education “evolution will make certain the survival of colleges and universities” willing to embrace “prudent change” and remain grounded in the mission responsiveness and consistency towards the needs of their clientele (p. 198). The leadership model for higher education must undertake significant change to manage the complexity of enterprises operating in a 21st century knowledge economy. “Despite overwhelming support for a shared and participative approach to leadership, however, a clear finding concerned the expressed desire for inspirational or visionary individuals, particularly in times of change or transition” (Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2008, p. 364-366).

The campus executive officer for the 21 century academy brings a dynamic blend of entrepreneurial characteristics and traits to the leadership position. Fernald, Solomon, and Tarabishy (2005) discovered leaders and entrepreneurs are accomplished to the degree that they provided “(1) strategic leadership (vision and long-term goals); (2) problem-solving skills; (3) timely decision-making; (4) a willingness to accept risk; and (5) good negotiating skills” (p. 5). Likewise, Drew (2010) found the following five themes emerged from research including: “fiscal and people resources, flexibility, creativity and change-capability, responding to competing tensions and remaining relevant, maintaining academic quality, and effective strategic leadership” (p. 61-62). A compilation of leaders discussed “how leadership was accomplished within universities,

most referred to the significance of social networks and relationships...leaders frequently spoke of needing to learn how to navigate and utilize the informal paths and networks” (Bolden et al., 2008, p. 366). Furthermore, Amey (2006) posited, “...leaders across higher education are best served by learning to think critically about their roles” (p. 55). In American education, intelligibility is a basic ambition, and innovation and invention are the most significant outcomes (EMKF, 2009, p. 15). Entrepreneurial leadership has been identified by those who realize a transformation in leadership style is required in order for American’s economy to be competitive with the rest of the world (Fernald et al., 2005). The knowledge economy necessitates higher education leadership to view the enterprise of higher education through a lens of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship is higher education’s genuine and likely ally. The merger of the two is the best expectation to bring society the greatest advantage from the outcomes of independent and imaginative learning (EMKF, p. 15). Consequently, it is evident today of the beneficial outcomes of higher education and society working collaboratively in an entrepreneurial spirit.

Entrepreneurship can be seen in such trends as research collaborations between industry and academia; institutional, departmental, and individual responses to scarce resources; innovative approaches to traditional and technology-based instructional practices; and more socially driven pursuits that encourage new methods of enhancing the academy’s engagement with external communities (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 1).

Colleges and universities are frequently viewed by business partners as key constituents in the creation of knowledge including the knowledge-based economy supporting both industry-university partnerships and the market-oriented trend of academic

entrepreneurship (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). Burnett and Collins (2010) discussed “[l]eaders of our institutions must not only seek new revenue sources, but must also find more efficient means to provide high quality education in the challenging times of the twenty-first century” (p. 193). The campus executive officer sense of balance of entrepreneurship and leadership highlights the changing role for higher education in the knowledge economy. Drew (2010) interviewed several higher education leaders that stated a “recurring theme from participants was having the courage in leadership to think and act creatively, to take considered risks and to help staff deal with the impact of change” (p. 64). Additionally, “[a] need for change leadership that fosters innovation, collaboration and ability to influence” (Drew, p. 67) emerged from the participants interviewed.

The 21st century institution of higher education has emerged in a time of scarce resources. The declining federal and state support for higher education has “[i]nstitutional leaders faced with rising costs and failing resources have fewer options from which to choose in order to maintain the fiscal vitality of their institutions” (Burnett & Collins, 2010, p. 193). The expected acceptance of academic entrepreneurship as a feasible method for economic development has encouraged local and regional leaders to actively pursue opportunities intended to build knowledge-based industries and economic infrastructure in the areas that surround colleges and universities (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). The collaboration between higher education, city, and state provide a meaningful avenue for entrepreneurial synergy. A range of possible social gains can be disseminated across local and regional communities and the broader society as a result of moving academic innovations to the market through entrepreneurial channels. Examples of these gains can

be economic (development in industrial sectors) and social (advances to health care) through dissemination of medical research outputs (Mars & Metcalf). “Entrepreneurship is about formulating and implementing novel ideas and practices or improving existing ones” (EMKF, p. 14). Fernald et al. (2005) suggested one such paradigm shift is from a “producer mentality” that seeks instructions to an “entrepreneurial mentality” that seeks results (p. 4). It is becoming increasingly transparent that the campus executive officer plays a critical role in strategy and implementation in the entrepreneurial academy.

A significant point to articulate is that the definition of entrepreneurship should not be “constrained to market-driven strategies but should also include finding novel solutions to the diversity of challenges facing the contemporary academy” (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 21). “It is important for anyone involved in entrepreneurial ventures, especially the entrepreneur, to fully comprehend the importance of sound leadership practices” (Fernald et al., 2005, p. 1). In the knowledge economy innovations become quickly outdated and as such human capital relatively to physical capital is more important and sustainable (Mars & Metcalf). A shift toward human-capital or knowledge creation, not fundamentally changing the nature of entrepreneurial behavior are developments that strengthen the role of higher education in the capitalist production cycle on the global scale, in other words, “the entrepreneurial academy in the context of knowledge economy” (Mars & Metcalf, p. 25).

The conceptual underpinnings were examined through the lens of leadership, in regards to the entrepreneurial academy leader, to include: entrepreneurship, culture, and knowledge creation. Fernald et al. (2005) conducted an extensive literature review to identify “characteristics possessed by both entrepreneurs and leaders...the characteristics

common to both entrepreneurs and leaders are visionary, risk-taker, achievement-orientated, able to motivate, creative, flexible, persistent, and patient” (p. 6). As well, extracted from the literature on academic culture frequently acknowledged are the norms and values of academia: originality, curiosity, basic research, academic freedom, and serving the public good (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). It is the intention of the researcher to provide a collective connection between the necessary values of entrepreneurship to lead a 21st century higher education institution contributing to the knowledge economy for human capital as an important resource for prosperity.

Conceptual Underpinnings of the Study

The purpose of this dual case-study was to gain an in-depth understanding of a college or university president using the conceptual underpinning of entrepreneurship. The constructs presented will examine leadership, entrepreneurship, organizational analysis, and knowledge creation. This examination of literature was designed to provide a creative view of the academy presidency through current complexity of the position based on internal and external forces, as well as the environmental change in higher education. Significantly, colleges and universities have been facing increasing pressure from internal and external stakeholders to increase innovation, support economic development, and be responsive to increased scrutiny which expands upon the traditional mission of service (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). Therefore, the presidents leading these colleges and universities continue to be an integral component of the development, management, and leadership of higher education institutions.

Leadership

The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization, with the leadership characterized as an essential component (Duderstadt, 2006). A campus leader can be the integral dynamic shaping the institution as Yukl (2006) affirmed “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 3). Yet, Gardner (2000) identified leadership as the ability to reinforce the institution because no individual has the expertise to bear all the multifaceted tasks of modern-day leadership. It is clear that the new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness “to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions” (Gardner, p. 257).

In *Leadership Agility*, Joiner (2009) conjectured “the ability to lead effectively when rapid change and uncertainty are the norm and when success requires consideration of multiple views and priorities. It requires using a process of using enhanced awareness and intentionality to increase effectiveness under real-time conditions” (p. 29). Likewise, De Meuse, Guangrong and Hellenbeck (2010) posited leaders “who are highly learning agile continuously seek out new challenges, actively seek feedback from others to grow and develop, tend to self-reflect, and evaluate their experiences and draw practical conclusions” (p. 121). The agile leader exhibits a self-reflective posture seeking a deeper understanding.

Leadership is no longer simply described as an individual characteristic or difference, but rather is depicted in various models as dyadic, shared, relational, strategic,

global, and a complex social dynamic (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). “Self-confidence and the ability to inspire collaboration in a common cause are qualities that seem to have been developed consistently” (Lawrence, 2006, p. 443). The leader who can inspire followers displays an agile approach in leadership situations.

The literature of leadership theory is vast and encompassing; therefore it is reasonable to note that many common characteristics can be attributed in discussing leadership. In discussing entrepreneurship, Vecchio (2003) posited:

[I]t seems reasonable to conclude that: (a) many of the constructs used in the area of entrepreneurship are also found within the mainstream of leadership theory; (b) the findings are not beyond being incorporated within available scholarship on leadership and interpersonal influence (i.e., entrepreneurship is leadership within a narrow, specific context)” (p. 322).

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) agreed “[t]he value of entrepreneurship for education and, thus, of learning about it, can be best appreciated when seeing concretely how the use of entrepreneurial attitudes, skills, and behaviors has made some educators more successful” which could improve generally institutional education (p. 22). The entrepreneurship lens provides an innovative view of leadership theory.

Entrepreneurship

In general, entrepreneurship refers to the economic discipline, yet educators need to recognize the potential entrepreneurship provides for guidance to leaders in becoming effective agents of change in higher education (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). It provides a lens to view higher education in an innovative and strategic way. The literature on institutional entrepreneurship notably peers through an intellectual property lens, but the

concepts can be applied across the institution enterprise. The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653).

The overall perception of entrepreneurship maintains a guarded acceptance from higher education stakeholders. Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) stated, “[v]alue creation is an essential construct in the development of an analytical model of academic entrepreneurship” (p. 455). Institutional stakeholders interpret the value of entrepreneurship in accepting the scholarship of the concept in an academic environment. The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). Many scholars have argued that entrepreneurial skills or traits are not separate from those demonstrated by leaders, but rather entrepreneurship is a form of leadership that occurs in particular settings (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). Czariawska-Joerges and Wolff (1991) offered that “entrepreneurship mainly fits contexts which are new and cannot be dealt with by means of experience or routine. Entrepreneurship is leadership in exceptional situations” (p. 533). The leader in an entrepreneurial framework must conceptualize the organizational analysis of an institution because “innovative models for structuring higher education are emerging around the globe” (Newman & Couturier, 2004, p. 61).

Organizational Analysis

Within this inquiry, the culture metaphor will be the primary frame in analyzing organizations based on the campus leader's personal reference in managing a higher education institution (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Donaldson, 2008; Morgan, 2006). The institution of higher education identity through a cultural lens provides insight for the leader since it can be assumed, contemporary leadership includes constituents who have an investment in the organization (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000). Specifically, the culture in higher education includes long standing traditions, rituals, ceremonies, and structure. The culture metaphor developed by Morgan outlined four specific strengths to gain insight into an organization. The first strength of the culture metaphor is the focus on the symbolic significance of almost every aspect of organizational life. Second, organizations rest in a shared system of meaning constantly creating and re-creating sense among interpretive schemes. Third, Morgan's culture metaphor encourages individuals to view the connection between an organization and environment as a social relationship. Finally, the fourth strength of the culture metaphor allows for understanding of organizational change (Morgan).

As entrepreneurship initiatives continue to emerge across the nation, integrating a robust and adaptive philosophical structure into these efforts will be critical to their long-term success – to their ability to be institutionally mainstreamed and sustained by changing the academic culture (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 35). Borasi and Finnigan (2010) argued those “leaders must shape the culture of the organization and successfully deal with the environment to achieve organizational goals and improve organizational effectiveness” (p. 6). The leader through culture awareness

can garner stakeholder support in shaping the entrepreneurial focus throughout an organization. The acceptance of an entrepreneurial culture sustains the university in providing an economic engine to drive knowledge creation enterprise.

Knowledge Creation

The world has rapidly moved into a knowledge-based economy (St. George, 2006) where education has taken the place of production. Duderstadt (2006) confirmed the need for the university to adjust rapidly; yet, he also stated a change in the culture from a consensus-building process to “a willingness by leaders throughout the university to occasionally make difficult decisions and take strong action” (p. 249). Knowledge creation has been described as the ability of organizational leaders to tap into the knowledge of their most valuable resources: their people. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) posited, “[o]rganizational knowledge creation is a continuous and dynamic interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge” (p. 70), while Baumard (1999) suggested the knowledge creation process is “visible and invisible, tangible and intangible, stable and unstable” (p. 2).

Senge (1990) argued that to bring about change in a knowledge creating organization, leaders must have a clear personal vision and must build a shared vision or common purpose in the organization; must develop shared discussion to generate collective learning; and must encourage organizational members to understand the underlying structures and relationships. Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) posited “intellectual entrepreneurs, both inside and outside universities, take risks and seize opportunities, discover and create knowledge, and innovation, collaborate, and solve problems in any number of social realms: corporate, nonprofit, government, and

education” (p. 29). Therefore, “...higher education plays a key role in a nation’s ability to remain highly competitive in the global knowledge-based economy and then an overview of academic capitalism and the creation of the contemporary knowledge/learning regime” (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 26).

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Consequently, the entrepreneurial university maintains the importance of knowledge creation in sustaining the economic activity of society in the state and region. Mars and Metcalf (2009) stated “...the entrepreneurial university which integrates the commercialization and capitalization of knowledge with teaching and research at the core of postsecondary education” exemplifies the core mission of knowledge creation and entrepreneurship (p. 29).

The view of 21st century education requires leadership to comprehend the adaption of entrepreneurship attitudes, behaviors, and skills for the survival of the institution. These challenges are essential to understand since “the traditional university missions of research, teaching, and service have put our institutions of higher education at the forefront of our society as gatekeepers for the knowledge, creativity, and invention that can guarantee economic security and advancement” (Lawrence, 2006, p. 3). Therefore, the presidents leading the colleges and universities have become an integral component of the development, management, and leadership of higher education institutions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dual case study was to examine the perceived effectiveness of a campus leader in an institution of higher education with a high incidence of successful management and vision for the 21st century organization. Institutional achievement, within this inquiry, was measured by the level of campus success evidenced by fiscal stewardship, faculty confidence, student satisfaction, and leadership team collaboration. This study focused on entrepreneurial characteristics and practice that lead to consistent achievement. The researcher selected a dual case study to focus on discovery rather than hypothesis testing (Merriam, 1998). The case study, further, provided an avenue through which the researcher gleaned the greatest understanding possible based on a holistic picture in the natural setting of the institution (Creswell, 1994).

An entrepreneurial academy was measured through the lens of leadership. In particular, significant attention to the following: (a) synthesizing leadership theory through the entrepreneurial lens; (b) understanding the importance of organizational analysis particularly culture in higher education; and (c) the 21st century institution of higher education impact in a knowledge-based economy. The review of literature enhanced the researcher's ability to posit research questions to investigate the conceptual underpinning of the study.

Research Questions

In a case study, the questions evolve from a wide net that is refined and focused as the process continues with a narrowing of materials and questions as the themes emerge (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The study began with the broad question: How do campus leaders lead a higher education institution for the 21st century? The synthesis of

related literature focused on leadership as the critical factor in institutional success which suggested the grand tour question: What do higher education leaders do on a daily basis to bring about institutional collaboration to define an entrepreneurial academy? With the collection and analysis of the interviews, focus groups, documents, and field notes, several questions emerged that informed this study.

1. What leadership qualities does a traditional career path versus nontraditional career path university president possess that lead the institution to consistently achieve successful outcomes?
2. What processes does the university president implement that encourage an entrepreneurial academy?
3. What structures does the traditional career path versus nontraditional career path university president implement that lead to acceptance in the higher education culture?
4. How does the traditional career path versus nontraditional career path university president establish collaboration among various stakeholders?
5. How have entrepreneurial strategies been integrated into the institutional plan?

Limitations and Assumptions

The following provides identified limitations for the study which should be considered throughout the remainder of the research:

1. The case study design is the notion that such a study is less credible than quantitative studies since it evolves from “apparently subjective findings based on interviews and observations” (Fowler, 2000, p. 312).

2. The validity relates to the integrity and competence of the researcher who collected and analyzed all the data; and the reliability of the study was dependent upon the consistency with which both the collection and analysis were completed (Patton, 1997).
3. The researcher also assumed the trustworthiness of informants who were interviewed.
4. The generalizability of the findings to apply from a dual case study. Generalizability requires data from large populations which provides the best foundation for producing broad generalizability (Misco, 2007). However, because this study institutes a small sample population of two Midwestern institutions the limitation to generalize the dual case study findings to other institutions is limited. Nonetheless, the transferability of this study may be possible as transferability does not involve broad claims, but yet invites readers of this research to make connections between the study and apply to other own experiences (Misco).
5. The study included only two institutions from the Midwest which may limit the geographical application throughout the country.

Design Controls

The selection of the campus executive officer abided by Merriam's (2009) case study analysis that "you first establish the criteria that will guide case selection and then select a case that meets those criteria" (p. 65). To include professional expertise and experience, the researcher selected the institutional leader based on a review of the curriculum vita to determine the professional pathway to the campus presidency. The

dual case study included a campus president with a traditional higher education career pathway, as well as a nontraditional career pathway to the campus executive position.

In an effort to control the limitations that were bound by the constraints of the selected entrepreneurship conceptual underpinning, an extensive literature review was conducted to determine what leadership theories would be applicable in a higher education institution. As a consequence of this review, entrepreneurship with leadership, organizational analysis (culture), and knowledge creation became apparent as the conceptual categories in supporting the research design (Merriam, 1998).

To make certain trustworthiness of the data compilation and analysis, a variety of methods were employed to be confident of the rigor of the research. The triangulation of data “using multiple investigators, sources of data, or methods to confirm the emerging findings” (Merriam, 1998, p. 24). The rich, thick data gathered from statistics collection and triangulation permitted the researcher and the readers of the study to establish whether the findings can be transmitted to other comparable condition (Creswell, 2003; Merriam). An audit trail was conserved of this rich, thick data, so associate researchers can conclude how data were composed, compartmentalized, and utilized in the study (Merriam).

The researcher was cognizant of the validity and reliability limitations of the case study. Rich data resulted from a variety of sources including the stakeholders in the institution, documents of meetings, artifacts from the institution, and field notes from observation (Merriam, 1998). A purposeful sample including leadership team members, faculty, students, and members of the board of trustees participated in interviews and focus groups allowing the investigator the ability “to discover, understand, and gain

insight” (Merriam, p. 61). The researcher conducted all the interviews and analyzed the materials and artifacts for consistency. To ensure the integrity of transcription, the written scripts was returned to the interviewees for verification prior to inclusion in the study, and any discrepancies noted by the participants were corrected (Merriam).

To include professional expertise and experience, the researcher selected the institutional leader based on a review of the curriculum vita to determine the professional career pathway to the campus presidency. The dual case study included a campus president with a traditional higher education career pathway, as well as a president with a nontraditional career pathway to the campus executive position. The purposive sample was deemed appropriate as a means to attain campus stakeholders’ perceptions of the leader.

Comparison of transcripts from the interviews with data from numerous school documents and artifacts provided rich comparison and triangulation (Merriam, 1998). The interview and focus group instrument was tested and retested to determine validity and reliability with “careful attention to a study’s conceptualization” in the literature review process (Merriam, p. 199). The generalizability of this case study, which was written with detailed description, may be determined through other studies “to establish the representativeness of what they have found” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 32).

Definitions of Key Terms

In order to provide a more thorough understanding of the conceptual underpinnings, the following definitions were applied to form the foundation of this research.

Academic and Intellectual Entrepreneurism. Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) asserted "...academic entrepreneurship is understood primarily through market-orientated lenses (p. 452). "Intellectual entrepreneurship leverages the knowledge assets contained within the university's walls, empowering the faculty and students to become agents of change, both internally and externally" (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 28).

Culture. Morgan (2006) stressed "that the nature of a culture is found in its social norms and customs and that if one adheres to these rules of behavior one will be successful in constructing an appropriate social reality" (p. 135). Additionally, Clark (1998) posited "the cultural or symbolic side of the university becomes particularly important in cultivating institutional identity and distinctive reputations" (p. 7).

Entrepreneurism. Mars and Metcalf (2009) offered the following, "We define entrepreneurship as those activities that combine risk, innovation, and opportunity particularly in times of uncertain resources" (p. 3). Borasi and Finnigan (2010) highlighted the following concepts and findings supporting the definition of entrepreneurship including vision, engaging in innovation, dealing with opportunities, dealing with risk and resources, problem solver, and growth minded.

Institutional Entrepreneurship. The scope of intellectual property derived from the innovation in bench and clinical research (Hansson & Monsted, 2008). Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) posited "the theory of institutional entrepreneur may indeed provide a novel approach to understanding academics who engage in market activities as entrepreneurs who are creatively shaping institutional environments in order to create efficient opportunities to make the outcomes of their work more available and accessible to others" (p. 455).

Knowledge Creation. Takeuchi (1995) posited, “[o]rganizational knowledge creation is a continuous and dynamic interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge” (p. 70), while Baumard (1999) suggested the knowledge creation process is “visible and invisible, tangible and intangible, stable and unstable” (p. 2).

Leadership Agility. The agile leader exhibits a self-reflective posture seeking a deeper understanding. At its core, “leadership agility is a process of stepping back from your current focus in a way that allows you to make wiser decisions and then fully engage in what needs to be done next” (Joiner & Joseph, 2007, p. 209).

Non Traditional Career Pathway. Appadurai (2009) suggested higher education leadership has begun to recruit campus leaders from the business and political sectors. The nontraditional campus executive brings extensive executive leadership outside of the post secondary institution.

Social Entrepreneurism. Welsh and Krueger (2009) utilized J.G. Dees’ definition of social entrepreneur as “a change agent in the social sector who adopts a mission to create and sustain social value, who engages in continuous innovation, and who exhibits a higher accountability both to constituents and outcomes” (p. 36). It is not only about the social good of the activity, but the economic prosperity higher education must embrace in an entrepreneurial way.

Traditional Career Pathway. Trani and Halsworth (2010) suggested the traditional pathway to the university leadership role is the provost and dean positions within higher education. The traditional campus executive brings an extensive career in higher education.

Summary

The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization. Therefore, leadership in higher education is characterized as an essential component. A campus leader can be the integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership. The university leaders, who develop ways to operate efficiently and connect their programs to mission are more likely to maintain robust enrollments, provide excellent academic programs, balance budgets and prosper in the 21st century (Burnett & Collins, 2010). The leader operating in a capital and knowledge drive economy provides vision and strategy for the future.

The complexity of the institutions demands a leader who can manage multiple functions of the organization. In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role, with the president guiding resource development including state, federal, private donors, intellectual property, land development, and many more revenue streams. The institution of higher education in a knowledge-based society seeks dynamic visionary leadership (Smith, 2008). Yokoyama (2006) noted a strong leadership approach must be integrated in higher education to sustain the resources necessary in creating an entrepreneurial culture. The importance of university leadership in the American higher education institutions requires strong entrepreneurial guidance during a time of great change (Yokoyama).

The conceptual underpinnings were examined through the lens of leadership in regard to the entrepreneurial academy leader to include entrepreneurship, culture, and knowledge creation. Fernald et al. (2005) conducted an extensive literature review to identify “characteristics possessed by both entrepreneurs and leaders...the characteristics common to both entrepreneurs and leaders are visionary, risk-taker, achievement-

orientated, able to motivate, creative, flexible, persistent, and patient” (p. 6). Therefore, the presidents leading the colleges and universities have become an integral component of the development, management, and leadership of higher education institutions.

An examination of the current literature interrelated to the study is included in Chapter Two. Conferred in Chapter Three is a narrative of the research design and methodology. The justification for selecting the design of the study, a dual case study, is also illustrated. Presentation of the data findings and analysis of these findings are presented in Chapter Four. Finally, summarized in Chapter Five are the findings, conclusions, and implications for practices with implication for future research are described.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

“This is a time for change in higher education” (Newman & Couturier, 2004, p. 61). The state of higher education is changing, therefore, institutions need to adapt to a new environment for survival (Collis, 2001; Collis, 2002; Duderstadt, 2006; Mullin, 2001). This new environment faces a myriad of significant change and challenges including the proliferation of proprietary institutions and the explosion of distance learning (Appaduria, 2009). These challenges are essential to understand since “the traditional university missions of research, teaching, and service have put our institutions of higher education at the forefront of our society as gatekeepers for the knowledge, creativity, and invention that can guarantee economic security and advancement” (Lawrence, 2006, p. 3). Consequently, the presidents leading colleges and universities have become an integral component of the development, management, and leadership of higher education institutions.

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) speculated “we need more educators—across all specializations and leadership levels—that are willing and able to lead innovations that will result in better services for their students and communities...thus increasing the need for entrepreneurial behavior and creative approaches” (p. 25). The entrepreneurship theme provides an innovative approach that many institutions of higher education have adopted (Clark, 1998). In the corporate world, the chief executive officer is often aligned to principles defined by entrepreneurship which the general population identifies, however it is a relatively newer phenomenon for the institution of higher education (Padilla, 2005).

However the complexities of colleges and universities make the transfer of entrepreneurship leadership in the corporate world to higher education a challenge. As Padilla (2005) posited, “It is true corporate CEOs have much more control over their enterprises and expense and over how they spend their time. Decision making is much faster in the corporate world...in contrast to the lonelier work of the university leader” (p. 15). Consequently, the complexity of stakeholders in higher education including students, faculty, alumni, athletic boosters, legislators, parents, businesses, and philanthropy contributes to the convolution (Appaduria, 2009). Yet, it is becoming increasingly transparent the parallel functions between the corporate and higher education leader including multi-million dollar operating budgets, various lines of revenue, public relations, strategic planning, and innovation have created a need for a different type of leadership for Universities (Vecchio, 2003).

Significantly, colleges and universities have been facing increasing pressure from internal and external stakeholders to increase innovation, support economic development, and be responsive to increased scrutiny which expands upon the traditional mission of service. Newman and Couturier (2004) argued there is:

...a move to shift higher education from operating in the public sector, with significant government support and regulation, toward operating in a more market-oriented, competitive mode closer to that practiced by private institutions in the US, with increased reliance on external revenue, more competition for funding and students, and less regulation (p. 61).

These changes support an institutional structure in higher education resembling an entrepreneurial focus, not only from the leader, but also the organization. The higher

education community is becoming attentive of the transformation, yet “the ensuing discussion has been cast in polar terms—the value of change versus the importance of maintaining the status quo, or the creation of the entrepreneurial university versus the essential nature of the proven traditional university” (Newman & Couturier, p. 61). While there is a wealth of information on leadership in higher education, there is a dearth of studies examining the construct of entrepreneurial leadership in higher education. Presented in this chapter will be the research examining leadership, entrepreneurship, organizational analysis, and knowledge creation. This examination of literature was designed to provide a creative view of the presidency through current complexity of the position based on internal and external forces, as well as the environmental change in higher education.

Leadership

Leadership is one of the least understood but most observed phenomena (Burns, 1978); yet, it is often regarded as the most critical factor in the success or failure of an institution (Bass, 1990). The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization, resulting in the leadership in higher education often characterized as an essential component (Duderstadt, 2006). A campus leader can be the integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership. As Yukl (2006) affirmed “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 3). Yet, Gardner (2000) identified leadership as the ability to strengthen the system because “no individual has the skills...to carry out all the complex tasks of contemporary leadership” (p. 12). It is clear that the new model

of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness to the altering desires and rising issues of our culture and its educational institutions (Yukl).

Leadership Agility

In leadership agility, Joiner (2009) conjectured “the ability to lead effectively when rapid change and uncertainty are the norm and when success requires consideration of multiple views and priorities. It requires using a process of using enhanced awareness and intentionality to increase effectiveness under real-time conditions” (p. 29). Likewise, De Meuse et al. (2010) posited leaders “who are highly learning agile continuously seek out new challenges, actively seek feedback from others to grow and develop, tend to self-reflect, and evaluate their experiences and draw practical conclusions” (p. 121). The agile leader exhibits a self-reflective posture seeking a deeper understanding.

At its core, “leadership agility is a process of stepping back from your current focus in a way that allows you to make wiser decisions and then fully engage in what needs to be done next” (Joiner & Joseph, 2007, p. 209). Joiner (2009) stated:

Leaders use four kinds of agility: 1) context-setting agility” enables leaders to scan their environment, anticipate change, decide what initiatives they need to take, scope these initiatives and determine needed outcomes, 2) “stakeholder agility” provides the leader an understanding of key stakeholders understanding, the priorities, and forge greater alignment, 3) “creative agility” empowers leaders to transform complex, novel problems and opportunities into desired results, and 4) “self-leadership agility” allows leaders to accelerate their own development while reflect on and learn from everyday experiences (p. 29).

Additionally, Joiner and Joseph provided “five distinctive levels in the mastery of leadership agility: Expert, Achiever, Catalyst, Co-Creator, and Synergist” (p. 7). The majority of leaders fall into the first three mastery levels, while less than five percent function in the Co-Creator or Synergist level.

The strength of agile leadership lies in the leader’s awareness of cultural difference which provide worldly perspective. Culture agility emerges when you have knowledge as an outsider perspective to reflect on, learn from and make sense of the experience (Santana, 2010). “In short, organizations need leaders who are learning agile” (De Meuse et al., 2010, p. 128). Furthermore, De Meuse et al. posited leadership agility is “a culture that is supportive, entrepreneurial, and nurturing fosters learning and learning agility” (p. 128).

Researchers are now examining all angles of leadership and including in their models and study the leader, the follower, the context, the levels, and their dynamic interactions. The second trend involves examining how the process of leadership actually takes place by, for example, integrating the work of cognitive psychology with strategic leadership. In this regard, “the interest in how the leader processes information as well as how the follower does so, and how each affects the other, the group, and organization [is growing]” (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 441). As expected, the ability to listen is also high on the list for leaders of institutions that depend so heavily on teamwork...“being a good listener is his most important advice to new college presidents” (Lawrence, 2006, p. 446).

Today, the field of leadership focuses not only on the leader, but also on followers, peers, supervisors, work setting/context, and culture, which includes a much broader array of individuals representing the entire spectrum of diverse, public, private,

and not-for-profit organizations. Increasingly over the past 20 years, samples of populations from nations around the globe (Yukl, 2006). “Leadership is no longer simply described as an individual characteristic or difference, but rather is depicted in various models as dyadic, shared, relational, strategic, global, and a complex social dynamic” (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 422-423). Self-confidence and the ability to inspire collaboration in a common cause are qualities that seem to have been developed consistently (Lawrence, 2006, p. 443). The leader who can inspire followers displays an agile approach in leadership situations.

Leithwood et al. (2000) concluded there was not one appropriate definition of leadership; however a development of several models describing leadership has emerged. The definitions of leadership associate to the number of theories that exist. To further understand the diverse definitions of leadership as well as to emphasize the selection of leadership agility and entrepreneurial leadership as the most pertinent styles to evaluate campus leaders for the purpose of this study, various leadership styles found within the literature will be presented.

Other Leadership Theories

The emergence and utilization of leadership agility will be woven throughout the multiple theories of leadership. In order to convey the appropriateness of selecting and focusing on leadership agility and entrepreneurial leadership theory within an innovative university setting, a review of diverse leadership theories, longstanding and more recent, will be presented in order to understand the complexity and scope the literature presents on leadership.

Yukl's Leadership Classification

Yukl (2006) suggested leadership classified through the following five approaches (1) the trait approach, (2) the behavioral approach, (3) the power-influence approach, (4) the situational approach, and (5) the integrative approach. Each will be discussed in the context of this inquiry.

Trait Approach. The trait approach calls attention to the leaders' aspects such as values, skills, personality, and motives (Yukl, 2006). Zaccaro (2007) offered the following definition of leader traits "as relatively coherent and integrated patterns of personal characteristics, reflecting a range of individual differences that foster consistent leadership effectiveness across a variety of group and organizational situations" (p. 7). The strength of the leader traits theory has been researched extensively in the 1930s and 1940s with no significant trait identifying leadership success (Yukl). Recently, the leader trait theory has emerged again, identifying attributes and traits of leaders (Zaccaro). Accordingly, Yukl posited "researchers made progress in discovering how leader attributes are related to leadership behavior and effectiveness" (p. 13).

Behavioral Approach. The behavioral approach emerged from the diminishing research around the trait theory choosing to look more closely to what leader actually do in their roles (Yukl, 2006). Yukl declared behavioral research falls into two subcategories. A behavioral approach looks through the lens of how managers spend time and the patterns of activity. It is common to acquire the data through observations, document analysis, and interviews. "Leadership effectiveness depends in part on how well a manager resolves role conflicts, copes with demands, recognizes opportunities, and overcomes constraints" (Yukl, p. 13). The second general behavioral approach spotlights effective behaviors of leadership. The preferred model according to Yukl utilized "a

survey field study with a behavioral descriptive questionnaire” (p. 13). Specifically, the survey data examined correlations between behavior and effectiveness of leaders.

Power-Influence Approach. The power-influence approach observed “influence processes between leaders and other people” (Yukl, 2006, p. 14). This approach attempts to explain effective leadership through a lens of type and amount of power a leader possess and how the power is utilized (Yukl). In leadership, power can be important in influencing subordinates, peers, and superiors, as well as people and organizations outside the institution. Yukl suggested the study of influence tactics can be linked to the power-influence and behavior approach.

Situational Approach. The situational approach (Yukl, 2006) draws attention to “the importance of contextual factors that influence leadership processes” (p. 14). Yukl expanded upon the concept to explain major situational variables including attributes of followers, what kind of work the leader’s team performs, the type of organization, and the nature of the outside environment. The research reviews leadership across different organizations, culture, and management. The situational approach can be associated with contingency theory positing that different attributes should be used in distinctive situations.

Integrative Approach. The final approach outlined by Yukl (2006) is the integrative approach. The approach includes multiple leadership variables including trait, behavior, power, and situational. The new paradigm of complex organizations may find the integrative approach conceptually stronger based on the environmental factors. Yukl suggested charismatic leadership adheres to the integrative approach “which attempts to

explain why the followers of some leaders are willing to exert exceptional effort and make personal sacrifices to accomplish the group objectives or mission” (p. 15).

Yet, there has been a growing sense of tension in the leadership literature that models of leadership that were designed for the past century may not fully capture the leadership dynamic of organizations operating in today’s knowledge-driven economy (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 430).

Participative Leadership Theory

In a participatory leadership model, a leader influences others through delegation, shared power, empowerment and other participation ways. The shared power structure influences the organization to empower others to shape the leadership. The model “encourages and facilitates participation in others” creating a shared decision-making leadership structure (Yukl, 2006, p. 112). The participatory leadership model shapes our perception of effective leader design through empowerment, delegation, and involving others in the decision-making. Anderson (1998) stated “participation is authentic if it includes relevant stakeholders and creates relatively safe, structured spaces for multiple voices to be heard...the ultimate ends of participation should be greater student achievement” (p. 575). On the other hand, distributive leadership focuses on the interaction of many people rather than the actions of one central figure. Gronn (2002) stated that “time is up for the leader with the vision” (p. 426) and instead it is time for the vision of a collective group. The concept of participatory leadership includes the use of empowerment and delegation, nevertheless Anderson (1998) argued these qualities have not emerged because the leadership has not been authentic. What we need to see for authentic participation is a more democratic institution which leads through authentic

design increasing the influence and effectiveness of others (Gronn).

If an organization has authentic participatory leadership then several benefits emerge including decision quality, acceptance, satisfaction with process and development of skills (Yukl, 2006). For decision acceptance, Yukl suggested a “feeling of ownership” by the participants while understanding the effects on themselves (p. 85). The satisfaction of participants includes your voice being heard and not manipulated. In contrast, a distributive leadership property is coordination. Coordination is “managing the dependencies between activities” (Gronn, 2002, p. 433). Finally, the development of participation skills occurs when the decision process includes everyone through shared decision-making (Yukl). The ability to define leadership occurs by asking the simple question of what a leader does, as well as the behavior exhibited (Davis, 2003).

The participatory lens of leadership may result in finding a leader who exemplifies a charismatic to inspirational model (Avolio et al., 1999). “Charismatic leaders, when compared with generally effective leaders who are not considered charismatic, tend to be especially good at seeing the big picture, communicating their ideas, laying out a vision, and modeling it” (Davis, 2003, p. 13). In a higher education institution, Davis believed it might be better to have an inspirational leader than a charismatic because the focus is on the goals and purpose not the person. A shared governance structure is common in higher education, so a leadership policy inclusive of shared decision-making, communication, empowerment and delegation may be more effective (Duderstadt, 2006). Whetten and Cameron (1985) postulated that “studies of higher education effectiveness which discovered that the most powerful predictor of organization effectiveness in colleges and universities is administrative behavior” (p.

459). The participatory leadership model supports higher education effectiveness through empowering participants through shared or distributed leadership (Jablonski, 2000; Yukl, 2006).

Distributed or Shared Leadership Theory

Distributive leadership is focused on groups of people working together or in concertive action (Gronn, 2002). Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond (2001) stated distributive leadership emerges in and through interactions between leaders, followers, and situations, noting "...the interplay between the practices of multiple leaders is essential to understanding how leadership is displaced among several organizational members" (p. 25). Likewise, Pearce, Hoch, Jeppesen, and Wegge (2010) posited shared leadership "occurs when group members actively and intentionally shift the role of leader to one another as necessitated by the environment or circumstances in which the group operates" (p. 151). The theory of shared leadership can positively affect a unit's opinions, attitudes, though process, and effectiveness (Pearce et al.).

Another property of distributive leadership is coordination, or "managing the dependencies between activities" (Gronn, 2002, p. 433). Coordination is created by clustering groups of people who collectively work to achieve a common goal. Such synergy can create a result greater than the sum of each individual's practice (Spillane et al., 2001). Spillane et al. further noted this proper coordination provides opportunities for collaboration essential to the distributive leadership process.

When analyzing distributive leadership the focus must be on how leaders involved others in carrying out micro tasks and exploring the process that a leader uses to interact with others (Spillane et al., 2001). In the knowledge era, the model of leadership

will continue to evolve to a shifting away from hierarchical structure to a more unfolding social process encompassing a shared leadership perspective (Pearce et al., 2010).

Distributive leadership is becoming more critical for leaders to be effective when more and more expectations are placed upon them (Gronn, 2002). For this reason, member participation is vital to the leadership success within the organization.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Four distinct types of leadership behaviors of transformational leaders were identified by Bass (1990) and Bass and Avolio (1990). Idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration arose from the original work of Bass (1985), while a fourth behavior, inspirational motivation was an outcome of revised theory by Bass and Avolio (1990). These components make transformational leaders effective in motivation and empowering followers to a full commitment to the vision of the leader (Bass & Avolio, 1994). However, transformational leaders can display these behaviors to varying degrees and abilities.

The transformational leader employs intellectual stimulation encouraging subordinates to be proactive, creative, and innovative in their thinking (Bass, 1985). Enhancing the capabilities of the follower to seek alternate perspectives and development new ways to perform job roles enhances variety and autonomy (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006), ultimately providing workers with an increased feeling of accomplishment and professional reward (Emery & Barker, 2007). If problems arise, leaders focus on *what* problems instead of *who's to blame*. If necessary, the views of the leader can be questioned, re-evaluated, and

altered (Avolio, 1999). As a result, creative thinking is enhanced which leads to greater product innovation and positive effects for their organizations (Avolio).

The concern for the needs of the subordinate as a person and employee, in addition to mentoring, coaching, and teaching reflect the behavior of individualized consideration (Keller, 1992; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). As a result the subordinate feels “trust, admiration, loyalty and respect toward the leader” (Yukl, 2006, p. 262) as followers have a sense that their leader is caring for their individualized needs (Emery & Barker, 2007).

Transformational leaders heighten individual and team commitment through inspirational motivation (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). Inspirational motivation exhibited by the leader, rouses followers to transcend ambitious goals by heightening their expectations (Antonakis et al., 2003). Consequently, followers exert additional effort on behalf of the organization, as a result of increased self-worth, job performance, and organizational commitment (Bass, 1985).

It has also been argued that transformational leadership and servant leadership are similar theories because both are “people-orientated leadership approaches, both emphasize the importance of valuing people, listening and empowering followers” (Cerit, 2010, p. 303). However, Cerit suggested the “principle difference is the focus of the leader” developing an “overriding focus of the servant leader is to serve their followers” (Cerit, p. 303).

Servant Leadership Theory

As Greenleaf (1991) conjectured, servant leadership fosters an often unknown objective of social responsibility from organizations, thereby resulting in more people who serve as moral agents providing a voice to those unwilling to speak up. Service to others was a lens which current scholarly work conceptualizes the theoretical underpinnings of servant leadership. When you perceive the phrase servant leadership, one might be confused as to what it is because the phrase itself seems like a paradox (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Servant leaders at their core are first and foremost servants (Greenleaf). Greenleaf posited the servant leader is one whose main concern is to meet “other people’s highest priority of needs” (p. 7).

Spears (1998) characterized servant leadership as the facilitation of teamwork and harmony, involving others joint decision-making, encouraging moral and compassionate behavior, and individual development. Likewise, Sergiovanni (2000) suggested that an important characteristic of servant leadership is the devotion to the service of ideals positioning that “servant leadership is practiced by serving others, but its ultimate purpose is to place oneself, and others for whom one has responsibility, in the service to ideals” (p. 284). Accordingly, McGee-Cooper and Trammell (2002) suggested the most significant quality of a servant leader is a “deep, internal drive to contribute to a collective result or vision” (p. 148). Further, Yukl (2006) posited, “[t]he servant leader must empower followers instead of using power to dominate them. Trust is established by being completely honest and open, keeping actions consistent with values and showing trust in followers” (p. 420).

While the literature of leadership theory is vast and encompassing, it is reasonable to note that many common characteristics can be attributed in discussing entrepreneur

leadership. In discussing entrepreneurship, Vecchio (2003) posited, “it seems reasonable to conclude that; (a) many of the constructs used in the area of entrepreneurship are also found within the mainstream of leadership theory; (b) the findings are not beyond being incorporated within available scholarship on leadership and interpersonal influence (i.e., entrepreneurship is leadership within a narrow, specific context)” (p. 322). “The value of entrepreneurship for education and, thus, of learning about it, can be best appreciated when seeing concretely how the use of entrepreneurial attitudes, skills, and behaviors has made some educators more successful and contributed to the overall goal of improving education” (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010, p. 22). The entrepreneurship lens provides an innovative view of leadership theory.

Entrepreneurism

The study and definition of entrepreneurship has been impeded by a lack of scholarly agreement on the meaning of entrepreneurship, as well as the large amount multifaceted applications in the social science disciplines (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). The scholarship of entrepreneurship is primarily located within the economics and management literature (Mars & Rios-Aguilar), while the working definition of entrepreneurship is founds more often in the economic discipline (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). Additionally, Vecchio (2003) stated, “the emergence of entrepreneurship as a relatively distinct field within the organizational sciences is that its dual footings in psychology and economics have contributed to the creation of a separate character or identity” (p. 304). Subsequently, Mars and Metcalf offered the following, “We define entrepreneurship as those activities that combine risk, innovation, and opportunity particularly in times of uncertain resources...In the academic context, entrepreneurship

might involve individuals (students, faculty, administrators), organizational units such as departments or colleges, or the entire institution” (p. 3). Borasi and Finnigan (2010) posited, “The lack of an agreed-upon definition of entrepreneurship as a serious shortcoming for the development of entrepreneurship as a field... suggest that entrepreneurship should not be limited to the starting of new businesses, but rather it is a concept that can be applied more broadly” (p.4).

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) highlighted the following concepts and findings supporting the definition of entrepreneurship:

- A) Vision. “Having a clear vision and being able to effectively share it with others have been identified in the literature as one of the key characteristics of entrepreneurs in general, and social entrepreneurship in particular” (p.4).
- B) Engaging in innovation. “...places engagement in innovation at the very core of what entrepreneurs do” (p. 4).
- C) Dealing with opportunities. “...the literature on entrepreneurship suggests that one of the things that most characterizes entrepreneurs is their unique approach to opportunities, which involves both proactively seeking and being ready to seize opportunities” (p. 4).
- D) Dealing with risk. “They [entrepreneurs] evaluate risk differently because of a combination of their knowledge, experience and high self-efficacy...Entrepreneurs also seems to give greater weight to the risk of “missing the boat.” (p. 5).
- E) Dealing with resources. “...they [entrepreneurs] need to secure the necessary funding for any initiative they want to launch, but also new start-up businesses

usually have to operate with very little funding...which focuses on the management of scarce resources” (p. 5).

F) Decision-making and problem-solving. “Entrepreneurs are characterized in the literature as having a unique style of decision-making and problem-solving...entrepreneurs tend to make decisions and solve problems quickly” (p. 5).

G) Dealing with growth. “Expansion is a key drive for entrepreneurs, whether it means continuing to grow a business or organization to achieve greater revenues and success” (p. 5).

These seven concepts represent many defining qualities and traits associated with entrepreneurship. In general, the assumption of entrepreneurship typically refer to the economic discipline, yet educators to recognize the potential entrepreneurship provides for guidance in becoming effective agents of change in higher education (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). It provides a lens to view higher education in an innovative and strategic way. The literature on institutional entrepreneurship notably peers through an intellectual property lens, but the concepts can be applied across the institution enterprise.

Institutional Entrepreneurship

A widely held perceptive of institutional entrepreneurship primarily can be found in the scope of intellectual property derived from the innovation in bench and clinical research (Hansson & Monsted, 2008). In fact, the research university promotes the economic and development value such activity provides as a service to the community. “The passage of the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 that allowed universities to take ownership of intellectual properties created through federally funded research was an innovative

policy that sparked emergence of the U.S. technology transfer movement” (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 454). A great deal of the literature on entrepreneurship and higher education focused on the research institution, nevertheless, Mars and Metcalf (2009) acknowledged, “Liberal arts institutions and community colleges, however, are not devoid of entrepreneurial activities, traits, and agendas that are market orientated or centered on the acquisition of resources” (p. 45). The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653).

Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) assuaged, “[e]fforts to transform academe via entrepreneurship share certain commonalities: garnering faculty support, providing visionary leadership and developing innovative curricula certainly lead the list” (p. 27). Moreover, numerous post secondary institutions have also found that defining entrepreneurship in a manner exclusive to their planned goals and institutional culture is significant to successful implementation and enduring sustainability, particularly given a universal nervousness with entrepreneurship defined wholly in economic terms (Beckman & Cherwitz). The academe comprises multiple stakeholders engaged in leading the institution. In particular, “the theory of institutional entrepreneur may indeed provide a novel approach to understanding academics who engage in market activities as entrepreneurs who are creatively shaping institutional environments” (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 455).

For institutions that look for application and change through entrepreneurship, an extensive intellectual and philosophical platform must be created. Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) asserted:

This platform must be inclusive, thoughtful, and diverse; it must reflect the humanistic origins of universities, contain an academic ethos, and empower those who are touched by this vision. Above all else, the foundation for these efforts must demonstrate that the greatest asset of any campus is the ability to deconstruct impediments that segregate knowledge and prevent it from being put to work (p. 28).

Staley and Trinkle (2011) provided a view of higher education through a changing lens to include “the competitive ecosystem” and the institution “is changing rapidly and disruptively” (p. 16). The entrepreneurship philosophy needs to be embraced by the entire campus community for change to successfully integrate among the many stakeholders.

In a comparative study of entrepreneurial cultures of Japanese and UK universities, Yokoyama (2006) stated:

Terms such as ‘entrepreneurial’ and ‘entrepreneurialism’ in the context of universities are, therefore, not necessarily to be understood with the idea of profit-gain, risk taking, and even commercial activities. Rather, this paper signifies the universities attitudes in attempting to ‘stand up’ and be self-reliant.

‘Entrepreneurial’ activities in this in definition could be related to the promotion of their accountability to society as a whole; ‘entrepreneurialism’ is the process by which the universities become engaged in more entrepreneurial activities than were previously (p. 527).

Similarly, Mars and Metcalf (2009) posited entrepreneurship can be viewed through research collaborations between “industry and academia; institutional, departmental, and individual responses to scarce resources; innovative approaches to traditional and technology-based instructional practices; and more socially driven pursuits that encourage new methods for enhancing the academy’s engagement with external communities” (p. 1). The institutional membership (students, staff, faculty, administration) seek entrepreneurship as a lens to view the institution to value the complexity of 21st century higher education. Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) postulated:

Value creation is an essential construct in the development of an analytical model of academic entrepreneurship...We encourage higher education scholars to more fully consider the economic, social, and ecological value created in markets and communities located outside of the academy (p. 455).

The value argument can be widely supported based on the traditional held belief of the academe. “The value of entrepreneurship for education and, thus, of learning about it, can be best appreciated when seeing concretely how the use of entrepreneurial attitudes, skills, and behaviors has made some educators more successful and contributed to the overall goal of improving education” (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010, p. 22). The concept of social entrepreneurship in the academe presents a discipline much more widely adapted.

Social Entrepreneurism

Welsh and Krueger (2009) utilized J.G. Dees’ definition of social entrepreneur as “a change agent in the social sector who adopts a mission to create and sustain social value, who engages in continuous innovation, and who exhibits a higher accountability both to constituents and outcomes” (p. 36). Additionally, Lewellyn et al. (2010) put

forward “social entrepreneurs as idealistic, forward-looking people who are innovative, opportunity-oriented, resourceful, value-creating change agents” (p. 46). The traditional message of entrepreneurship in a profit mindset creates a dilemma for the academe, but social entrepreneurship brings in the social change perspective lessening the corporate stigma associated with the lens. Furthermore, social entrepreneurship in the academe posits “...intellectual entrepreneurship emerges as a seamless, integrated, and intrinsic philosophy that is authentic to the purpose of creating citizens who advance and better society” (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 34).

“The emergence of social entrepreneurship as a point of scholarly interest and instructional value has been diverse and widespread” (Mars & Garrison, 2009, p. 291). It is not uncommon to find social entrepreneurship pedagogy immersed in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum in interdisciplinary fields (Welsh & Krueger, 2009). In higher education, entrepreneurship instruction has gained significant didactic time within the curriculum. The institutions of higher education have applied “...creative and innovative strategies that have been designed by students, professors, and practitioners within colleges and universities with the intent of solving a wide range of societal problems” (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 446). The academe embraced social entrepreneurship pedagogy.

It is important to understand, Welsh and Krueger (2009) argued, “faculty and staff can adopt entrepreneurial mindsets themselves” and the academy “must teach students to think like entrepreneurs” in order to change the model of higher education. The mindset of social entrepreneurship needs to flow through the entire institution to impact the leadership. It is not only about the social good of the activity, but the economic prosperity

higher education must embrace in an entrepreneurial way. “Intellectual entrepreneurship leverages the knowledge assets contained within the university’s walls, empowering the faculty and students to become agents of change, both internally and externally” (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 28).

Academic and Intellectual Entrepreneurism

Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) posited, “It is our contention that intellectual entrepreneurship provides an intellectually authentic philosophical foundation capable of sustaining cross-campus entrepreneurship education” (p. 28). Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) asserted “...academic entrepreneurship is understood primarily through market-orientated lenses (p. 452). The institutions of higher education provide an economic engine to the communities and state through the intellectual and scholarly discoveries. The academy through “...entrepreneurship is sometimes used to articulate and deconstruct the commercial activities that begin with colleges and universities and are later realized within the private marketplace” (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, p. 446). The entrepreneurial philosophy transcends higher education’s impact on the economy, as well as the overall financial and physical health of a society.

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) “believe[d] that employing these ‘entrepreneurial’ attitudes and behaviors could indeed empower educators in various positions and diverse contexts to more effectively pursue change and, ultimately, fulfill their mission and vision” (p. 26). In higher education, entrepreneurial pedagogy has spread across multiple degree granting departments creating an intellectual culture. “Intellectual entrepreneurship leverages the knowledge assets contained within the university’s walls, empowering the faculty and students to become agents of change, both internally and

externally” (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 28). According to Beckman and Cherwitz, “[i]ntellectual entrepreneurs, both inside and outside universities, take risks and seize opportunities, discover and create knowledge, and innovation, collaborate, and solve problems in any number of social realms: corporate, nonprofit, government, and education” (p. 29). The research university has capitalized on the discovery and intellectual property movement resulting from the passing of the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010), yet the institution fails to act fully on the entrepreneurial construct.

Unfortunately, education has yet to capitalize on contributions from the field of entrepreneurship, because of the combination of a misunderstanding of entrepreneurship’s scope of application, lack of awareness of what those contributions might be, and the distrust many educators have for any business application (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010, p. 26).

The overall perception of entrepreneurship maintains a guarded acceptance from higher education stakeholders. Mars and Rios-Aguilar stated, “[v]alue creation is an essential construct in the development of an analytical model of academic entrepreneurship” (p. 455). Institutional stakeholders interpret the value of entrepreneurship in accepting the scholarship of the concept in an academic environment.

Entrepreneurism Conclusion

Clark (1998) assuaged:

An entrepreneurial university, on its own, actively seeks to innovate in how it goes about its business. It seeks to work out a substantial shift in organizational character so as to arrive at a more promising posture for the future...Institutional entrepreneurship can be seen as both process and outcomes” (p. 4).

The acceptance of social entrepreneurship in the academic community provides a vision for the overall management of higher education. The value of entrepreneurship for academia and developing knowledge is “appreciated when seeing concretely how the use of entrepreneurial attitudes, skills, and behaviors has made some educators more successful and contributed to the overall goal of improving education” (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010, p. 22).

The value of entrepreneurship can then be more widely accepted based on the attitudes of higher education stakeholders. Accordingly, Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) posited:

Our current contention is that multi-dimensional assessments of the various types of value created through academic entrepreneurship will construct a more robust framework through which to assess the costs and benefits that arise from the diverse entrepreneurial activities that occur within and beyond higher education institutions (p. 455).

Clark (1998) suggested an entrepreneurial university goes about transforming themselves through five elements: “a strengthened steering core; an expanded developmental periphery; a diversified funding base; a stimulated academic heartland; and an integrated entrepreneurial culture” (p. 5). The elements provide a framework for the institution to initiate change through entrepreneurial attitudes, skills, and behaviors.

The entrepreneurial values weave throughout the entire organization not just the academic curriculum.

The attentiveness to value creation will move higher education scholarship beyond descriptive forecasting and characterizing to more empirically sophisticated analyses of the costs and benefits of academic entrepreneurship to a variety of internal and external constituents and within unique political, social, and economic environments (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 456).

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). Many scholars have argued that entrepreneurial skills or traits are not separate from those demonstrated by leaders, but rather entrepreneurship is a form of leadership that occurs in particular settings (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). Czariawska-Joerges and Wolff (1991) offered that “entrepreneurship mainly fits contexts which are new and cannot be dealt with by means of experience or routine. Entrepreneurship is leadership in exceptional situations” (p. 533). What higher education needs from the public according to Newman and Couturier (2004) is “they need the right to operate efficiently and to make entrepreneurial judgments without undo interference” (p. 66). The leadership of higher education gains significant attention in managing the entrepreneurial theme. Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) provided a leadership perspective that “non-marketed orientated activities and behaviors of those within the post-secondary academy that both shape and are shaped by endogenous and exogenous social, political, and

economic forces and conditions” (p. 453). The leader in an entrepreneurial framework should conceptualize the organizational analysis of an institution because “innovative models for structuring higher education are emerging around the globe” (Newman & Couturier, p. 61).

Consequently, there is no empirical work within the top tiered higher education literature that give attention to the characteristics and implications of individual entrepreneurial behavior... Thus, while some promise of understanding the effects of academic entrepreneurship on systems, institutions, and professional/disciplinary fields exists within the higher education literature, we observed through our content analysis no substantive groundwork for understanding the implications of academic entrepreneurship on individuals” (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, p. 451).

Organizational Analysis

The literature revealed multiple theories and lens to view organizational analysis. One such theory is Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames (the Structural Frame, the Human Resource Frame, the Political Frame, and the Symbolic Frame) for analyzing an organization and making sense of these complex systems. In addition, Morgan (2006) provided eight metaphors to describe organizations “based on implicit images or metaphors that lead us to see, understand, and manage organizations” (p. 4) in a multifaceted system. While Bolman and Deal, and Morgan provided similar approaches, literature would posit using metaphors as a method of analysis for organizations because they provided a thicker examination, which reveals a better understood or familiarity to those outside the organizational research arena (Donaldson, 1998). While each of the

metaphors are essential, the culture metaphor will be the primary frame in analyzing organizations based on the campus leader's personal reference in managing a higher education institution (Bolman & Deal; Donaldson; Morgan). It is important to understand the rituals and history of an institution to effectively lead the complex stakeholder relationships.

Culture Metaphor

The institution of higher education identity through a cultural lens provides insight for the leader. It can be assumed, contemporary leadership includes constituents who have an investment in the organization (Leithwood et al., 2000). In higher education, the constituents include multiple groups covering a wide-range including tax payers, legislatures, students, faculty, and staff. In the 21st century, these multiple constituent groups have challenged the campus leader authority and leadership (Duderstadt, 2006). The culture in higher education includes long standing traditions, rituals, ceremonies, and structure.

Morgan's (2006) culture metaphor is a valuable way to view organizations as a frame of reference. The culture metaphor builds on my understanding about organizations and the people working within the organization based on values, norms, rituals, ideas, and other forms of shared understanding. Three key areas Morgan identified with culture and organization are (a) organizations as a cultural phenomenon, (b) organization and cultural context, and (c) corporate cultures and subcultures. The cultural phenomenon develops around the simple daily life rituals within a large organization. Individuals become a part of the industrial society they work in every day. A group develops a routine of working in an industrial society shaping the culture of members (Morgan).

In viewing organization and cultural context, Morgan (2006) explained differences exist in cross-national culture. The management of organizations can vary with the culture ideology of the country. “The point is that culture, whether Japanese, Arabian, British, Canadian, Chinese, French, or American, shapes the character of the organization” (Morgan, p.122). In Japan, an employee belongs as a part of the collective whole instead of being individuals working separately for an organization. In Britain, the whole class conflict shapes how workers and managers are perceived in an antagonistic organization (Morgan).

Finally, organizations consist of corporate cultures and subcultures sharing ideas and issues not associated with the overall organization. Small sub groups may have different views while working for the organization. In these small groups, rituals, norms, and language often differ from the general description of the organization (Morgan, 2006). The three key areas of culture and organization are (a) organizations as a cultural phenomenon, (b) organization and cultural context, and (c) corporate cultures and subcultures shape the organization. Morgan stressed “that the nature of a culture is found in its social norms and customs and that if one adheres to these rules of behavior one will be successful in constructing an appropriate social reality” (p. 135).

In addition, Morgan’s (2006) political and domination metaphor, as well as Bolman and Deal’s (2003) symbolic and political frame will be synthesized through key concepts and definitions. The symbolic frame “seeks to interpret and illuminate basic issues of meaning and belief that make symbols so powerful” (Bolman & Deal, p. 242). The symbols portray an organizations’ culture complete with the values, beliefs, and practices revolving around how members define day-to-day activities. “The political

frame views organizations as living, screaming, political arenas that host a complex web of individual and group interests” (Bolman & Deal, p. 186). Yet politics tend to be viewed as a *dirty* word. The political metaphor makes sense out of the daily interactions of members around divergent interests. The organization is shaped through the *wheeling and dealing* of interest among groups. In history, the domination metaphor explains “organization has been associated with processes of social domination where individuals and groups find ways of imposing their will on others” (Morgan, p. 293). Morgan’s domination and political metaphor, and Bolman and Deal’s political and symbolic frame outline many quality characteristics.

The culture metaphor developed by Morgan (2006) outlined four specific strengths to gain insight into an organization. The first strength of the culture metaphor is the focus on the symbolic significance of almost every aspect of organizational life. Second, organizations rest in shared system of meaning constantly creating and re-creating sense among interpretive schemes. Third, Morgan’s culture metaphor encourages us to view the connection between an organization and environment as a social relationship. Finally, the fourth strength of the culture metaphor allows for us to understand organizational change (Morgan). The culture metaphor strengths contain similar characteristics to the symbolic frame. The symbolic frame includes references around symbols for meanings. Members of the organization utilize myths, rituals, ceremonies, and heroes and heroines to find purpose in life and work (Bolman & Deal, 2003). “Culture is the glue that holds organizations together and unites people around shared values and beliefs” (Bolman & Deal, p. 243). The culture metaphor and symbolic frame share many characteristics that draw your attention to the parallels associated with

organizations. “When we talk about culture we are usually referring to the pattern of development reflected in society’s system of knowledge, ideology, values, laws, and day-to-day ritual” (Morgan, p. 116).

In contrast, the domination metaphor (Morgan, 2006), characteristic of imposing ones will on others or groups, would not be seen in an organization but viewed through the culture metaphor. The use of primary and secondary labor market separates an organization as unique characteristics of values and beliefs. On the other hand, Morgan’s example of the Japanese role within the organization shows some parallel with the culture metaphor. The perception would be the Japanese work in a domination organization, yet they feel a part of the organization instead of being an individual working separate.

It would be unproblematic to view similarities with the political metaphor and the political frame, such as the use of power.

However, comparisons can be drawn with the political metaphor and frame against the culture metaphor. In the political metaphor, Morgan (2006) stated, “An organization’s politics is most clearly manifested in the conflicts and power plays that sometimes occupy center stage, and in the countless interpersonal intrigues that provide diversions in the flow of organizational activity” (p. 156). Morgan paralleled the use of politics in dealing with the everyday corporate culture of an organization. Bolman and Deal (2003) highlighted conflict in the political frame as a means to stimulate, challenge the status quo, and create curiosity. In the culture metaphor, managers and leaders see themselves as the people to shape and create the meaning to guide organized actions (Morgan). Therefore, conflict is a necessary outcome to shape the overall goal of the organization. The reality is many subcultures within an organization have conflicting

values and beliefs, but the manager is responsible for managing the conflict for the better good of the organization. The culture metaphor shares many characteristics with the political and symbolic frame, as well as the political and domination metaphor. The cross comparisons can be viewed among the frames and metaphors in gaining insight into an organization.

Entrepreneurism and Culture

Bolman and Deal (2003) communicated that values are elusive and often help others create a sense of identity that will differentiate an organization and are often difficult for the institution or members to express.

For institutions that seek relevance and change through entrepreneurship, a broad intellectual and philosophical platform must be created. This platform must be inclusive, thoughtful, and diverse; it must reflect the humanistic origins of universities, contain an academic ethos, and empower those who are touched by this vision. Above all else, the foundation for these efforts must demonstrate that the greatest asset of any campus is the ability to deconstruct impediments that segregate knowledge and prevent it from being put to work (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 28).

McLaurin (2008) provided several steps a leader should go through that attempts organizational change:

1. Changing behaviors of subordinates, because that's the most effective way of changing people's beliefs

2. Justifying the new behavior to employees so that they can see its worth, because changes in behavior alone do not guarantee commitment and cultural change
3. Motivating the new behaviors through cultural communication via announcements, memos, rituals, stories, dress, etc
4. Socializing new employees and teaching them the target cultural values
5. Removing members of the organization who misfit the target culture if the cost of training them for it exceeds the value their skills and experience adds to the organization. (p. 57-58).

Schein (1996) speculated that leaders must mold the culture of the organization while managing environmental factors to achieve organizational goals and effectiveness.

“As entrepreneurship initiatives continue to emerge across the nation, integrating a robust and adaptive philosophical structure into these efforts will be critical to their long-term success – to their ability to be institutionally mainstreamed and sustained by changing the academic culture” (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 35). Borasi and Finnigan (2010) argued those “leaders must shape the culture of the organization and successfully deal with the environment to achieve organizational goals and improve organizational effectiveness” (p. 6). The leader through culture awareness can garner stakeholder support in shaping the entrepreneurial focus throughout an organization. McLaurin (2008) asserted:

Through their reactions to critical incidents and crises, leaders create norms, values, and ways of doing things that transmit to the employees’ important assumptions that in turn direct their own behavior. Resources allocation decisions,

informal messages, reward distribution, promotions, performance evaluations, and recruitment, selection and socialization are all tools through which the leader can communicate and embed the new or emphasized values at the deepest levels of the enhanced organizational culture (i.e. the underlying assumptions and values and beliefs)” (p. 65).

McLaurin (2008) posited, “through socialization, the leader can transmit to followers the organizational values, assumptions and attitudes in an attempt to change their own in order to maximize the fit between new employees and the organizational culture” (p. 58-59). The leadership plays a momentous role in assembling followers to buy into the entrepreneurial attitudes, beliefs, and skills. Lawrence (2006) highlighted university leaders who were

Under considerable stress, each of the presidents whose stories we have recorded was able to call on the institution’s strengths and traditions and to mobilize the members of their academic communities to think strategically, to plan a way to take the university forward, and to act on that plan (p. 446).

Additionally, Clark (1998) posited, “enterprising universities, much as firms in the high tech industry, develop a work culture that embraces change...as ideas and practices interact, the cultural or symbolic side of the university becomes particularly important in cultivating institutional identity and distinctive reputations” (p. 7). The acceptance of an entrepreneurial culture sustains the university in providing an economic engine to drive knowledge creation enterprise.

Knowledge Creation

The world has rapidly moved into a knowledge-based economy (St. George, 2006) where education has taken the place of production. The education level of the people more closely aligns with the strength of the country. The higher education institution therefore plays a critical role in economic strength directly influencing society (St. George). St. George reiterated, “[t]he emphasis must not be only on the structure of the educational institution, but also on their content...the most important skill that education can supply is flexibility” (p. 592). Additionally, Duderstadt (2006) confirmed the need for the university to adjust rapidly; yet, he also stated a change in the culture from a consensus-building process to “a willingness by leaders throughout the university to occasionally make difficult decisions and take strong action” (p. 249) in leading the institution of the 21st century.

Knowledge creation has been described as the ability of organizational leaders to tap into the knowledge of their most valuable resources: their people. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) posited, “[o]rganizational knowledge creation is a continuous and dynamic interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge” (p. 70), while Baumard (1999) suggested the knowledge creation process is “visible and invisible, tangible and intangible, stable and unstable” (p. 2). Much of the research on organizational knowledge creation and organizational learning has revolved around Nonaka and Takeuchi’s *The Knowledge Creating Company* and Peter Senge’s (1990) work *The Fifth Discipline*. The foundation of these knowledge creation theories rests on the sharing of tacit or personal knowledge that can be converted into explicit knowledge and operationalized by all within the organization. Nonaka and Takeuchi stated in a simplified overview:

When organizations innovate, they do not simply process information from outside in, in order to solve existing problems and adapt to a changing environment. They actually create new knowledge and information from the inside out, in order to redefine both problems and solutions and... re-create their environment. (p. 56)

In order to have an organization that creates new knowledge, employees must be given time and processes by which to share tacit knowledge. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) denoted this process as the four modes of knowledge conversion: “Our dynamic model of knowledge creation is anchored to a critical assumption that human knowledge is created and expanded through social interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge” (p. 61). This process can be extremely complex and iterative. The modes include socialization, externalization, internalization, and combination. In effect, the modes represent a process beginning with shared mental models and spiraling through different conversions to become knowledge that is explicitly stated and used in everyday operations.

The best management can do, according to Nonaka (1991), is to provide opportunity for self-organizing groups or teams to engage in constant dialogue in order to integrate their diverse perspectives into a new, collective perspective. The process does not go without occasional dissension, but, according to Nonaka, “it is precisely such conflict that pushes employees to question existing premises and make sense of their experience in a new way” (p.104). The importance higher education institutions fulfill in society through economic growth, life-long learning, healthcare, and socialization, all

suggest the “importance of experienced, responsible, and enlightened university governance and leadership” (Duderstadt, 2006, p. 239).

In knowledge creating companies, making an individual’s personal knowledge available to others is the central activity. It is through this process, the spiral of knowledge, that personal knowledge is transformed into organizational knowledge and becomes valuable to the company as a whole. As Nonaka (1991) summarized, “[t]o create new knowledge means... to re-create the company and everyone in it in a nonstop process of personal and organizational self renewal” (p. 97).

Once such discourse has occurred within an organization, the transformation into an effective learning organization can truly begin. Senge (1990) echoed the previous literature when noting that, in order to “build shared vision, [organizations should] bring to the surface and challenge prevailing mental models [in order] to foster more systemic ways of thinking” (p. 9). Doing so requires continuous individual and collective critical reflection via “a high-level of self-disclosure and willingness” (p. 19) to have one’s view’s challenged. It also requires an organization to look at knowledge creation in practice as well as in cognitive and/or social contexts (Brown & Duguid, 2001), as “[p]eople do not simply learn about; they also learn...to be” (p. 200). Therefore, the literature would suggest that we should take a comprehensive approach to knowledge creation in order to be fully cognizant of how different assumptions, different outlooks, different interpretations of the world, and different ways of sense-making either inhibit or prohibit shared practice (Brown & Duguid).

Analyzing knowledge creation through Donaldson’s (2008) I-C-I model of leadership gives us a language with which to assess leadership demands and successes,

and provides a comprehensive platform to “design and pursue new knowledge to improve [leadership] performance” (p. 9). The three domains of leadership knowledge, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and cognitive, comprise the I-C-I framework and enhance understanding of leadership challenges, and promote subsequent diagnostic decision making as a result of critical personal reflection, as enhances professional knowledge and learning. Moreover, the I-C-I model suggests that persistent obstacles “to leader effectiveness are the result, in part of gaps in leaders’ interpersonal, intrapersonal, and cognitive knowledge sets” (p. 45).

Entrepreneurism and Knowledge Creation

Senge (1990) argued that to bring about change in a knowledge creating organization, leaders must have a clear personal vision and should build a shared vision or common purpose in the organization; should develop shared discussion to generate collective learning; and must encourage organizational members to understand the underlying structures and relationships. Yet, there has been a growing sense of “tension in the leadership literature that models of leadership that were designed for the past century may not fully capture the leadership dynamic of organizations operating in today’s knowledge-driven economy” (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 430). Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) posited “intellectual entrepreneurs, both inside and outside universities, take risks and seize opportunities, discover and create knowledge, and innovation, collaborate, and solve problems in any number of social realms: corporate, nonprofit, government, and education” (p. 29). Therefore, “...higher education plays a key role in a nation’s ability to remain highly competitive in the global knowledge-based economy and

then an overview of academic capitalism and the creation of the contemporary knowledge/learning regime (Mars et al., 2009, p. 26).

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). Consequently, the entrepreneurial university maintains the importance of knowledge creation in sustaining the economic activity of society in the state and region. Mars et al. (2009) stated “...the entrepreneurial university which integrates the commercialization and capitalization of knowledge with teaching and research at the core of postsecondary education” exemplifies the core mission of knowledge creation and entrepreneurship (p. 29).

Summary

Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) argued:

Efforts to transform academe via entrepreneurship share certain commonalities: garnering faculty support, providing visionary leadership, and developing innovative curricula certainly lead the list. However, many universities have also found that defining this term in a manner unique to their intended goals and institutional culture is critical to successful implementation and long-term sustainability, particularly given a general uneasiness with entrepreneurship defined exclusively in economic terms (p. 27).

The institutions of higher education need to adapt to a new environment for survival (Collis, 2001; Collis, 2002; Mullin, 2001). The view of 21st century education requires

leadership to comprehend the adaption of entrepreneurship attitudes, behaviors, and skills for the survival of the institution. These challenges are essential to understand since “the traditional university missions of research, teaching, and service have put our institutions of higher education at the forefront of our society as gatekeepers for the knowledge, creativity, and invention that can guarantee economic security and advancement” (Lawrence, 2006, p. 3). Therefore, the presidents leading the colleges and universities have become an integral component of the development, management, and leadership of higher education institutions.

Vecchio (2003) posited:

Following our examination of the available literature, it seems reasonable to conclude that; (a) many of the constructs used in the area of entrepreneurship are also found within the mainstream of leadership theory; (b) the findings are not beyond being incorporated within available scholarship on leadership and interpersonal influence (i.e., entrepreneurship is leadership within a narrow, specific context)...it is more cogent and parsimonious to view entrepreneurship as simply a type of leadership that occurs in a specific setting and, like many other small group manifestations of leadership (e.g., coaching sports teams, organizing volunteer workers, etc.), a type of leadership that is not beyond the reach or understanding of available theory in the areas of leadership and interpersonal influence” (p. 322).

The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization, resulting in the leadership in higher education s often characterized as an essential component (Duderstadt, 2006). A campus leader can be the integral dynamic shaping the institution

through leadership as Yukl (2006) affirmed “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 3). Yet, it is critical for the leader to adapt cultural and leadership agility in the entrepreneurial university.

In leadership agility, Joiner (2009) conjectured “the ability to lead effectively when rapid change and uncertainty are the norm and when success requires consideration of multiple views and priorities. It requires using a process of using enhanced awareness and intentionality to increase effectiveness under real-time conditions” (p. 29). Likewise, De Meuse et al. (2010) posited leaders “who are highly learning agile continuously seek out new challenges, actively seek feedback from others to grow and develop, tend to self-reflect, and evaluate their experiences and draw practical conclusions” (p. 121). The agile leader exhibits a self-reflective posture seeking a deeper understanding.

Avolio et al. (2009) asserted:

Researchers are now examining all angles of leadership and including in their models and studies the leader, the follower, the context, the levels, and their dynamic inter-action. The second trend involves examining how the process of leadership actually takes place by, for example, integrating the work of cognitive psychology with strategic leadership. In this regard, we are witnessing greater interest in how the leader processes information as well as how the follower does so, and how each affects the other, the group, and organization (p. 441).

Leithwood et al. (2000) concluded there was no one appropriate definition of leadership, but a development of several models describing leadership has emerged.

In general, the assumption of entrepreneurship typically refer to the economic discipline, yet educators to recognize the potential entrepreneurship provides for guidance in becoming effective agents of change in higher education (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). It provides a lens to view higher education in an innovative and strategic way. The literature on institutional entrepreneurship notably peers through an intellectual property lens, but the concepts can be applied across the institution enterprise. “For institutions that seek relevance and change through entrepreneurship, a broad intellectual and philosophical platform must be created. This platform must be inclusive, thoughtful, and diverse; it must reflect the humanistic origins of universities, contain an academic ethos, and empower those who are touched by this vision” (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 28). The ability of a leader to touch the followers depends upon the understanding and acceptance of the importance of institutional culture.

Bolman and Deal (2003) communicated that values are elusive and often help others create a sense of identity that will differentiate an organization and are often difficult for the institution or members to express. Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) stated:

For institutions that seek relevance and change through entrepreneurship, a broad intellectual and philosophical platform must be created. This platform must be inclusive, thoughtful, and diverse; it must reflect the humanistic origins of universities, contain an academic ethos, and empower those who are touched by this vision. Above all else, the foundation for these efforts must demonstrate that the greatest asset of any campus is the ability to deconstruct impediments that segregate knowledge and prevent it from being put to work” (p. 28).

The acceptance of an entrepreneurial culture sustains the university in providing an economic engine to drive knowledge creation enterprise.

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). Consequently, the entrepreneurial university maintains the importance of knowledge creation in sustaining the economic activity of society in the state and region. Mars et al. (2009) stated “...the entrepreneurial university which integrates the commercialization and capitalization of knowledge with teaching and research at the core of postsecondary education” exemplifies the core mission of knowledge creation and entrepreneurship (p. 29).

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) declared:

With public schools and many other areas of education currently in a crisis, we need more educators—across all specializations and leadership levels—that are willing and able to lead innovations that will result in better services for their students and communities...thus increasing the need for entrepreneurial behavior and creative approaches to securing the needed resources” (p. 25).

The entrepreneurship theme provides an innovative approach that many institutions of higher education have adopted (Clark, 1998). “The quantitative strategies for studying leadership have dominated the literature over the past 100 years, but increasing attention is being paid to cases and qualitative research that should now be integrated with quantitative approach” (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 442). The institutional membership

(students, staff, faculty, administration) seek entrepreneurship as a lens to view the institution to value the complexity of 21st century higher education.

This research study focused on examining entrepreneurship as a leadership lens and whether the University President's use of entrepreneur leadership characteristics were imbedded within the organization and ultimately improved the creation of knowledge in the higher education institution. Explored in Chapter Three will be the research design and methodology utilized along with the research questions, population sample, methods of data collection, and data analysis. Presented in Chapter Four are the analysis and the results of the data collected. Findings, conclusions, implementations for practice and recommendations for future research are described in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The complexity of the academy demands a leader who can manage multiple functions of the organization. In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role, with the president guiding resource development including state, federal, private donors, intellectual property, land development, and many more revenue streams. It is clear the University of the 21st century requires leadership capable of responding to emerging global opportunities to deliver life-long learning across the world (Duderstadt, 2006). As a result, an entrepreneurial leadership focus may be essential in leading post secondary education in a knowledge-based economy. Accordingly, the campus executive officer brings a significant scope of influence to managing the organization through knowledge creation and keeping a keen eye on the history, rituals, norms, and values forming the mission of the institution.

In this chapter, the leadership functions of the campus executive officer through the conceptual underpinning of the entrepreneurial lens will be outlined. This qualitative study focuses on leadership style, organizational analysis and knowledge creation. A dual case study method was used to gain a better understanding of the campus executive officer's role in leading an institution of higher education. Presented in this chapter are the research questions, research design, data collection process, and data analysis preparation.

Overview of Purpose and Problem

The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization, resulting in the leadership in higher education often characterized as an essential component (Duderstadt, 2006). The current view of education requires leadership to comprehend the adaption of entrepreneurship attitudes, behaviors, and skills for the survival of the institution. These challenges are essential to understand since “the traditional university missions of research, teaching, and service have put our institutions of higher education at the forefront of our society as gatekeepers for the knowledge, creativity, and invention that can guarantee economic security and advancement” (Lawrence, 2006, p. 3). Therefore, the presidents leading the colleges and universities have become an integral component of the development, management, and leadership of higher education institutions.

A campus leader can be the integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership as Yukl (2006) affirmed “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 3). Yet, it is critical for the leader to adapt cultural and leadership agility in the entrepreneurial university. The entrepreneurship theme provides an innovative approach that many institutions of higher education have adopted (Clark, 1998). “The quantitative strategies for studying leadership have dominated the literature over the past 100 years, but increasing attention is being paid to cases and qualitative research that should now be integrated with quantitative approach” (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 442).

Consequently, Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) presented there is no observed effort within the “top tiered higher education literature that gives attention to the characteristics and implications of individual entrepreneurial behaviors...we observed through our content analysis no substantive groundwork for understanding the implications of academic entrepreneurship on individuals” (p. 451). Additionally, Vecchio (2003) posited, “(a) many of the constructs used in the area of entrepreneurship are also found within the mainstream of leadership theory; (b) the findings are not beyond being incorporated within available scholarship on leadership and interpersonal influence (i.e., entrepreneurship is leadership within a narrow, specific context)” (p. 322). The paucity of empirical research in the area of entrepreneurial leadership supports this researchers’ determination to gain additional insight into the connection of organizational analysis and knowledge creation with entrepreneurial leadership.

Research Questions

Within the context of this study, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What leadership qualities does a traditional career pathway versus nontraditional career pathway university president possess that lead the institution to consistently achieve successful outcomes?
2. What processes does the university president implement that encourage an entrepreneurial academy?
3. What structures does the traditional career pathway versus nontraditional career pathway university president implement that lead to acceptance in the higher education culture?

4. How does the traditional career pathway versus nontraditional career pathway university president establish collaboration among various stakeholders?
5. How have entrepreneurial strategies been integrated into the institutional plan?

Rationale for Use of a Dual Case Study

The researcher selected a dual case study to answer the question *how* an entrepreneurial leadership style could be effective for a higher education institution in the 21st century. Secondary questions focus on *what* questions to explain the phenomenon. Yin (1994) described the case study method as a research design of empirical inquiry. Such qualitative data answers the *how*, *why* and *what* questions. In addition, the dual case study allowed a snapshot of the campus executive officer and stakeholders in the natural setting and during daily operation through situational analysis that focused on the topic from several participants' points of view (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). A case study provided the opportunity to gather multiple perspectives.

Qualitative study is defined as an inquiry process to build understanding of either a social or human problem based upon a holistic picture that is created using words (Merriam, 1998). The study was conducted in a natural setting with informants providing the details (Creswell, 1994). The central concept, entrepreneurial leadership for the management direction of the institution, was the focus of the study. The researcher interacted with the participants at the site of the university during several visits and reported the observations and interviews using words such as discovery, meaning, and understanding.

Another dimension of a case study is the exploration of a single entity or phenomenon within a time limit during which detailed information is collected from a variety of sources with a number of data collection procedures (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994). Qualitative research finds basis in a phenomenological approach, which attempts to emphasize the subjective aspects of behavior (Creswell, 1994). In viewing human behavior, qualitative researchers look at interactions as a way to determine meaning through interpretation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Personal visits to the schools by the researcher provided rich information that was bound to the natural setting and the schools stakeholders. From data collected from interviews, focus groups, documents, and artifacts, several categories emerged, allowing the comparison of data and triangulation for verification (Merriam).

The researcher preferred the subjective interaction with the subjects and interpretative approach to investigate the unique context of the university through the lens of entrepreneurial leadership. The university is a self-contained, bounded system with Merriam (1998) identifying a bounded system as a possible case selected due to an issue, concern, or hypothesis. Yin (1994) defined a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (p. 23). The ability to gather and use a variety of sources of evidence is an identified strength of a case study (Yin).

Qualitative Research

The common approaches to research include the use of quantitative, qualitative and mixed method design in measurement of data. Quantitative research is designed to

test key topics, theories, and hypotheses while qualitative research is designed to build concepts based on data collection through open-ended questions, narratives, observations, focus groups and interviews (Creswell, 2003). Merriam (1998) asserted:

Choosing a study design requires understanding the philosophical foundations underlying the type of research, taking stock of whether there is a good match between the type of research and your personality, attributes, and skills, and becoming informed as to the design choices available to you within the paradigm (p. 1).

Creswell (2003) suggested the researcher should conceptualize three questions in determining design of the project: “What knowledge claims are being made by the researcher (including a theoretical perspective)? What strategies of inquiry will inform the procedures? and What methods of data collection and analysis will be used?” (p. 5). The researcher, through the use of Creswell’s three design questions, can determine “either the qualitative, quantitative or mixed method approach to inquiry” (p. 6).

The qualitative approach knowledge claim can utilize a constructivist, advocacy, or participatory philosophies. The constructivist seeks to develop meaning through engaging the world, while the advocacy/participatory researcher seeks to understand the social injustice of those that would be marginalized (Creswell, 2003). The qualitative researcher “help[s] us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible” (Merriam, 1998, p. 5). Contrastingly, the quantitative approach knowledge claim based primarily on postpositivist perspective meaning causes determine effects and outcomes. In addition, postpositivism reduces the

ideas into small ideas to test, while measuring the objective that exists out in the world (Creswell, 2003).

An employed strategy of qualitative inquiry includes phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, case study and narrative. The methods of a qualitative study utilize open-ended questions, emergent approaches and text/image data. The practices of qualitative research contains participant meaning, the researchers positions themselves, focus on a single concept, brings personal values, studies context and setting, interprets the data, creates an agenda for change, and collaborates with the participants (Creswell, 2003). On the contrary, the method implemented in a quantitative approach includes closed-ended questions, encoded approach, and numeric data utilizing a sophisticated measurement devise like SPSS. Finally, the practices of quantitative research include hypothesizing the problem, identifying and relating variables to the hypothesis, standards for reliability and validity, numerical measures of information and statistical procedures (Creswell).

The research study utilizing a qualitative approach should provide a better understanding of the importance of entrepreneurship, organizational analysis and knowledge creation. The qualitative design will seek to understand the insiders' perspective in entrepreneurship, while the quantitative study perspective focuses on the problem from the researcher's point of view (Merriam, 1998). In a qualitative study, "the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis" (Merriam, 2003, p. 7), whereas a quantitative approach uses sophisticated analysis software to analysis the data collected through experimental procedures. Nonetheless, an argument can be supported for taking active participation in the research study through qualitative

processes of interviews, focus groups and observations. Because of the data collection techniques instituted, the researcher develops a richer understanding of the study.

A qualitative study builds on the lack of information on an obtainable theory instead of testing an existing theory. The qualitative researcher gains understanding through collection of data from observations in the field. In contrast, a quantitative study finds data to correlate with an existing theory (Merriam, 1998). “Typically, qualitative research findings are in the form of themes, categories, typologies, concepts, tentative hypotheses, even theory, which have been inductively derived from the data” (Merriam, p. 7-8).

The characteristics of a quantitative study follow a very structured and predetermined design, whereas qualitative study characteristic models a flexible, evolving and emergent design (Creswell, 2003). An emerging design allows the researcher to adjust to changing conditions of the study and to pursue and probe emergent themes (Merriam, 1998). The sample size of a quantitative study is more random and large unlike the qualitative study being nonrandom, purposive, and small in order to gather rich, thick data (Merriam). A researcher in a qualitative design spends significant time immersed in the natural setting of the study (Merriam).

The researcher in a qualitative study is “the primary instrument for gathering and analyzing data,” therefore, mistakes can be made and personal biases can play into the study (Merriam, 1998, p. 20). The rigor of a qualitative design, referred to as *rich thick description* is witnessed by the ability of the readers to transfer the research findings into similar situations (Merriam). In contrast, a quantitative study the researcher test and validates theory through statistical procedures. Further, rigor and quality of a quantitative

design is determined through statistical significance, and hypotheses testing.

Furthermore, it can be argued for a qualitative study, the researcher must have a large open-mindedness for ambiguity to not bias the study.

Case Study

The case study design was selected to allow analysis of the campus executive officer and the university stakeholders in real-life context using multiple sources of information. The researcher concluded using a qualitative research method, explicitly a dual case study, would clarify and expand upon the research questions through situational analysis that considered the information from perspectives of all participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Additionally, Merriam (1998) provided supportive reasons for a case study including “seeing through the researcher’s eyes” and “decreased defensiveness” as advantages in case study methodology (p. 238).

Participants

The researcher used a qualitative research design to study a dual case study to understand the campus executive officer leadership utilizing entrepreneurship as a frame of reference. The study examined organizational analysis and knowledge creation in regard to the campus executive officer’s role in leading the 21st century institution of higher education. A narrative case study was conducted using various stakeholders who had insights into the campus executive officer’s leadership (Creswell, 2003).

The institutions of higher education selected for the dual case study are Midwest universities with a primarily liberal arts mission. The researcher purposefully selected the two institutions based on comparable organizational structure “that will best help the researcher understand the problem and the research question[s]” (Creswell, 2003, p. 185).

The two campus leaders selected as participants are the chief executive officers of the institution reporting directly to the respected Board of Trustees.

Since the traditional liberal arts institution has been placed in an economically challenging role in the state of higher education today (Duderstadt, 2006), the two liberal arts institutions selected provided a meaningful entrepreneurial focal point. In *Entrepreneurial Domains*, the authors describe the integration of professional degree programs into traditional liberal arts institutions as entrepreneurial efforts to attract students to relevant knowledge-based employment economy. Therefore, the researcher's selection of the two case study institutions provided excellent models to study the entrepreneurial leadership theme.

A sample population composed of key stakeholders in the case study institutions emerged through purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2003). The Leadership Team was chosen as it was a "naturally formed group and volunteered as participants" (Creswell, p. 164). As determined through a face-to-face interview and a phone interview with the campus executive officers, the target audience was defined as the Leadership Team, faculty, and trustees. The focus of the research was its internal communication functions, strategic planning, fiscal operations, and campus culture. In addition, internal communication functions were examined to determine if the leadership style of the president enhanced or hindered the institution's mission.

The institution Leadership Team primarily consisted of an academic officer or provost, administrative officer or chief operation officer (COO), enrollment management officer, chief information officer (CIO), chief financial officer (CFO), and human resources officer. The Leadership Team provided a more rich in-depth analysis of the

campus executive officer based on a significantly higher level working relationship and team dynamics (Merriam, 1998). These participants provide qualitative data through interviews, a focus group, and document analysis. The participants in the research study include two campus executive interviews (n=2), the leadership team member interviews (n=8), and two focus groups (n=10).

Data Collection and Instruments

In a qualitative study, the researcher represents the primary means for data collection and measurement (Merriam, 2003). The methods to collect the participant data include interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and observations resulting in a richer understanding of the study (Creswell, 2003). Therefore, a researcher in a qualitative design spends significant time immersed in the natural setting of the study (Merriam, 1998). As a result, the researcher obtains gatekeeper permission allowing the researcher to study the case including participants from the organization.

The researcher contacted the administrative assistant for the campus executive officer through an email with the gatekeeper letter (Appendix A). The researcher made a follow up telephone call to the administrative assistant to schedule a face-to-face meeting with the gate keeper. Following the meeting, the researcher obtained verbal and written permission to conduct the case study research. The qualitative researcher gains understanding through collection of data from observations in the field (Merriam, 1998). The data collection consists of interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and observations.

Interviews

The literature review assisted in the development of the interview questions (Merriam, 1998) designed to gather relevant information centered on the primary research question. Open-ended questions were utilized to encourage participants to elaborate candidly about experiences and opinions revolving around the evaluation question (Merriam). The questions were developed to use interpretive questions and probes (Merriam) in order to gather thick, rich data from the interviewee. The interview was semi-structured (Merriam) as questions were developed beforehand to explore key concepts, but further questioning took place when new information arose.

Initially, the researcher utilized purposeful sampling to identify participants; yet, the researcher approached the interviews with a snowballing plan, resulting in additional names developed from document analysis and focus groups. The semistructured interview format assisted the researcher in obtaining answers to ten interview questions. In addition, probes were used to increase response outcomes to expand upon the interview questions (Merriam, 1998).

The researchers developed an interview instrument for the campus executive officer, as well as an instrument for all other participants from an exhaustive review of the literature (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010; Duderstadt, 2006; Gardner, 2007; Fernald et al., 2005; Hansson & Monsted, 2008; Mars & Metcalf, 2009). The literature guided the researcher question development to investigate the conceptual underpinning of entrepreneurship. The interview questions addressed the participants' background, knowledge, historical reference, and opinions. The researcher obtained interviews

through personal communication with the participants, and the use of the snowball approach. In addition, document analysis was collected from the participants.

After the initial contact with a participant, an arranged time was scheduled to conduct the interviews. The researcher asked for an hour to be dedicated to field the questions. The participants were given an informed consent document (Appendix F) which reviewed the purpose of the study and involvement was voluntary. The participants received no monetary compensation for the study. At the onset of the interviews, participants were asked verbally if audio taping was permissible. The researcher conducted all of the interviews and subsequently transcribed the data in a word document.

Focus Groups

The researcher conducted two focus group meetings at the two case study institutions. A snowball sample (Merriam, 2008) for the first focus group was chosen due to the leadership roles of the members within the leadership team. The researchers developed the focus group guide from a thorough review of the literature (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010; Duderstadt, 2006; Gardner, 2007; Fernald et al., 2005; Hansson & Monsted, 2008; Mars & Metcalf, 2009). The literature leads the researcher question progress to investigate the conceptual underpinning of entrepreneurship (Merriam, 1998).

The group consisted of the institution leadership team, while the second integrated various institution stakeholders including faculty, students, trustees, and staff. The focus group was moderated by the researcher while recording the conversations for later transcription. Focus group questions were developed to be unstructured, open-ended questions with the facilitator of each focus group utilizing the same question format for

each group (Appendix E). This strategy enabled the researcher to elicit views and opinions (Creswell, 2003) of the participants about the campus executive officer. Potential probes were developed to encourage the group to delve for deeper meaning if the original question failed to gather thick rich data (Merriam, 1998). Focus groups were audio taped and transcribed by the researcher conducting the questioning. The researcher was responsible for citing observations of his or her respondents during the process. The focus groups took place at the research site lasting less than one hour.

Document Analysis

An extensive review of document analysis gained a broader perspective into the physical documents. The documents included public and private files. The collection of documents included files from the interviews and focus groups that emerged from the conversations. The documents spanned a significant amount of time. Multiple investigators and resources resulted in a broadened triangulation of data. The researcher also collected electronic documents to gain further understanding of the case study institutions mission, vision, and values.

Observation

The researcher conducted observations during a leadership team meeting in a complete observer role (Merriam, 1998). The researcher's field notes documented activities, which included outside presenters as well as members of the executive team presenting during the meeting. In addition, the researcher shadowed the campus executive officer through a half day to gain an understanding about the leader's day-to-day role. In the observer role, the researcher will be able to "notice things that have become routine to the participants," yet yielding valuable data supporting the research

questions” (Merriam, p. 95). Additionally, the use of observation in a qualitative study expands the researchers understanding of participant behaviors supporting reference points in interviews (Merriam).

Data Analysis

After all interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and observations had been transcribed in a timely manner while the experiences were fresh in the researcher’s mind, the researcher coded themes that emerged from the research. During open coding analysis (Merriam, 1998), the researcher first separately examined his own transcriptions and documents for emerging patterns and themes. The researcher compiled individual themes and patterns to come up with a condensed consolidated coding. A list of three themes was coded. Through team analysis, it was determined that three main themes and six sub themes emerged: 1) *Sense of Urgency*, with subthemes of: a) Leadership, b) Communication; and 2) *Culture of Higher Education*, with subthemes of: a) History and Traditions, b) Environment; and 3) *Vision*, with subthemes of: a) 21st Century Higher Education, b) Institutional Platform and Innovation. The participant interviews were then cut and pasted to according themes. A theme table was constructed to organize data collection during axial coding (Merriam). The researcher and doctoral advisor reassembled to discuss placement of data into themes.

The second step of the transcript analysis was to ensure internal validity and trustworthiness. In addition, the researcher noted patterns that did not fit into the team determined codes. A holistic understanding of the data to understand the phenomena supported issues of validity and trustworthiness (Merriam, 1998). The researcher demonstrated trustworthiness through careful planning and adherence to quality research.

To achieve this, the researcher sought internal validity by bringing forth findings that match reality (Merriam), allowing the researcher to triangulate findings to some degree to “confirm the emerging findings” (Merriam, p. 204) and “to establish validity through pooled judgment” (Foreman, 1948, p. 204).

In addition, the researcher ensured trustworthiness by increasing reliability, the ability to replicate findings (Merriam, 1998). Since the researcher was the primary research instrument, reliability could be seriously affected. Considering this before, during, and after data collection and analysis allowed for improved reliability. Furthermore, all data have been logged and saved allowing an audit trail ensuring that others can return to the research and draw conclusions similar to the original researcher.

Artifact Analysis

The researcher collected public and private documents including meeting agendas, web sites, staff logs, strategic planning, and meeting notes. These artifacts allowed the researcher to note common language and themes. The authenticity and accuracy of the documents (Merriam, 1998) is a significant process in the researcher’s discovery of additional data coded to common themes from the findings. The documents analysis “furnished descriptive information” reinforcing the “stability” (Merriam, p. 126) of the conceptual underpinning of entrepreneurship in the research study. Additionally, the documents “grounded an investigation in the context of the problem being investigated” (Merriam, p. 126) through the use of triangulation.

Summary

Qualitative study is defined as an inquiry process to build understanding of either a social or human problem based upon a holistic picture that is created using words

(Merriam, 1998). This study was conducted in a natural setting with informants providing the details (Creswell, 1998). The central concept, entrepreneurial leadership for the management direction of the institution, was the focus of the study. The researcher interacted with the participants at the site of the university during several visits and reported the observations and interviews using descriptive narratives in the *voices* of the participants.

The qualitative research methods used to gather data included observations, focus group meetings, personal interviews, and document analysis. The researcher visited the case study sites on several occasions and used an interpretation of the data to examine the leadership dynamics of the executive campus officer.

The case study design was selected to allow analysis of the campus executive officer and its stakeholders in a real-life context using multiple sources of information. The researcher selected a qualitative research method, explicitly a dual case study, which would clarify and expand upon the research questions. Presentation of the data findings and analysis are presented in Chapter Four. Finally, provided in Chapter Five are the findings, conclusions, implication for practice along with recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The focus of this research study was to add to the limited body of knowledge on traditional career pathway and non-traditional career pathway campus executive officer's ability to lead a higher education institution utilizing an entrepreneurial strategy. The purpose of this dual case study was to examine the perceived effectiveness of a campus leader (traditional vs. non traditional career pathways) in an institution of higher education with a high incidence of successful management and vision for the 21st century organization. Through the lens of entrepreneurship, the research analysis was designed to understand the campus executive officer's leadership and management through the conceptual underpinnings of leadership, organizational analysis, specifically culture, and knowledge creation. This study focused on entrepreneurial characteristics and practice of two university presidents, one with a traditional career pathway and the other, a nontraditional career pathway.

The view of 21st century education requires leadership to comprehend the adaption of entrepreneurship attitudes, behaviors, and skills for the survival of the institution. These challenges are essential to understand since "the traditional university missions of research, teaching, and service have put our institutions of higher education at the forefront of our society as gatekeepers for the knowledge, creativity, and invention that can guarantee economic security and advancement" (Lawrence, 2006, p. 3). In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role, with the president guiding resource development including state, federal, private donors, intellectual

property, land development, and many more revenue streams. Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) posited, “there is no empirical work within the top tiered higher education literature that give attention to the characteristics and implications of individual entrepreneurial behavior... no substantive groundwork for understanding the implications of academic entrepreneurship on individuals” (p. 451). This study expanded upon the substance of research about two campus executive officers, one traditional career pathway and the other having a non-traditional career pathway, demonstrating entrepreneur behavior in leading an institution of higher education for the 21st century.

The researcher will present illustrated information on the chief executive officers, participants, and settings of each dual case study. Finally, themes that surfaced will be synthesized through the utilization of qualitative data collection measures of interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis.

Study Design

The researcher selected a dual case study to answer the question *how* an entrepreneurial leadership style could be effective for a higher education institution in the 21st century. Another dimension of a case study is the exploration of a single entity or phenomenon within a time limit during which detailed information is collected from a variety of sources with a number of data collection procedures (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994). Qualitative study is defined as an inquiry process to build understanding of either a social or human problem based upon a holistic picture that is created using words (Merriam). Qualitative research finds basis in a phenomenological approach, which attempts to emphasize the subjective aspects of behavior (Creswell, 1994). The researcher selected a dual case study to focus on discovery rather than hypothesis testing

(Merriam). This case study further provided a viable means through which the researcher gleaned the greatest understanding possible based on a holistic picture in the natural setting of the two institutions (Creswell). The selection of the two campus executive officers abided by Merriam's (2009) case study analysis that "first establish the criteria that will guide case selection and then select a case that meets those criteria" (p. 65).

The researcher purposefully selected the two institutions based on comparable organizational structure which "that will best help the researcher understand the problem and the research question[s]" (Creswell, 2003, p. 185). For this study, two cases or campus executive officers were chosen through purposive sampling including: regional locations in the Midwest of the United States, traditional liberal arts institutions, and similar campus size and population (Merriam, 1998). Within each case study, the chief campus officers and members of the leadership team (Executive Committee and Leadership Cabinet) were interviewed individually or as a part of focus groups and supporting data were collated.

Data Collection Method

Prior to collecting data from the participants, permission was requested from the institutions campus executive officer (president) in the form of a gatekeeper letter (Appendix A) which stated the purpose of the research study and the access needed by the researcher. After receiving gatekeeper permission, the researcher completed the Campus Institutional Review Board (IRB) application at the University of Missouri – Columbia, as well as one of the case study site's Human Research Subjects Committee. Once the study received IRB approval (Appendix B), the researcher established an institutional representative who assisted in scheduling the campus executive officers and

leadership team associates for interviews and focus groups. The majority of interviews and focus groups were conducted on the case study campus, or affiliated campus sites. Prior to the interviews and focus groups, each participant received an inform consent letter (Appendix F) and the IRB approval letter (Appendix B) specifying the participants contribution and rights within the scope of the research.

The researcher in a qualitative study is “the primary instrument for gathering and analyzing data,” (Merriam, 1998, p. 20) therefore, mistakes can be made and personal biases can play into the study. Therefore, the researcher informed the participants audio-taping would be done during the interviews and focus groups following an interview and focus group protocol. To ensure accuracy, the participants received a transcript from the interviews and focus groups to verify accuracy of content and clarity of meaning. This process of member checking provides participants the chance to ensure perspective and meaning of the transcript data (Creswell, 2003). After all interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and observations had been transcribed in a timely manner, the data was triangulated using the transcriptions, artifacts, and observations.

Conceptual Framework

The purpose of this dual case-study was to gain an in-depth understanding of the college and university president through an entrepreneurship lens as the conceptual underpinning. The constructs presented examined leadership, entrepreneurship, organizational analysis, and knowledge creation. This examination of literature was designed to provide a creative view of the academy presidency through current complexity of the position based on the career pathways of each, the internal and external forces, as well as the environmental change in higher education. Significantly, colleges

and universities have been facing increasing pressure from internal and external stakeholders to increase innovation, support economic development, and be responsive to increased scrutiny which expands upon the traditional mission of service (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). Therefore, the presidents leading the colleges and universities have become an integral component of the development, management, and leadership of higher education institutions.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. What leadership qualities does a traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president possess that lead the institution to consistently achieve successful outcomes?
2. What processes does the university president implement that encourage an entrepreneurial academy?
3. What structures does the traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president implement that lead to acceptance in the higher education culture?
4. How does the traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president establish collaboration among various stakeholders?
5. How have entrepreneurial strategies been integrated into the institutional plan?

Process of Data Analysis

The researcher selected a dual case study to answer the question *how* an entrepreneurial leadership style could be effective for a higher education institution in the 21st century. Secondary questions focused on the *what* questions to explain the phenomenon. Yin (1994) described the case study method as a research design of empirical inquiry. The data was deduced through a social constructivist lens which develops meaning through a relational process normally with the researcher and participants during the study (Raskin, 2011). In addition, the dual case study allowed a snapshot of the campus executive officer and stakeholders in the natural setting during their daily operation. Through situational analysis, the topic could be evaluated from several participants' points of view (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). This, a case study provides the opportunity to gather multiple perspectives.

The qualitative research methods used to gather data included observations, focus group meetings, personal interviews, and document examination. The documents analysis “furnished descriptive information” reinforcing the “stability” (Merriam, 1998, p. 126) of the conceptual underpinning of entrepreneurship in the research study. Additionally, the documents “grounded an investigation in the context of the problem being investigated” (Merriam, p. 126) through the use of triangulation. Each participant or observation was assigned a code: Campus Executive Officer 1 (CEO1), Campus Executive Officer 2 (CEO2), Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT1), Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT2), Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT3), Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT4), Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT5), Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT6), Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT7),

Academic Leadership Team Member (ALT8), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT1), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT2), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT3), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT4), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT5), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT6), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT7), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT8), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT9), Administrative Leadership Team Member (AdLT10), Field Observation 1 (FO1), and Field Observation 2 (FO2). To support accuracy and consistency, the transcripts and observation logs were interpreted multiple times.

Settings

The institutions of higher education selected for the dual case study are Midwest universities with a primarily liberal arts mission. The researcher purposefully selected the two institutions based on comparable organizational structure “that will best help the researcher understand the problem and the research question[s]” (Creswell, 2003, p. 185). The two universities are private post-secondary education institutions not currently offering doctoral level degree programs. The two campus leaders selected as participants are the chief executive officers of the institution reporting directly to the respected Board of Trustees. A narrative description of each institution is presented.

Institution 1: Capital University. The University is located approximately 60 miles from a metropolitan city in a town of 12,000 people. The institution has a rich and long history dating back almost 150 years located directly off the small town’s main street corridor. The mission of Capital University is to provide the highest quality liberal arts and professional education in a caring, Christ-centered community of grace which

integrates faith, learning and life. The University serves students of traditional age, adult learners and organizations through undergraduate and graduate programs. The vision: *By 2020, Capital University will be positioned as a distinctive and rapidly expanding institution known for its innovative educational models, exceptional value, and special ability to prepare diverse student populations for lifetimes of enlightened faith, exemplary service, inspired leadership, and personal significance* (Capital University, 2013). The institution serves over 7,000 students through the residential campus, seven adult and professional campuses, and growing on-line programs. The residential campus includes 14 buildings with a student population of 1,200 students. The administrative center is located within the middle of the residential campus. The Campus Executive Officer (President) office location is located in the administrative center directly off the main entrance into the building creating a very accessible and visible presence. The academics of Capital University include 30 undergraduate majors and concentrations and four graduate degree programs within three school or degree programs.

Institution 2: Mission University: The University is located outside of a metropolitan city within the limits of a suburban area. The institution dates back to the mid 1800's through a faith based affiliation which developed into several academic iterations until the early 1960's when the current name became a reality. The plight of Mission University, a Faith University sponsored by the Sisters, is a values-based community of learning providing liberal arts, professional, undergraduate and graduate education to prepare students for responsible lifelong contributions to the global community. The values include excellence in teaching and learning, the Faith identity of the University, the sponsorship and contribution of the Sisters, the worth, dignity, and

potential of each human being, diversity and its expression, commitment to the continual growth of the whole person, and interaction with and service to others. The institution serves over 1,800 students through a residential campus, corporate site locations, and through on-line learning management system. The residential campus includes 14 buildings encompasses 50 acres with an approximate student population of 1,200. The administrative center serves as the gateway into the residential campus. The Campus Executive Officer (President) office is located on the main entrance into the administrative center completely visible and accessible to the public. The academics of Mission University include 60 undergraduate majors and concentrations and six graduate degree programs within seven school or degree programs.

Participants

For this research study, a qualitative, dual case study research design was used to understand the campus executive officer leadership utilization of entrepreneurship as a frame of reference. The two campus leaders selected as participants are the chief executive officers of the institution reporting directly to the respected Board of Trustees. The two individuals have been the campus executive officers for more than five years. An additional 19 individuals from the executive or cabinet leadership team participated in either personal interviews or focus groups through questionnaires (Appendix D & E) to gain a richer and meaningful perceptive of the campus executive officer. These individuals included campus executive officers' (CEO), academic leadership team member (ALT), and administrative leadership team member (AdLT).

Campus Executive Officer (CEO): Two campus executive officers were interviewed for the dual case study. The first campus executive officer, Keith Embry

(pseudonym), has been the president at Capital University for over six years. He became president of the University during a very difficult time including financial instability, poor faculty and staff moral, and infrastructure challenges. President Embry had been serving on the Board of Trustees for Capital University including a term as Chairman of the Board. He received an undergraduate degree from the University, and maintained connected to the institution while rising to executive level leadership positions in corporate America. He eventually founded three companies that went on to achieve financial milestones creating a very successful entrepreneur legacy. Mr. Embry had been recruited multiple times to lead Capital University, for which he turned down two previous time, but finally accepted the third time. He felt compelled to bring back the institution that he so dearly cared for while serving on the Board of Trustees. The second campus executive officer, Dr. Richard Sach (pseudonym), has been president of Mission University for over six years. Similarly, Dr. Sach became president of the University during fiscally challenging times for the institution, poor physical facilities, and a lack of institutional vision. He was the overwhelming favorite to take the president position during the search process. Dr. Sach brought a higher education career pathway that included leadership positions in the student affairs and strategic planning. The majority of his experience had been with faith based institutions of higher education which continued with Mission University. Dr. Sach believed that Mission University had great potential ingrained in the institutional mission and history.

Academic Leadership Team member (ALT): Eight academic leadership team members were interviewed or members of a focus group. At Capital University, male and female participants were part of the data collection. A female academic leader served as

dean of a school which she recently promoted to the position. She had been a faculty member for the University for several years and previously was a teacher in a local school district. The male academic leaders ($n = 2$) serve in executive level leadership positions including provost of the college and chief academic officer. They each have been affiliated with Capital University for many years serving in multiple academic leadership positions.

At Mission University, male and female were a part of the data collection. The female academic leaders consisted of two deans of schools and two executive level leaders in position of provost and vice provost. The four have significant tenure with the institution including three decades for the provost position. The male academic leaders both served as deans of schools. They both have an extensive tenure with Mission University each dating 30 and 40 years respectively.

Administrative Leadership Team member (AdLT): The administrative leadership team consisted of 11 members that were interviewed or participants in a focus group. At Capital University, male and female were a part of the data collection. The female administrative leaders served the institution as vice president of government affairs and director of human resources. The vice president of government affairs initially fulfilled a faculty role, but soon after moved into an administrative capacity for the University. They each have a significant tenure with the institution dating back several decades. The male administrative leaders were higher in representation with Capital University serving in roles such as vice president of advancement, chief information officer, vice president of administration/chief financial officer, chief operating officer, and vice president of online learning. The tenure for the male administrative leaders was to a large extent

shorter than the female administrative leaders except for the chief information officer who had served for three decades.

At Mission University, male and female were a part of the data collection. The female administrative leaders served the institution in a capacity of dean of students and vice president of advancement. The tenure for the female administrative leaders was less than ten years. The male administrative leaders fulfilled executive level management such as director of mission effectiveness, vice president of administration, and associate vice president of enrollment management. Similar to the female administrative leaders of Mission University, the tenure for each of the members was less than ten years.

Themes

Using the data set and the predetermined codes, a synthesis from the data the following themes emerged: 1) *Sense of Urgency*, with subthemes of: a) Leadership, b) Communication; and 2) *Culture of Higher Education*, with subthemes of: a) History and Traditions, b) Environment; and 3) *Entrepreneurial Vision*, with subthemes of: a) 21st Century Higher Education, b) Institutional Platform and Innovation. These themes present a comprehension of entrepreneurial practices of campus executive officers and the management of institutional leadership from the perspective of executive level leadership team members.

Sense of Urgency

In this study, a common theme that emerged in multiple ways was the sense of urgency. The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization. The new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness “to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions”

(Duderstadt, 2006, p. 257). In *Leadership Agility*, Joiner (2009) conjectured “the ability to lead effectively when rapid change and uncertainty are the norm” lends to the theme of urgency (p. 29). As stated by the President of Capital University, “sometimes leadership sees and feels urgency that the rest of the institution conveniently doesn’t.” Likewise, the President of Mission University expressed “you’ve really got to keep in front of your organization’s mind that the sense of compelling urgency in moving forward.” It was evident each president expressed the overwhelming institutional priority to keep pushing the organization forward and not be comfortable with a current state of achievement. A Capital University administrative leader illustrated how the president leads by a sense of urgency:

I think it is both a culture change because he came from the corporate environment, but also because of his personality and the way he moves an organization along. There are a lot of expectations, and a lot of things to do, and he feels that urgency.

Similarly, a Mission University academic leader provided a picture of the way the president suggest the sense of urgency:

I’ve often said to him he’s an idea a minute person. In the beginning, when I first worked with him, I about drove myself crazy because, every time I met with him, he would throw out 15 ideas. I learned to not take them all literally, but to offer a few good ideas to move forward out of the 15.

Dudersadt (2006) postulated that the changes and challenges in our society require a dedicated higher education leader willing to keep pace with the private sector. An administrative leader with Capital University explained about the President’s drive, “He

never stops to rest; he can't, because he knows we have to keep pushing forward to do something different and better if we are going to compete in these markets." Further arguing, the machine of higher education must allow a leader the creativity and authority to strengthen the resolve of the institution to move more rapidly (Duderstadt).

Consequently, the effectiveness of a college or university can be directly related to the strength of the institution leadership (Whetten & Cameron, 1985). As President Embry articulated:

How do you keep people feeling a sense of mastery and feeling like they're making progress personally and institutionally, while at the same time confronting them with whatever they did last year is not going to be good enough this year, which is the harsh reality of the world that we live in.

The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization. Therefore, leadership in higher education is characterized as an essential component and the campus leader must be the integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership (Amey, 2006). Yukl (2006) stated "most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization" (p. 3). The sense of urgency theme emerged into two distinctive subthemes of leadership and communication.

Leadership

The executive leadership team members' sense of urgency originated from the campus executive officer leadership of the institution. Therefore, leadership in higher education is characterized as an essential component and the campus leader must be the

integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership (Amey, 2006). Yet, Gardner (2000) identified leadership as the ability to strengthen the organization because “no individual has the skills...to carry out all the complex tasks of contemporary leadership” (p. 12). However, it is clear that the new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness “to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions” (Duderstadt, 2006, p. 257). The importance of university leadership in the American higher education institutions requires strong entrepreneurial guidance during a time of great change (Yokoyama, 2006).

The participants communicated repeatedly the campus executive officers’ balance of entrepreneurship and leadership in describing the urgency of leading a 21st century higher education institution. An administrative leader with Capital University communicated the entrepreneurial leadership perspective:

If you're not entrepreneurial, you probably will find yourself struggling on the executive cabinet level because you are encouraged to go out and find new ventures, find new opportunities, find new revenue streams, and find new growth opportunities. That absolutely exists in the leadership team level ranks.

President Sach of Mission University discussed the balance of leading and being entrepreneurial:

As a leader and entrepreneur, I see my role. My interest is on behalf of the institution, but trying to put people together and trying to convene people around it and trying to find ... I see myself as a leader as one who can stimulate it, one that can encourage it, one that can try to clear the pathways for it. It's funny; if a

president takes an interest in something it tends to get more interest. I can marshal resources around something.

The complexity of the institutions demands a leader who can manage multiple functions of the organization. In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role. The President of Capital University provided a personal perspective for leading:

I think that's where great leaders set themselves apart from others, because they are very versatile and they have a good repertoire of things that they can call on, of skills and knowledge and experience that they can call on when necessary, in the belief that all leadership is situation specific. It's even more so when the situation's changing as fast these do.

Amey (2006) stated “[l]eaders are key to how organizations function, and there is little doubt that the leaders who are needed to guide postsecondary institutions in tomorrow’s complex environments have to think about their work differently than did their predecessors” (p. 58). The participants from Mission University provided some insights concerning the leadership of the President:

I think at the executive level it’s just empowerment. He is not ... as a leader, he’s not one to get in the weeds with you. He asks you very difficult question, expects you to be the expert... allowing people to do their jobs and to think creatively and to be open to hearing these thoughts because ultimately it’s all going to come up through him.

He’s collaborative. He’s accessible. He’s big picture, trustworthy. It’s not that he’s trustworthy but he trusts the team that he hires. In my mind, that’s where I

want our leader to be; to empower us to do our jobs and to do them the best that we think and not feel like he has to micro manage that or whatever. He is always about improving. He is a big picture thinker, the entrepreneurial.

The participants from Capital University communicated similar leadership characteristics of the President:

I think President Embry, even if he were to leave today, I think he has done such an incredible job of taking an entity that was stale and financially in a little bit of turmoil and has turned that around through his vision and his strategic initiatives and through his ability to attract and retain good leaders at various levels. He has turned this entity into not only financially being very stable, but being entrepreneurial and looking forward towards too new initiatives.

Does driver work? He leads by example because he is one of the hardest working people I know. He is sending emails to me when he is on vacation, at night, you name it. I say leads by example because he has that expectation of his team. He wants everybody to have that same work ethic.

Keith to me is like an analogy of great professional athlete or a great statesman in that they all have an ego. It is not a negative; I'm just saying that I think that has to be there to be successful. And it relates to vision too. I think Keith in his mind has a clear vision on how we need to proceed. He does take input and adjust that through the hearing of other people, but I don't think he ever goes to bed at night thinking I don't know what to do about that. I just don't get that he would ever say that about himself. I think he feels good about his own skill sets; his ability to think through problems, and his supreme confidence in himself. I think he tries to

draw other people to that level, but may get frustrated when people can't get there.

Dudersadt (2006) postulated that the changes and challenges in our society require a dedicated higher education leader willing to keep pace with the private sector including leading through creativity and authority to strengthen the resolve of the institution to move more rapidly. The sense of urgency for leadership transcends the higher education institution for the 21st century.

Communication

Bolden et al. (2008) discussed within universities the significance of understanding social networks and relationships to garner the ability to learn how to navigate and utilize the informal pathways and networks to communicate the urgency to institutional stakeholders. Yukl (2006) affirmed “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 3). The communication theme provided insight into the campus executive officers’ ability to lead multiple constituents through the institutional maze of higher education.

In reflecting a communication pattern, an academic leadership team member from Mission University discussed the President’s communication style, “He’s very collaborative. He’ll pull things in. He always has groups working with him to do that, to shape it.” Another member stated, “Communication is important. He sends out emails periodically to the entire campus. He meets with faculty and staff three times a year.” President Sach of Mission University provided important insight into communication

when he explained, "...there may be value in someone's thoughtful dissent because that one voice may be the right voice to pay attention to." Finally, an administrative team member from Mission University provided an important principle, "He tries to figure out how can this person be a person that's going to do something good for us, and how can we do something good for them? That's Richard. It's always mutual. It's always back and forth." The President of Mission University brings a collaborative philosophy in communicating the urgency of listening and building partnerships for institutional strategy and vision. The campus executive officers today are charged with the task of moving an institution forward while communicating the vision-state (Taylor, Machado & Peterson, 2008) for the institution of the 21st century operating in a knowledge and capital economy

In discussing university leadership and communication, Collis (2004) stated, "...it becomes increasingly difficult to govern the sheer complexity of the institution, yet alone build a consensus behind a fundamental change in strategy" (p. 146). President Embry of Capital University discussed communication in building consensus:

What they can't handle is no news, and so in times of crisis or even in times of perceived crisis, leadership has to rally double down on its commitment to communicate, and can't take for one second anything for granted about what is understood. They have to test for understanding all the time.

An administrative team member from Capital University provided an example of how President Embry uses communication for institutional transparency:

President Embry has countless social events and meetings that he holds with the student body, different student groups. Athletes or scholars or musicians or all the

different groups and just talk and talk and talk and get their views. We're all in this together. Ultimately, get everybody on the same page, or at least let everybody know what page we're on. I think that helps.

As one academic leadership team members stated, "...all people on board with the final decisions – consensus." In this study, the participants commented on multiple occasions the campus executive officers' ability to communicate effectively the vision and goals of the institution. The mode of communication included multiple methods, but the message was the same, and one administrator commented, "... constant and frequent and consistent communication, buy in from departments...that is you get a voice."

Culture of Higher Education

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Borasi and Finnigan (2010) argued those "leaders must shape the culture of the organization and successfully deal with the environment to achieve organizational goals and improve organizational effectiveness" (p. 6). Clark (1998) posited, "... the cultural or symbolic side of the university becomes particularly important in cultivating institutional identity and distinctive reputations" (p. 7). The President of Capital University commented "[t]he norms, the rituals, some of those need to be sustained at all cost, because they are part of who we are and they're part of our identity." Yet, President Embry went on to explain, "...higher education will not be able to continue to resist fundamental economic forces as they seemed to have done for a few hundred years."

As an administrative team member for Capital University articulated the challenge for change of culture for the campus:

The shift in the culture has not been easy, it comes with challenges, it comes with stresses, and even for the people who accept it; it is different. For an institution who has operated in a traditional academic culture, it is different, and anytime you implement that, it causes strain and stresses on the institution from the management level all the way down. I don't know if we are always as receptive to that or in tuned to that institutionally, not just President Embry, but all of us.

Likewise, an academic leadership team member from Capital University commented, "[t]here are people in higher education, I don't care where you go, that don't believe entrepreneurship is a component of higher education." McLaurin (2008) posited, "through socialization, the leader can transmit to followers the organizational values, assumptions and attitudes in an attempt to change their own in order to maximize the fit between new employees and the organizational culture" (p. 58-59). In this study, a significant amount of the participants commented on the campus executive officers' challenge to build consensus for the new model of higher education among the many stakeholders. The President of Mission University remarked on institutional culture change, "[y]ou tend to be comfortable with where you are and it's the way we've always done it and it's good enough. You've got to really keep pushing hard for change." An administrative team member from Mission University provided insight concerning culture change, "[t]he culture is starting to understand the importance of it and I think before you launch it the innovative mindset is yet to bring the culture to feel that and allow that to happen."

The new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness “to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions” (Duderstadt, 2006, p. 257). Amey (2006) believed higher education leadership today utilize a lens towards the future while “providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organization culture and values” (p. 58). It is imperative university leaders maintain a strong balance of institutional traditions, yet a keen focus on strategy and environmental analysis in leading their institutions for the 21st century of higher education.

History and traditions

The university leaders who develop ways to operate efficiently and connect their programs to the university’s mission and traditions are more likely to provide excellent academic programs, balance budgets and prosper in the 21st century (Burnett & Collins, 2010). The leader operating in a capital and knowledge drive economy provides vision and strategy for the future. An academic leader with Capital University communicated her concerns around institutional traditions:

The shift in the culture has not been easy, it comes with challenges, it comes with stresses, even for the people who accept it, it is different. For an institution who has operated in a traditional academic culture, it is different, and anytime you implement that, it causes strain and stresses on the institution from the management level all the way down. I don’t know if we are always as receptive to that or in tuned to that institutionally, not just [the President], but all of us.

“Today’s postsecondary leaders need to guide their institutions into the future while providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep

understanding of organization culture and values” (Amey, 2006, p. 58). The President of Mission University provided insight into the institution’s mission stating, “[w]e put an awful lot on mission, and this idea of mission guiding who we are and what we try to do and how we try to work with students. The mission becomes a defining element of culture.” The higher education community is becoming attentive of the transformation, yet “the ensuing discussion has been cast in polar terms-the value of change versus the importance of maintaining the status quo, or the creation of the entrepreneurial university versus the essential nature of the proven traditional university” (Newman & Couturier, 2004 p. 61). The challenge of an entrepreneurial university theme became apparent through a comment from an academic leader with Capital University:

There are people in higher education, I don’t care where you go, that don’t believe entrepreneurship is a component of higher education. And we are salted with our share of those people who believe that as well. So they be challenged to what needs to the institution forward, they don’t necessarily see it as their job or they don’t necessarily see it as best for the institution.

President Sachs of Mission University commented

[t]he norms, the rituals, some of those need to be sustained at all cost, because they are part of who we are and they’re part of our identity. You tend to be comfortable with where you are and it’s the way we’ve always done it and it’s good enough. You’ve got to really keep pushing hard for change but not change the culture.

Conversely, an administrative team member for Capital University articulated the challenge for change of culture for the campus:

The shift in the culture has not been easy, it comes with challenges, it comes with stresses, and even for the people who accept it; it is different. For an institution who has operated in a traditional academic culture, it is different, and anytime you implement that, it causes strain and stresses on the institution from the management level all the way down.

The Mission University President remarked on institutional culture change, “[y]ou tend to be comfortable with where you are and it’s the way we’ve always done it and it’s good enough. You’ve got to really keep pushing hard for change.” An administrative team member from Mission University provided insight concerning culture change,

The idea here is if you take a risk and you're entrepreneurial in spirit, and it doesn't work, you just set the institution back, perhaps by months or even years. That is something that restricts us. That's a barrier in my opinion, for why we're not more of an entrepreneurial academy.

Additionally, an academic leader from Capital University expressed the challenge of institutional tradition and history:

One thing I’ve come to appreciate is that history can be a good and a bad thing. It is a good thing when it informs us about who we are, and how we operate. It can be a bad thing when it is like an anchor because we sort of hang on to that saying we’ve always offered these things and that is what we have always done. It is amazing how pervasive that spirit of history is... I think that is truly a challenge for the President and the rest us too, and while that entrepreneurial spirit is here, we still have those very substantial pockets of – we’ve always done it that way, and I’m not sure that is conscious from a lot of people, but I think it is just hard

for a lot of people to shed your history, and we've had a lot of it. It is worse here at the College, but that is because it is just the College - The traditional home. I think we are in a battle over that honestly.

Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) discussed presidents' entrepreneurship initiatives emergence in higher education "will be critical to their long-term success – to their ability to be institutionally mainstreamed and sustained by changing the academic culture." (p. 35). The leader through culture awareness can garner stakeholder support in shaping the entrepreneurial focus throughout an organization. The acceptance of an entrepreneurial culture sustains the university in providing an economic engine to drive knowledge creation enterprise.

Environment

Amey (2006) stated "[l]eaders are key to how organizations function, and there is little doubt that the leaders who are needed to guide postsecondary institutions in tomorrow's complex environments have to think about their work differently than did their predecessors" (p. 58). Consequently, the environment resulting from inadequate resources and reductions in projected funding can compel academics and higher education leaders to become more entrepreneurial in their approach and expand networks (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). The President of Capital University articulated his perspective on the higher education environment:

That tension between what does this environment mean and how fundamentally it's changing the core assumptions on which higher education has historically rested on the one hand, and being able to keep an organization where people feel

appreciated and vital and growing and seeing upside and positive opportunities.

That's plenty damn challenging, I'll tell you that.

Likewise, an administrative leader from Mission University offered a perspective concerning the institution's environment,

For me though, it would be an institution where innovation can be maximized and encouraged, where professors have the ability to teach with the tools and research and whatever it is that they need to be able to teach to the best of their ability; to be able to provide an environment for the staff to have a wonderful place to work, and they're having a great experience because of that. I think we're able to provide that in a lot of ways.

Burnett and Collins (2010) trusted higher education "evolution will make certain the survival of colleges and universities" willing to embrace "prudent change" and remain grounded in the mission responsiveness and consistency towards the needs of their clientele (p. 198). The campus executive officer's sense of balance of entrepreneurship and leadership highlights the changing role for higher education in the knowledge economy. Drew (2010) interviewed several higher education leaders that stated a "recurring theme from participants was having the courage in leadership to think and act creatively, to take considered risks and to help staff deal with the impact of change" (p. 64). Additionally, "A need for change leadership that fosters innovation, collaboration and ability to influence" (Drew, p. 67) emerged from the participants interviewed.

The President of Capital University discusses change and building morale:

The challenge here was people were looking down and my challenge was to get them to look up and ahead. That's where Vision 2020 came in and then infusing the organization with new talent whose infusion and whose prior experience were such that they helped reshape the culture to becoming more of a high performance implementation culture.

In support of the Capital University President, an academic leader provided additional feedback concerning the educational environment:

Education has changed, it is not the same market place it was five years ago. And those of us that figure it out earlier are going to be in a far better position than those that don't. I think we have pockets where that entrepreneurship ethic has still not caught on as well, and clearly if the president did not have it, we would be in a world of hurt in my mind. And certainly with the teams closest to the president that is taking up momentum. There is a little more vision about 'hey, we need to be outside the box thinking about new things'.

An administrative leader from Mission University discussed an environment around collaboration:

I welcome and am excited about the opportunity at the executive level to work together in an environment where it's safe, it's honest, it's challenging, it's respectful... Whether we agree with what they [students] want or not or whether we think it's the best, it's an environment to explore and figure that out and decide for themselves.

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission

and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). The academic leader from Capital University supplied an excellent analogy for higher education:

I really think our innovation or our way out, is still through programming development, the product side of what we do. It is a consumer industry now; we've turned education into a consumer industry. We have to think like consumers specialists. We have to think like Apple, I think the majority of those people are thinking, what is the next iPhone look like, not what the budget is.

Entrepreneurial Vision

The complexity of the institutions demands a leader who can manage multiple functions of the organization. In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role, with the president guiding resource development including state, federal, private donors, intellectual property, land development, and many more revenue streams. It is clear; the University of the 21st century requires leadership capable of responding to emerging global opportunities to deliver life-long learning across the world (Duderstadt, 2006). Smith (2008) argued the leadership of higher education “[had] been encouraged to shift toward more executive styles of leadership and decision-making” (p. 240) in a knowledge-based society seeking dynamic visionary leadership. Furthermore, Yokoyama (2006) noted a strong leadership approach must be integrated in higher education to sustain the resources necessary in creating an entrepreneurial and visionary culture.

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). The President of Capital University conveyed the urgency of vision:

Capital University had a pretty decent mission. It was in a turnaround situation. What it desperately needed was vision, but it had to be a vision that was one that would lift people. They wanted to be lifted ... desperately wanted to be lifted. I thought Capital University was fine on mission but it had very little vision, and so that's where Vision 2020 was born.

Likewise, the President of Mission University articulated the connection between mission and vision:

My vision is one that an institution who runs from their mission is an institution on the road to failure. When I came to the institution, we were running from our mission and we didn't have a clear vision and we didn't have a real clear sense of why we were who we are, and therefore how to get to become a better version of who we are.

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) argued “leaders must shape the culture of the organization and successfully deal with the environment to achieve organizational goals and improve organizational effectiveness” (p. 6). In this case study, the institution leaders clearly articulated the urgency of mission and vision including the distinction of the two. The President of Capital University stated it best:

First of all, mission and vision people are always confusing. The mission is about the core purpose of the organization relative to its constituents... Vision is always about your aspirations as an organization and when people combined the two, they get in trouble... Our strategy is tied to our mission and vision. It can't be separate, but it isn't the same thing. The strategy ... the mission should be relatively unchanging. The vision should change periodically, but if it was changing every year, you don't have a vision.

The leader operating in a capital and knowledge-driven economy provides vision and strategy for the future. Leadership is one of the least understood but most observed phenomena (Burns, 1978); yet, it is often regarded as the most critical factor in the success or failure of an institution (Bass, 1990). An administrative leader for Capital University explained how the President leads toward a vision:

He is good at drawing the vision at where we need to go, and then helping us then work together to get to that vision. You know where you're heading. And if you know which direction your heading it is easier to be in a collaborative environment to know I need to do these things because of priorities because I now it impacts this department and that department toward their objectives. At the thirty two thousand foot level, I think it is just his ability to set a vision and communicate that effectively.

A campus leader can be the integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership. Yukl (2006) affirmed, "most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or

organization” (p. 3). Additionally, an academic leader from Capital University shared the President’s ability to lead, “I think Keith has a keen ability to set a vision, speak a vision, and get the people on board that he can... His ability to lead and sell things to folks seems to be a very natural thing for him”. Finally, President Sach articulated the role of the president in leading faculty and staff, “My strategy was one of focusing on mission, helping people see themselves grounded in that mission and really identifying the goodness that they’re already doing”. The vision theme provided a global view of the emergence of the data, yet the sub themes of 21st Century Higher Education and Institutional Platform/Innovation extended deeper into the understanding of the entrepreneurial conceptual underpinning.

21st Century Higher Education

The leader in an entrepreneurial framework must conceptualize the organizational analysis and vision of an institution because “innovative models for structuring higher education are emerging around the globe” (Newman & Couturier, 2004, p. 61).

Significantly, colleges and universities have been facing increasing pressure from internal and external stakeholders to increase innovation, support economic development, and be responsive to increased scrutiny which expands upon the traditional mission of service.

The President of Capital University stressed:

You better be entrepreneurial today if you expect to be around, but we've defined entrepreneurship differently than innovation, okay? I think that distinction is useful and powerful. Obviously, you have to innovate, but sometimes you can't innovate successfully without also being entrepreneurial because you don't have the means by which to do it.

Newman and Couturier provided insight for the institution of higher education for the 21st century, “[t]he ensuing discussion has been cast in polar terms—the value of change versus the importance of maintaining the status quo, or the creation of the entrepreneurial university versus the essential nature of the proven traditional university” (p. 61). It is clear; the University of the 21st century requires leadership capable of responding to emerging global opportunities to deliver life-long learning across the world (Duderstadt, 2006). The President of Mission University emphasizes “... the pace of change is going to require us to be more nimble than we have been as an enterprise of higher education in the past” in discussing the future of higher education.

Dudersadt (2006) postulated that the changes and challenges in our society require a dedicated higher education leader willing to keep pace with the private sector. Further arguing, the machine of higher education must allow a leader the creativity and authority to strengthen the resolve of the institution to move more rapidly (Duderstadt). An academic leader from Capital University provided clarity concerning the President vision for the future of higher education, “... a successful entrepreneurial president will have trust in his leadership and trust in his academic leadership to take bold moves and investigate and to explore and to create and to pilot and he will provide funding for that.” In this study, a significant amount of the participants indicated the importance of the president giving faculty and staff the ability to be creative in shaping the learning environment. As one administrative leader from Mission University believed, “[t]here is going to be a point where it’s going to have a calculated risk, maybe not a low risk but a calculated risk with a high, high reward. We’re going to really move the needle.”

The campus executive officer balance of entrepreneurship and leadership highlights the changing role for higher education in the knowledge economy. Drew (2010) interviewed several higher education leaders that stated a “recurring theme from participants was having the courage in leadership to think and act creatively, to take considered risks and to help staff deal with the impact of change” (p. 64).

The President Embry articulated the future for higher education:

I think we are living in an increasingly boundary-less world where the ability to synthesize across disciplines and frankly across organizations and get them to collaborate - much as we are attempting to do with Blackboard - who is a for-profit and a not-for-profit coming together for a common purposes. I think that is a model of the future, enabled by technology, enabled by different skill sets. So knowledge creation and preparation to live in a world like that is very much a part of an institution’s mission like ours.

The 21st century institution of higher education has emerged in a time of scarce resources. The declining federal and state support for higher education has “[i]nstitutional leaders faced with rising costs and failing resources have fewer options from which to choose in order to maintain the fiscal vitality of their institutions” (Burnett & Collins, 2010, p. 193). The expected acceptance of academic entrepreneurship as a feasible method for economic development has encouraged local and regional leaders to actively pursue opportunities intended to build knowledge-based industries and economic infrastructure in the areas that surround colleges and universities (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). The collaboration between higher education, city, and state provide a meaningful avenue for entrepreneurial synergy. A range of possible social gains can be disseminated across

local and regional communities and the broader society as a result of moving academic innovations to the market through entrepreneurial channels. An administrative leader with Capital University describes learning for the 21st century:

Our technologies are on the cutting edge. We spend a lot of money on that. I'm not sure what else to say there, but I think we're always looking to—curriculum, our design studio. Our curriculum design studio, other institutions, no one has ever seen that before. We have a whole group of staff that's all they do. It's just a design studio to design our curriculum. Design our classes. They work with various different partners to bring in and pull and create the most state of the art innovative curriculum for any class—undergrad, grad, it doesn't matter. Every class that we build has an online component to it.

Similarly, an administrative leader with Mission University explains the President's outlook for the future, "He's always there with the idea and saying, we've got to figure this out so that we can differentiate ourselves or stay in the game or be the best in the game". The view of 21st century education requires leadership to comprehend the adaption of entrepreneurship attitudes, behaviors, and skills for the survival of the institution. These challenges are essential to understand since "the traditional university missions of research, teaching, and service have put our institutions of higher education at the forefront of our society as gatekeepers for the knowledge, creativity, and invention that can guarantee economic security and advancement" (Lawrence, 2006, p. 3).

Institutional Platform and Innovation

Bolman and Deal (2003) communicated that values are elusive and often help others create a sense of identity that will differentiate an organization and are often difficult for the institution or members to express. Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) posited:

For institutions that seek relevance and change through entrepreneurship, a broad intellectual and philosophical platform must be created. This platform must be inclusive, thoughtful, and diverse; it must reflect the humanistic origins of universities, contain an academic ethos, and empower those who are touched by this vision. Above all else, the foundation for these efforts must demonstrate that the greatest asset of any campus is the ability to deconstruct impediments that segregate knowledge and prevent it from being put to work. (p. 28)

An academic leader from Capital University discussed challenges in developing innovative academic programs:

I feel it is a challenge at the level I operate at to get people to think entrepreneurial. I'll give you an example, I've been trying to get growth in our academic programs here, at the school, some new programs we don't have. Some people would look at that as entrepreneurial... I continue to say students are coming to look at our school, they look in our front window, they see what we offer, and a lot of them keep walking by because we are not offering the kind of things that students today are looking for. So, it is a challenge to get people to think in that direction, and part of it is not they don't want to be entrepreneurial, but part of it is they are just too darn busy getting the job done. It takes a lot of work to develop new things, so I find it to be challenging from my perspective.

The complexity of the institutions demands a leader who can manage multiple functions of the organization. In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role, with the president guiding resource development including state, federal, private donors, intellectual property, land development, and many more revenue streams. The institution of higher education in a knowledge-based society seeks dynamic visionary leadership (Smith, 2008). An administrative leader for Capital University discussed innovation, “[t]he market is demanding faster, multiple platforms for delivery, ubiquitous access, asynchronous, synchronous, I mean the market is demanding those things. So if you don’t have a leader that can provide that, then you’re not going to survive”. The President of Capital University supported the administrative leader by stating:

I think we are living in an increasingly boundary-less world where the ability to synthesize across disciplines and frankly across organizations and get them to collaborate - much as we are attempting to do with Blackboard - who is a for-profit and a not-for-profit coming together for a common purposes. I think that is a model of the future, enabled by technology, enabled by different skill sets. So knowledge creation and preparation to live in a world like that is very much a part of an institution’s mission like ours.

These changes support an institutional structure in higher education resembling an entrepreneurial focus, not only from the leader, but also the organization. The President of Mission University supported the claim, “Again, entrepreneurial means not simply that which generates profit but it’s also that which represents new and innovative approaches to learning and being able, being willing to test and to fail on some of those.” In addition,

an administrative leader of Capital University provided examples into entrepreneurial actions:

The Blackboard partnership is truly entrepreneurial on both sides. It is a big play, and entrepreneurial for both organizations as they get into new markets, and as we try to grow and establish foot holes in bigger markets. So, I think things like that are direct reflections of Keith's talents. He is always looking at out of the box options. You just sit back and find out what the next innovation is, and what your role is, or the impact.

It is clear that the new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness "to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions" (Duderstadt, 2006, p. 257). Joiner (2009) described "the ability to lead effectively when rapid change and uncertainty are the norm and when success requires consideration of multiple views and priorities" through agile leadership (p. 29). At its core, "leadership agility is a process of stepping back from your current focus in a way that allows you to make wiser decisions and then fully engage in what needs to be done next" (Joiner & Joseph, 2007, p. 209).

The agile leader empowers faculty and staff in creating an institutional platform that drives innovative programming and solutions. An academic leader with Mission University provided support for empowerment:

I think that he gives us permission to dream. He gives us permission to suggest those things that maybe even we might think are wildly out of what we could ever do but to talk about them and to present something there and then say, is there

something to do? He has given us permission and empowered us to make decisions to move forward.

The university leaders who develop ways to operate efficiently and connect their programs to the university's mission are more likely to maintain robust enrollments, provide excellent academic programs, balance budgets and prosper in the 21st century (Burnett & Collins, 2010). The leader operating in a capital and knowledge drive economy provides vision and strategy for the future. "The conditions resulting from scarce resources and conditions created by reductions in expected funding can force academics and higher education practitioners to become more entrepreneurial in how they approach, sustain, and expand their professional network" (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 21-22). The President of Mission University championed the innovative theme, "[w]e need to be even more rapid in accommodating change. We need to be looking at what is the model for a small, liberal arts college to be successful in the future." Likewise, the President of Capital University stated, "I think there's a lot of things we do that are challenging ourselves and are new and innovative things." The strategies of entrepreneurship resemble what the contemporary post secondary institution of higher learning aspires to model in an academic capacity. "Today's postsecondary leaders need to guide their institutions into the future while providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organization culture and values" (Amey, 2006, p. 58). An academic leader with Mission University concluded, "I think Mission University not as a cutting-edge of entrepreneurialism, but I think it is, in the whole spectrum of higher education, pretty flexible, pretty responsive to what's going on." In this study, the two case study institutions fully appreciate the need for

entrepreneurial approach for the longevity and sustainability of the university, while empowering faculty and staff to investigate and recommend innovative solutions.

Summary

Within Chapter Four, the study design, data collection method, conceptual framework, research questions, and process of data analysis were discussed. In addition, the emerging themes were presented in Chapter Four included: 1) *Sense of Urgency*, with subthemes of: a) Leadership, b) Communication; and 2) *Culture of Higher Education*, with subthemes of: a) History and Traditions, b) Environment; and 3) *Entrepreneurial Vision*, with subthemes of: a) 21st Century Higher Education, b) Institutional Platform and Innovation. These themes present a comprehension of entrepreneurial practices of campus executive officers and the management of institutional leadership from the perspective of executive level leadership team members. The information was synthesized from interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis. Moreover, discussed in Chapter Five will be the summary of findings, conclusions, limitations, implication for practice and recommendations for future study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The case study design was selected to allow analysis of the campus executive officer and the university stakeholders in real-life context using multiple sources of information. The researcher concluded using a qualitative research method, explicitly a dual case study, would clarify and expand upon the research questions through situational analysis that considered the information from perspectives of all participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Additionally, Merriam (1998) provided supportive reasons for a case study including “seeing through the researcher’s eyes” and “decreased defensiveness” (p. 238) as advantages in case study methodology. This research study focused on examining entrepreneurship as a leadership lens and whether the University President’s use of entrepreneur leadership characteristics were imbedded within the organization and ultimately improved the creation of knowledge in the higher education institution. Data were collected and triangulated through interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis (Creswell, 2003). The researcher demonstrated trustworthiness through careful planning and adherence to quality research. To achieve this, the researcher sought internal validity by bringing forth findings that match reality (Merriam), allowing the researcher to triangulate findings to some degree to “confirm the emerging findings” (Merriam, p. 204) and “to establish validity through pooled judgment” (Foreman, 1948, p. 204). Through data analysis, three themes emerged 1) *Sense of Urgency*, with subthemes of: a) Leadership, b) Communication; and 2) *Culture of Higher Education*, with subthemes of: a) History and Traditions, b) Environment; and

3) *Entrepreneurial Vision*, with subthemes of: a) 21st Century Higher Education, b) Institutional Platform and Innovation.

Within Chapter Five, a synopsis of the findings and conclusions that are sustained on the data analyzed will be discussed. Additionally, the implications for practice and recommendations will be presented. The qualitative researcher “help[s] us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible” (Merriam, 1998, p. 5). For the purpose of this research, the researcher selected a dual case study to answer the question *how* an entrepreneurial leadership lens could be effective for a higher education institution in the 21st century.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this research study investigating the campus executive officers leadership will be provided within this section. The focus of this research was to examine campus executive officer’s leadership characteristics through the lens of entrepreneurship. The campus executive officer for the 21 century academy brings a dynamic blend of entrepreneurial characteristics and traits to the leadership position. Fernald et al. (2005) discovered leaders and entrepreneurs are accomplished to the degree that they provided “(1) strategic leadership (vision and long-term goals); (2) problem-solving skills; (3) timely decision-making; (4) a willingness to accept risk; and (5) good negotiating skills” (p. 5). Czariawska-Joerges and Wolff (1991) offered “entrepreneurship mainly fits contexts which are new and cannot be dealt with by means of experience or routine. Entrepreneurship is leadership in exceptional situations” (p. 533). The leader in an entrepreneurial framework must conceptualize the organizational

analysis of an institution because “innovative models for structuring higher education are emerging around the globe” (Newman & Couturier, 2004, p. 61).

The following three themes associated to the perceptions of the campus executive officer emerged through the data analysis: *Sense of Urgency*, *Culture of Higher Education*, and *Entrepreneurial Vision*. Within the limits of the study, as derived from the conceptual underpinnings, the researcher sought to answer the following questions for this study:

1. What leadership qualities does a traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president possess that lead the institution to consistently achieve successful outcomes?
2. What processes does the university president implement that encourage an entrepreneurial academy?
3. What structures does the traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president implement that lead to acceptance in the higher education culture?
4. How does the traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president establish collaboration among various stakeholders?
5. How have entrepreneurial strategies been integrated into the institutional plan?

Through a summary of the data presented in Chapter Four, the researcher offered a review of the major concept extrapolated from the data. Additionally, the literature review served as a guide to interpret the data.

What leadership qualities does a traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president possess that lead the institution to consistently achieve successful outcomes?

Over the course of the data analysis, consensus emerged among many of the participants that leadership qualities similarly exist among the two case study leaders. Regardless of the traditional versus nontraditional career pathways, common descriptors were used in identifying leadership qualities exemplified in leading the institution measured by employee engagement, fiscal stewardship, program development, innovation, and strategic planning. An academic leader with Mission University (traditional career pathway) summarized the President's leadership qualities:

I would call him a collaborative guide. I think he guides the institution with some of his own ideas and things that he thinks and he does it in a collaborative nature as much as he can. But I think that can also be appropriately directive about where we need to go. That's why I would call him a collaborative guide.

Similarly, an administrative leader with Capital University (nontraditional career pathway) stated:

I think building a sense of community, building a sense of culture, that's true leadership. I think you do that through a very clear, concise vision where everybody knows where you're going. They're working together to get to that goal so that sense of community culture and vision, I think, are important attributes of the President.

Gardner (2000) identified leadership as the ability to strengthen the organization because "no individual has the skills...to carry out all the complex tasks of contemporary

leadership” (p. 12). Amey (2006) provided additional relevance concerning empowering others through “a sense of collective identity as collaborators in developing knowledge and active investigators into practice” (p. 56).

Convincingly, the presidents of the two institutions provided a similar role identity articulated through the lens of leadership. The President of Mission University (traditional career pathway) expanded upon the role of a collaborative leader:

My interest is on behalf of the institution, but trying to put people together and trying to convene people around it and trying to find ... I see myself as a leader as one who can stimulate it, one that can encourage it, and one that can try to clear the pathways for it. It’s funny, if a president takes an interest in something it tends to get more interest. I can marshal resources around something.

Likewise, the President of Capital University (nontraditional career pathway) provided insights around leading a team, “I do believe that all leadership is situation-specific and that different models of leadership are necessary and appropriate for institutions at various stages of their life cycle.” Amey (2006) posited, “...leaders across higher education are best served by learning to think critically about their roles” (p. 55).

Similarly, Lawrence (2006) described leadership exemplified through “[s]elf-confidence and the ability to inspire collaboration in a common cause are qualities that seem to have been developed consistently” (p. 443). The leader who can inspire followers displays an agile approach in leadership situations. An academic leader with Capital University shared these thoughts, “the president is such a commanding leader that people don’t just opt to not collaborate.... he is sharing the information necessary making sure in fact those stakeholders to come together face to face to deal with the issue.” Leadership is no longer

simply described as an individual trait or difference, but rather is depicted in diverse models as shared, relational, strategic, global, and a complex social dynamic (Avolio et al., 2009).

The complexity of the institutions demands a leader who can manage multiple functions of the organization. In many universities, the leadership has taken on a more entrepreneurial role, with the president guiding resource development including state, federal, private donors, intellectual property, land development, and many more revenue streams. The institution of higher education in a knowledge-based society seeks dynamic visionary leadership (Smith, 2008). Yokoyama (2006) noted a strong leadership approach must be integrated in higher education to sustain the resources necessary in creating an entrepreneurial culture. The importance of university leadership in the American higher education institutions requires strong entrepreneurial guidance during a time of great change (Yokoyama).

What processes does the university president implement that encourage an entrepreneurial academy?

It is becoming increasingly transparent that the campus executive officer plays a critical role in strategy and implementation in the entrepreneurial academy. Over the course of the data analysis, many of the participants emphasized the importance of the campus executive officer's leadership in developing an entrepreneurial perspective to guide the institution through strategy and innovation. The expected acceptance of academic entrepreneurship as a feasible method for economic development has encouraged local and regional leaders to actively pursue opportunities intended to build knowledge-based industries and economic infrastructure in the areas that surround

colleges and universities (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). In general, entrepreneurship refers to the economic discipline, yet educators need to recognize the potential entrepreneurship provides for guidance to leaders in becoming effective agents of change in higher education (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). It provides a lens to view higher education in an innovative and strategic way.

The overall perception of entrepreneurship maintains a guarded acceptance from higher education stakeholders. Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) stated, “[v]alue creation is an essential construct in the development of an analytical model of academic entrepreneurship” (p. 455). Institutional stakeholders interpret the value of entrepreneurship in accepting the scholarship of the concept in an academic environment. As stated by one academic leader with Capital University, “[w]hen I hear entrepreneurial academy, I think creating a culture and a lot of this starts with the President, but creating a culture that allows individuals throughout the university to pursue opportunities that will carry forth the mission of the institution.” The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). Many scholars have argued that entrepreneurial skills or traits are not separate from those demonstrated by leaders, but rather entrepreneurship is a form of leadership that occurs in particular settings (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). Czariawska-Joerges and Wolff (1991) offered that “entrepreneurship mainly fits contexts which are new and cannot be dealt with by means of experience or routine. Entrepreneurship is leadership in exceptional situations” (p.

533). The leader in an entrepreneurial framework must conceptualize the organizational analysis of an institution because “innovative models for structuring higher education are emerging around the globe” (Newman & Couturier, 2004, p. 61).

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. As the President of Capital University recounted the role of the campus executive officer in building the entrepreneurship urgency, “[s]ometimes leadership sees and feels urgency that the rest of the institution conveniently doesn't, and so how does the leader create that sense of urgency and seriousness about what's happening or what could happen.” Likewise, the President of Mission University provided his role in the process of an entrepreneurial academy, “[a] leader today's got to have a sense of what's over the horizon, and how then to affect work with the organization to help move it in a positive direction, engaging the people in the process because they've got to own it.” President Sach continued to expand the importance in leading for an entrepreneurial academy, “It's interesting, because in one sense I've got to trust my people and not undercut them by doing it for them or going out to their people... I've got to be careful to let you lead in your area and I've got to be even more careful to help you own and take credit for the work that you're doing.” An administrative leader with Mission University supported President Sach's comments regarding an entrepreneurial academy:

I think that he gives us permission to dream. He gives us permission to suggest those things that maybe even we might think are wildly out of what we could ever do but to talk about them and to present something there and then say, is there

something to do? He has given us permission and empowered us to make decisions to move forward. We don't have to go ask him everything... A lot of leaders say, well, before you step somewhere, run this by me. He doesn't do that. He empowers us to go do.

Finally, an academic leader with Capital University explained how the President encourages the entrepreneurial theme:

Well, he is entrepreneurial himself. Because he is entrepreneurial there are expectations that the institution will be entrepreneurial. I think there are lots of times at senior management meetings that he often throws out the seeds – he is a seed planter – and so he gets several different ideas out there in different venues before coming out and saying that he wants to do something. Then he plants those seeds to see people take an entrepreneurial approach to making a difference in the institution. Doing something that is unique to the school.

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) posited, “we need more educators—across all specializations and leadership levels—that are willing and able to lead innovations that will result in better services for their students and communities...thus increasing the need for entrepreneurial behavior and creative approaches” (p. 25). In addition, De Meuse et al. (2010) stated leaders “who are highly learning agile continuously seek out new challenges, actively seek feedback from others to grow and develop” (p. 121) for the entrepreneurial academy. The entrepreneurship theme provides an innovative approach that many institutions of higher education have adopted (Clark, 1998).

What structures does the traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president implement that lead to acceptance in the higher education culture?

Bolman and Deal (2003) communicated that values are elusive and often help others create a sense of identity that will differentiate an organization and are often difficult for the institution or members to express. “For institutions that seek relevance and change through entrepreneurship, a broad intellectual and philosophical platform must be created... the foundation for these efforts must demonstrate that the greatest asset of any campus is the ability to deconstruct impediments that segregate knowledge and prevent it from being put to work” (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009, p. 28). Schein (1996) speculated that leaders must mold the culture of the organization while managing environmental factors to achieve organizational goals and effectiveness.

Borasi and Finnigan (2010) argued those “leaders must shape the culture of the organization and successfully deal with the environment to achieve organizational goals and improve organizational effectiveness” (p. 6). The leader through culture awareness can garner stakeholder support in shaping the entrepreneurial focus throughout an organization. An academic leader with Capital University (nontraditional career pathway) articulates the challenge in higher education:

Keith is definitely entrepreneurial, and I don't I have any question about his entrepreneurship. It is not typical in higher education, and some people are starting to get it here and others not so much. My concern with that is we're not getting it fast enough; the gospel is not spreading fast enough. Education has changed, it is not the same market place it was five years ago. And those of us

that figure it out earlier are going to be in a far better position than those that don't. I think we have pockets where that entrepreneurship ethic has still not caught on as well, and clearly if the president did not have it, we would be in a world of hurt in my mind.

Likewise, another administrative leader with Capital University expressed concern around the culture of higher education adopting the entrepreneurial expectation:

There are people in higher education, I don't care where you go, that don't believe entrepreneurship is a component of higher education. And we are salted with our share of those people who believe that as well. So they'll be challenged to what the needs are to move the institution forward, they don't necessarily see it as their job or they don't necessarily see it as best for the institution.

McLaurin (2008) asserted the challenge for leadership in higher education is "through their reactions to critical incidents and crises, leaders create norms, values, and ways of doing things that transmit to the employees' important assumptions that in turn direct their own behavior" (p. 65). Over the course of the data analysis, a significant number of the participants provided feedback concerning the campus executive officers' ability to garner institutional support and acceptance of the entrepreneurial academy culture. An administrative leader with Capital University (nontraditional career pathway) eloquently stated a response to garnering institutional acceptance:

I think there's about a third of the faculty here, at this campus that are onboard and ready to go and think it's exciting and understand how it's going to benefit the student. I think there's probably a third at the other end of the spectrum that are for whatever reason going to do it my way, I've been doing it that way for

years, and I seem to be successful, and I'm just going to not—I don't really embrace change. And I think there's the middle third that could be pulled in either direction.

In the course of the data collection, the traditional university president often sighted the mission of the institution in garnering acceptance from the campus community. The President of Mission University (traditional career pathway) provided the following concerning mission, “[w]e put an awful lot on mission, and this idea of mission guiding who we are and what we try to do and how we try to work with students. The mission becomes a defining element of culture.” The university leaders who develop ways to operate efficiently and connect their programs to the university's mission are more likely to maintain robust enrollments, provide excellent academic programs, balance budgets and prosper in the 21st century (Burnett & Collins, 2010). Moreover, the President of Mission University (traditional career pathway) communicated a concern around mission complacency:

My fear and the obstacle there are being able to be nimble enough and responsible enough in moving the organization. When an organization moves from being in a troubled place into a much better place people think, well, we're good and that's good enough. The issue with any organization is good enough, isn't. You've really got to keep in front of your organization's mind that the sense of compelling urgency in moving things forward.

Finally, President Sach articulated building commitment among campus constituents through the University mission as a means to impacting institutional culture:

My strategy was one of focusing on mission, helping people see themselves grounded in that mission and really identifying the goodness that they're already doing, connected with that and, then helping them see how that could lead us forward and to understand how the vision and the mission provides touch-points to help us look at whether we're being faithful to it and true to who we are, best version of our self.

The strategies of entrepreneurship resemble what the contemporary post secondary institution of higher learning aspires to model in an academic capacity. "Today's postsecondary leaders need to guide their institutions into the future while providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organization culture and values" (Amey, 2006, p. 58).

How does the traditional career pathway versus a nontraditional career pathway university president establish collaboration among various stakeholders?

In the review of literature, Drew (2010) interviewed several higher education leaders that stated a "recurring theme from participants was having the courage in leadership to think and act creatively, to take considered risks and to help staff deal with the impact of change" (p. 64). Additionally, "A need for change leadership that fosters innovation, collaboration and ability to influence" (Drew, p. 67) emerged from the participants interviewed. Over the course of the data analysis, the overwhelming subject of collaboration weaved through the three primary themes that emerged from the data collection.

An academic leader with Mission University (traditional career pathway) expanded upon the President's ability to lead through collaboration:

Well, I think that what Richard did when he came was, first off, he was a good listener. He really didn't come in trying to totally change the university within a few months. This was not ... he came in and he listened individually to many of us and spent time thinking about that. Then, as part of the planning, he had university-wide gatherings whereby it really involved faculty, staff, everybody, where we came together and had opportunities to be having input into the direction of the university. That was really very meaningful and I enjoyed those sessions very much. That really was, I think, the background for the strategic plan. So it wasn't that a bunch of deans got together and all of a sudden we were coming up with something, but he really listened to, I would say, everyone. He was very sensitive to the culture that was here. I think he got to really truly understand the institution and then, in his own way, he's been leading us forward.

The President of Mission University (traditional career pathway) articulated his vision of leading the University in a collaborative manner:

From my point of view, the issue becomes one of how do you influence? How do you build support? How do you engage the outliers and try to win them over? How do you marginalize individuals who aren't going to be open to ... at least engaging? I don't care whether you support or not support, engage. That's the real question, because there may be value in someone's thoughtful dissent because that one voice may be the right voice to pay attention to.

According to Lawrence (2006), a leader displays "self-confidence and the ability to inspire collaboration in a common cause" (p. 443) resulting in a shared vision for the

future expectations of the institution. The leader who can inspire followers displays an agile approach in leadership situations.

It was evident from the data collected; the leadership team of Capital University provided a more top down approach towards stakeholder collaboration. One administrative leader with Capital University (nontraditional career pathway) explained stakeholder collaboration:

I think that collaboration is more comfortable naturally, when it's peer-to-peer. I think that's where you'll see a lot of collaboration when the President's not in the room, right? A group of VPs or a group of managers or a group of faculty. How to insert yourself as the authority figure, that's challenging. I think that's where probably we're not as effective in our collaboration.

Additionally, an academic leader with Capital University (nontraditional career pathway) provided insight into the President's collaborative approach:

I would agree completely, and the president is such a commanding leader that people don't just opt to not collaborate. It is clear that he intends for that to happen, and he is sharing the information necessary making sure in fact those stakeholders to come together face to face to deal with the issue.

In the midst of data collection, a common word associated with collaboration emerged from Capital University participants was communication. Additionally, the President of Capital University as evident by the last academic leader comment provided insight into the leadership through a power lens. Yukl (2006) posited, "[p]ower is the capacity to influence the attitudes and behavior of people in the desired direction" (p. 175).

Moreover, academic and administrative leaders affirmed the President's collaboration

often resulted from top down communication. The President of Capital University (nontraditional career pathway) offered insight concerning communication, “What they can't handle is no news, and so in times of crisis or even in times of perceived crisis, leadership has to really double down on its commitment to communicate, and can't take for one second anything for granted about what is understood. They have to test for understanding all the time.” It became evident collaboration with stakeholders typically resulted from leadership team members carrying out the direction of the President. As a result, collaboration resulted out of communication rather than institutional input.

How have entrepreneurial strategies been integrated into the institutional plan?

This finding provided an overwhelming response from the data collection concerning the institutions' need to integrate entrepreneurial strategies if it intends to grow or exist in the 21st century. As the President of Mission University conferred the future of higher education, “I don't believe that the way we're going about that now is the best way of doing it, but the fact that we need to do this in a much more entrepreneurial, a much more rapid way is an absolute necessity. What the university looks like 10 years from now will be very different.” Likewise, the President of Capital University articulated his concerns, “We will enter into a period of time where if you are not a whole lot more effective than you have been, you may very well not be around to see your next decade... I think you better be entrepreneurial if you're going to respond to that. How is that?” It is apparent leadership in higher education must be entrepreneurial; Amey (2006) stated “the leaders who are needed to guide postsecondary institutions in tomorrow's complex environments have to think about their work differently than did their predecessors” (p. 58).

Entrepreneurship affords a new perspective for leaders in managing the higher education enterprise. The EMKF, within the *Kauffman Thoughtbook* (2009), posited: [f]our reasons justify a significant role for entrepreneurship in contemporary American higher education. First, entrepreneurship is critical to success in the contemporary global economy. Second, entrepreneurship is already an expanding area of American college learning. Third, through innovation and commercialization, entrepreneurship is becoming a basic part of what universities themselves do. Fourth, entrepreneurship achieves key goals of quality American undergraduate education. To neglect entrepreneurship distances university learning from the world it is supposed to help students learn to understand. (p. 113)

The strategies of entrepreneurship resemble what the contemporary post secondary institution of higher learning aspires to model in an academic capacity. An academic leader of Mission University supported the strategy by offering, “[i]f you want entrepreneurship, it’s going to cost you something, not a lot necessarily, but at least the freedom of some decision making and some development activity.” The President of Capital University postulated in building an entrepreneurial strategy among stakeholders through, “involvement and education and engagement without letting ignorance and fear rule the day.” Similarly, an administrative leader from Capital University speculated an entrepreneurial strategy must exist because “the market is demanding faster, multiple platforms for delivery, ubiquitous access, asynchronous, synchronous, I mean the market is demanding those things. So if you don’t have a leader that can provide that, then you’re not going to survive.” The campus executive officer for the 21st century academy

brings a dynamic blend of entrepreneurial characteristics and traits to the leadership position.

The expected acceptance of academic entrepreneurship strategies as a feasible method for an institutional plan encourages leaders to actively pursue opportunities to sustain an infrastructure imbedded within the organization (Mars & Metcalf, 2009). The President of Mission University discussed entrepreneurial strategies stating:

Again, entrepreneurial means not simply that which generates profit but it's also that which represents new and innovative approaches to learning and being able, being willing to test and to fail on some of those. Because not everything's going to be successful. Most entrepreneurs, I want to say, fail eight or nine times if not more before they find what ultimately lands them in successful positions.

The President of Capital University reflected on the identity of an entrepreneurial strategy:

But what I've discovered that entrepreneurs truly have in common is they're willing to risk their identity, and they're willing to risk their institutional identity - personal and institutional. That's almost more powerful in terms of its behavioral implications than risking capital. When you put them together - risking identity and capital - you have a true entrepreneurial act.

A significant point to articulate is that the definition of entrepreneurship should not be “constrained to market-driven strategies but should also include finding novel solutions to the diversity of challenges facing the contemporary academy” (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 21). The collaboration between higher education, city, and state provide a meaningful

avenue for entrepreneurial synergy. The President of Capital University articulated it best:

I think we are living in an increasingly boundary-less world where the ability to synthesize across disciplines and frankly across organizations and get them to collaborate - much as we are attempting to do with Blackboard - who is a for-profit and a not-for-profit coming together for a common purposes. I think that is a model of the future, enabled by technology, enabled by different skill sets.

Amey (2006) recognized “[t]oday’s postsecondary leaders need to guide their institutions into the future while providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organization culture and values” (p. 58). A shift toward human-capital or knowledge creation, not fundamentally changing the nature of entrepreneurial behavior are developments that strengthen the role of higher education in the capitalist production cycle on the global scale, in other words, “the entrepreneurial academy in the context of knowledge economy” (Mars & Metcalf, 2009, p. 25). The leader in an entrepreneurial framework must conceptualize the organizational analysis of an institution because “innovative models for structuring higher education are emerging around the globe” (Newman & Couturier, 2004, p. 61).

Conclusion Derived from the Findings

The researcher used a qualitative research design to study a dual case study to understand the campus executive officer leadership utilizing entrepreneurship as a frame of reference. The purpose of this dual case study was to examine the perceived entrepreneurial leadership of a campus leader in an institution of higher education with a high incidence of successful management and vision for the 21st century organization.

Specifically, the case study design was selected to allow analysis of the campus executive officer and the university stakeholders in real-life context using multiple sources of information. Therefore, the following conclusions are derived from the study's findings to gain an in-depth understanding of a traditional and nontraditional career pathway university president using the conceptual underpinning entrepreneurship through the lens of leadership.

Sense of Urgency

In this study, a common theme that emerged in multiple ways was the *Sense of Urgency*. The *Sense of Urgency* theme emerged into two distinctive subthemes of Leadership and Communication. The 21st century higher education institution is a complex organization. The new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness “to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions” (Duderstadt, 2006, p. 257). In *Leadership Agility*, Joiner (2009) conjectured “the ability to lead effectively when rapid change and uncertainty are the norm” (p. 29) lends to the theme of urgency. It was evident from the interviews and focus groups, the participants articulated the campus executive officer's outward and intentional message of urgency communicated to the campus stakeholders including faculty, staff, students, alumni, and trustees.

The President of Capital University articulated, “[s]ometimes leadership sees and feels urgency that the rest of the institution conveniently doesn't.” Likewise, the President of Mission University expressed “you've really got to keep in front of your organization's mind that the sense of compelling urgency in moving forward.” It was

evident each president expressed the overwhelming institutional priority to keep pushing the organization forward and not be comfortable with a current state of achievement.

Dudersadt (2006) postulated higher education must allow a leader the creativity and authority to strengthen the resolve of the institution to move more rapidly. Therefore, as evident from the data collected, the university leader displays a resolve and urgency through leadership and communication. As stated from one administrative leader with Capital University, “there are a lot of expectations, and a lot of things to do, and he feels that urgency.” Additionally, another academic leader with Capital University expressed, “He never stops to rest; he can’t, because he knows we have to keep pushing forward to do something different and better if we are going to compete in these markets.” The executive leadership team members’ sense of urgency originated from the campus executive officer leadership of the institution. Therefore, leadership in higher education is characterized as an essential component and the campus leader must be the integral dynamic shaping the institution through leadership (Amey, 2006).

The participants communicated repeatedly the campus executive officers’ balance of entrepreneurship and leadership in describing the urgency of leading a 21st century higher education institution. An administrative leader with Capital University communicated the entrepreneurial leadership perspective, “If you're not entrepreneurial, you probably will find yourself struggling on the executive cabinet level.” There were frequent accounts from the members of the leadership team communicating the perception leadership implies an expectation from the campus executive officer for empowerment. As evident from one participant from Mission University, “I think at the executive level it’s just empowerment. He is not ... as a leader, he’s not one to get in the

weeds with you. He asks you very difficult question, expects you to be the expert.” Likewise, a participant from Capital University communicated similar leadership characteristics of the President, “I say leads by example because he has that expectation of his team. He wants everybody to have that same work ethic.” Therefore, it can be concluded from the research, that both the traditional and the nontraditional career pathway campus executive officers, through communication and leadership focusing on entrepreneurship, employed a sense of urgency resulting in institution strategy and vision for the 21st century.

Culture of Higher Education

The second common theme identified through the coding of research data was a *Culture of Higher Education*. The *Culture of Higher Education* theme emerged into two unique subthemes of History/Traditions and Environment. Borasi and Finnigan (2010) argued “leaders must shape the culture of the organization and successfully deal with the environment to achieve organizational goals and improve organizational effectiveness” (p. 6). Clark (1998) posited, “... the cultural or symbolic side of the university becomes particularly important in cultivating institutional identity and distinctive reputations” (p. 7). The data determined challenges persist for institutional leadership to impact the culture of higher education through an entrepreneurial ethos. The President of Capital University commented “[t]he norms, the rituals, some of those need to be sustained at all cost, because they are part of who we are and they’re part of our identity.” Yet, President Embry went on to explain, “...higher education will not be able to continue to resist fundamental economic forces as they seemed to have done for a few hundred years.” From the data collected, an administrative leader with Capital University expressed, “The

shift in the culture has not been easy, it comes with challenges, it comes with stresses, and even for the people who accept it; it is different.” Likewise, an academic leadership team member from Capital University commented, “[t]here are people in higher education, I don’t care where you go, that don’t believe entrepreneurship is a component of higher education.”

Based on the study findings, the researcher concluded a significant challenge existed in developing an entrepreneurial culture in the two case study institutions. In this study, a significant amount of the participants commented on the campus executive officers’ challenge to build consensus for the new model of higher education among the many stakeholders. The President of Mission University remarked on institutional culture change, “[y]ou tend to be comfortable with where you are and it’s the way we’ve always done it and it’s good enough. You’ve got to really keep pushing hard for change.” Amey (2006) believed higher education leadership today utilizes a lens towards the future while “providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organization culture and values” (p. 58). An academic leader with Capital University communicated her concerns around institutional traditions:

The shift in the culture has not been easy, it comes with challenges, it comes with stresses, even for the people who accept it, it is different. For an institution who has operated in a traditional academic culture, it is different, and anytime you implement that, it causes strain and stresses on the institution from the management level all the way down. I don’t know if we are always as receptive to that or in tuned to that institutionally, not just [the President], but all of us.

The President of Mission University provided insight into the institution's mission stating, "The mission becomes a defining element of culture." Finally, an academic leader of Capital University articulated his concern around institutional history and culture:

One thing I've come to appreciate is that history can be a good and a bad thing. It is a good thing when it informs us about who we are, and how we operate. It can be a bad thing when it is like an anchor because we sort of hang on to that saying we've always offered these things and that is what we have always done. It is amazing how pervasive that spirit of history is.

Burnett and Collins (2010) trusted higher education "evolution will make certain the survival of colleges and universities" willing to embrace "prudent change" (p. 198) and remain grounded in the mission responsiveness and consistency towards the needs of their constituents. The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited "the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity" (p. 653). However, from this data set, it was revealed that challenges do exist and need to be solved, for an entrepreneurial ethos to flourish in a higher education setting.

Entrepreneurial Vision

The final common themed emerged from the data collection was *Entrepreneurial Vision*. Within the *Entrepreneurial Vision* theme, two distinctive subthemes materialized: 21st Century Higher Education and Institutional Platform/Innovation. It is clear; the

University of the 21st century requires leadership capable of responding to emerging global opportunities to deliver life-long learning across the world (Duderstadt, 2006). Smith (2008) argued the leadership of higher education “[had] been encouraged to shift toward more executive styles of leadership and decision-making” (p. 240) in a knowledge-based society seeking dynamic visionary leadership. The vision theme depicted by the participants expanded upon the importance a campus leader strives for in leading the institution for the 21st century.

The movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Furthermore, Hansson and Monsted (2008) posited “the ability to organize in this new context has become the ability to engage a highly entrepreneurial activity” (p. 653). The President of Capital University conveyed the urgency of vision:

Capital University had a pretty decent mission. It was in a turnaround situation. What it desperately needed was vision, but it had to be a vision that was one that would lift people. They wanted to be lifted ... desperately wanted to be lifted. I thought Capital University was fine on mission but it had very little vision, and so that's where Vision 2020 was born.

In this case study, the institution leaders clearly articulated the urgency of mission and vision including the distinction of the two. The President of Capital University stated it best:

First of all, mission and vision people are always confusing. The mission is about the core purpose of the organization relative to its constituents... Vision is always about your aspirations as an organization and when people combined the two,

they get in trouble... Our strategy is tied to our mission and vision. It can't be separate, but it isn't the same thing. The strategy ... the mission should be relatively unchanging. The vision should change periodically, but if it was changing every year, you don't have a vision.

As indicated in the findings, the campus executive officer provided strategic direction in developing the institutional vision by empowering the leadership team including stakeholders. An administrative leader for Capital University explained how the President leads toward a vision, "He is good at drawing the vision at where we need to go, and then helping us then work together to get to that vision." Furthermore, Yokoyama (2006) noted a strong leadership approach must be integrated in higher education to sustain the resources necessary in creating an entrepreneurial and visionary culture.

The vision theme provided a global view of the emergence of the data, yet the sub themes of 21st Century Higher Education and Institutional Platform/Innovation extended deeper into the understanding of the entrepreneurial conceptual underpinning. Findings within the research data demonstrate the participants' perception concerning the campus leaders' ability in shaping an institutional vision through innovation, institutional platform, and entrepreneurial concepts. The President of Mission University emphasizes "... the pace of change is going to require us to be more nimble than we have been as an enterprise of higher education in the past" in discussing the future of higher education. In this study, a significant amount of the participants indicated the importance of the president giving faculty and staff the ability to be creative in shaping the learning environment. As one administrative leader from Mission University believed, "[t]here is

going to be a point where it's going to have a calculated risk, maybe not a low risk but a calculated risk with a high, high reward. We're going to really move the needle." The campus executive officer balance of entrepreneurship and leadership highlights the changing role for higher education in the knowledge economy. Drew (2010) interviewed several higher education leaders that stated a "recurring theme from participants was having the courage in leadership to think and act creatively, to take considered risks and to help staff deal with the impact of change" (p. 64). President Embry articulated the future for higher education stating, "I think we are living in an increasingly boundary-less world."

Bolman and Deal (2003) communicated that values are elusive and often help others create a sense of identity that will differentiate an organization and are often difficult for the institution or members to express. Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) posited, "[f]or institutions that seek relevance and change through entrepreneurship, a broad intellectual and philosophical platform must be created" (p. 28). Extrapolated from the findings, the presidents' for the two case study institutions provided insight into creating institutional innovation and platforms. The President of Mission University championed the innovative theme, "[w]e need to be even more rapid in accommodating change. We need to be looking at what is the model for a small, liberal arts college to be successful in the future." Likewise, the President of Capital University stated, "I think there's a lot of things we do that are challenging ourselves and are new and innovative things." It is clear that the new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness "to the changing needs and emerging challenges of our society and its educational institutions" (Duderstadt, 2006, p. 257). In this study, it can be concluded the

two case study institutions' leaders, regardless of career pathway, fully appreciate the need for entrepreneurial approach for the longevity and sustainability of the university, while empowering faculty and staff to investigate and recommend innovative solutions.

Limitations

Limitations for the study define boundaries which lack generalizability to be defined to a new case study. Marshall and Rossman (2006) believed "all proposed research projects have limitations" (p. 42), but there is no perfect design. In relation to this dual case study, the researcher acknowledged the following limitations.

An initial limitation of the study was the perception a case study design is less credible than quantitative studies since it evolves from "apparently subjective findings based on interviews and observations" (Fowler, 2000, p. 312). The characteristics of a quantitative study follow a very structured and predetermined design, whereas qualitative study characteristic models a flexible, evolving and emergent design (Creswell, 2003). An emerging design allows the researcher to adjust to changing conditions of the study and to pursue and probe emergent themes (Merriam, 1998). The researcher converged multiple forms of data collection including interviews, focus groups, and observations to triangulate the data for validity (Creswell). The case study design was selected to allow analysis of the campus executive officer and the university stakeholders in real-life context using multiple sources of information. Additionally, Merriam provided supportive reasons for a case study including "seeing through the researcher's eyes" and "decreased defensiveness" (p. 238) as advantages in case study methodology.

The validity relates to the integrity and competence of the researcher who collected and analyzed all the data; and the reliability of the study was dependent upon the consistency with which both the collection and analysis were completed (Patton, 1997). The researcher in a qualitative study is “the primary instrument for gathering and analyzing data,” (Merriam, 1998, p. 20) therefore, mistakes can be made and personal biases can play into the study. In this case study, the researcher established protocols and common instruments in data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2003).

The researcher also assumed the trustworthiness of informants who were interviewed. A narrative case study was conducted using various stakeholders who had insights into the campus executive officer’s leadership (Creswell, 2003). A sample population composed of key stakeholders in the case study institutions emerged through purposeful sampling (Creswell; Merriam, 1998). The Leadership Team was chosen as it was a “naturally formed group and volunteered as participants” (Creswell, p. 164). The researcher conducted the interviews and focus groups in the natural setting of the participants establishing a common process for data collection (Creswell).

An additional limitation in this study was the generalizability of the findings to apply from a dual case study. Generalizability requires data from large populations which provides the best foundation for producing broad generalizability (Misco, 2007). However, because this study institutes a small sample population of two Midwestern institutions the limitation to generalize the dual case study findings to other institutions is limited. Nonetheless, the transferability of this study may be possible as transferability does not involve broad claims, but yet invites readers of this research to make connections between the study and apply to other own experiences (Misco). Merriam

(1998) emphasized that qualitative research was not projected to generalize the findings, but to deduce the events.

The study included only two institutions from the Midwest which may limit the geographical application throughout the country. The researcher purposefully selected the two institutions based on comparable organizational structure “that will best help the researcher understand the problem and the research question[s]” (Creswell, 2003, p. 185). Qualitative study is defined as an inquiry process to build understanding of either a social or human problem based upon a holistic picture that is created using words (Merriam, 1998). The study was conducted in a natural setting with informants providing the details (Creswell, 1994). The two universities are private post-secondary education institutions not currently offering doctoral level degree programs. The two campus leaders selected as participants are the chief executive officers of the institution reporting directly to the respected Board of Trustees. The researcher concluded using a qualitative research method, explicitly a dual case study, would clarify and expand upon the research questions through situational analysis that considered the information from perspectives of all participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998).

Implications for Practice

The implications of this inquiry can be applied to higher education institutions. The findings suggest campus executive officer’s use of entrepreneurial concepts are directly associated with developing a vision and strategy for the institution of higher education in the 21st century. The findings support Mars and Metcalf (2009), Duderstadt (2006), and Burnett and Collins (2010) of the need to apply the principle, themes, and values of entrepreneurship to lead a 21st century higher education institution contributing

to the knowledge economy for human capital as an important resource for prosperity. Moreover, a more collaborative leadership approach should be adopted in developing an academic, social, and intellectual entrepreneurship vision. Furthermore, this collaborative leadership approach, coupled with tenets of entrepreneurialism, needs to be a focus in preparatory programs.

The study findings also revealed a need for campus leaders to be intentional in communicating and supporting a cultural change that an entrepreneurial approach would bring to a higher education institution. This was validated from many of the participants providing insight into the challenge of leading change in higher education historically engrained in tradition, values, and norms. The leadership plays a momentous role in assembling followers to buy into the entrepreneurial attitudes, beliefs, and skills.

Lawrence (2006) highlighted university leaders who were able to mobilize institutional strengths and traditions bring the academic community together to move the institution forward. An implication would be for campus leaders' to assemble a cross section of institutional stakeholders in mounting a common message concerning the vision and strategy for an entrepreneurial academy.

A subsequent implication would be to develop professional development programming for campus leaders around the entrepreneurial principles, themes, and values. This would assist the traditional higher education leader to become skilled at the business and strategy of leading a multi-dimensional institution of higher learning. In addition, the leader should expand leadership development by learning and modeling a more agile approach. In leadership agility, Joiner (2009) conjectured "the ability to lead effectively when rapid change and uncertainty are the norm and when success requires

consideration of multiple views and priorities” (p. 29). A professional development program would provide campus leaders with the necessary skills for leading an institution for the 21st century.

A final implication revealed from the study findings is the significance of keeping the institution constantly on a heightened sense of urgency. In other words, do not let complacency and comfort slow the progress of innovation or institutional growth. The two case study institutions articulated through the participants how a sense of urgency consistently guided the leadership team in seeking and developing new initiatives. It is therefore, essential universities not be complacent in success, yet always maintains the sense of urgency in planning institutional strategy and innovation.

Recommendations for Future Study

The results of this study should contribute to the current body of research and literature on the campus executive officer utilizing an entrepreneurial practice, principle, and skill in leading the institution of higher education for the 21st century. As confirmed in the literature review, limited research is presented in understanding the entrepreneurial lens in higher education (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Therefore, for purposes of this research study, the researcher provided the following two recommendations for future research discussed within this section.

A first recommendation for future research would be to conduct a single in-depth case study of a campus executive officer within a post secondary institution. The study could employ a mixed design approach to gain a deeper understanding of the case study. A convergent mixed method approach, the researcher gathers quantitative and qualitative data, analyzes them separately, and then evaluates the results to see if the findings prove

or disapprove each other (Creswell, 2003). In addition, a mixed method approach provides additional validity to the study by establishing constructs (quantitative validity) and triangulation (qualitative validity) for each database (Creswell). It can be argued mixed method provides a stronger understanding of the problem or question resulting from open-ended and closed-ended data (Creswell).

An additional recommendation would be to expand the scope of the institutions within the case study. This study was limited to two case study institutions within the Midwest region representing traditional liberal arts institutions with non doctoral degree programs. A widely held perceptive of institutional entrepreneurship primarily can be found in the scope of intellectual property derived from the innovation in bench and clinical research (Hansson & Monsted, 2008) traditionally found in the doctoral granting universities. Mars and Metcalf (2009) stated, “[e]ntrepreneurship can be seen in such trends as research collaborations between industry and academia; institutional, departmental, and individual responses to scarce resources; innovative approaches to traditional and technology-based instructional practices” (p. 1) expanding the scope of entrepreneurial behaviors.

Concluding Overview

The purpose of this dual case-study was to gain an in-depth understanding of a college or university president using the conceptual underpinning lens of entrepreneurship. The researcher examined the campus executive officer that followed a traditional and nontraditional career pathway to the president’s office through a dual-case study design. The constructs presented examined leadership, entrepreneurship, organizational analysis, and knowledge creation. The findings of this inquiry suggested

entrepreneurial principles, themes, and skills provide a valuable framework to shape the strategy and leadership for a successful institution for the 21st century regardless of career pathway. The literature suggests an entrepreneurial university goes about transforming themselves through five elements: “a strengthened steering core; an expanded developmental periphery; a diversified funding base; a stimulated academic heartland; and an integrated entrepreneurial culture” (Clark, 1998, p. 5). The researcher uncovered significant themes through interviews and focus groups with the participants from the two case study institutions including entrepreneurial sense of urgency, culture, and vision.

The findings of the study indicated the nontraditional career pathway president often communicated in a vertical hierarchy, while the traditional president tended to be more collaborative. In addition, the results of the study demonstrated that the role of traditional career pathway president is evolving to meet the needs of the changing climate of higher education. As expected the nontraditional career pathway president embodied greater entrepreneurial principles. Nonetheless, the traditional career pathway president also embraced the entrepreneurial philosophy.

In conclusion, the overarching question to examine the perceived effectiveness of a campus leader in an institution of higher education with a high incidence of successful management and vision for the 21st century organization, the researcher identified the following: the Leadership Team provided significant evidence through the data collection that the campus executive officer utilized entrepreneurial principles, skills, and themes in guiding the institution for a successful outcome. Yet, the challenge remained in building stakeholder acceptance of the importance of an entrepreneurial academy based on the historical cultural of higher education. The movement for higher education institutions

and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. Czariawska-Joerges and Wolff (1991) offered that “entrepreneurship mainly fits contexts which are new and cannot be dealt with by means of experience or routine. Entrepreneurship is leadership in exceptional situations” (p. 533). Moreover, while the career pathways of the university president did not alter significantly the use of entrepreneurship structures or strategies within each setting, such a use of entrepreneurship activities did enhance the capacity of the University to meet the ever-changing challenges of higher education for the 21st century.

References

- Amey, M.J. (2006). Leadership in higher education. *Change*, November/December, 55-58.
- Anderson, G. L. (1998). Towards authentic participation: Deconstructing the discourses of participatory reforms in education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(4), 571-603.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261–295.
- Appaduria, A. (2009). Higher education's coming leadership crisis. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(31), 60-61.
- Avolio, B. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O., & Weber, T.J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421-449.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. In R. Woodman and W. Pasmore (Eds.) *Research in organizational change and development*(pp. 231-272). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B., Avolio, B., Jung, D., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.
- Baumard, P. (1999). *Tacit knowledge in organizations*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Beckman, G & Cherwitz, R. (2009). Intellectual entrepreneurship: An authentic foundation for higher education. *Planning for Higher Education*, 37(4), 27 – 35.
- Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (1998). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory & methods*, (3rd. edition). Needham Heights, MA: Ally & Bacon.
- Bolden, R., Petrov, G. & Gosling, J. (2008). Tensions in higher education leadership: Towards a multi-level model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 358-376.
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T.E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey – Bass.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Borasi, R. & Finnigan, K. (2010). Entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors that can help prepare successful change-agents in education. *The New Educator*, 37, 1-29.
- Brown, J.S. & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and organization: A social practice perspective. *Organizational Science*, 12(2), 198-213.

- Burnett, D.D. & Collins, N.D. (2010). Higher Education for our time. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 22(3), 192-198.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Capital University. (2013). Our mission and vision. Retrieved from <http://www.capitaluniversity.edu/About-Us/Mission-and-Vision>
- Cerit, Y. (2010). The effects of servant leadership on teachers' organizational commitment in primary schools in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(3), 301-317.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities organizational pathways of transformation*. New York, NY: IAU Press.
- Collis, D.J. (2001). "When Industries Change" Revisited: New Scenarios for Higher Education. In M. Devlin and J. Meyerson, (Eds), *Forum Futures: Exploring the Future of Higher Education* (pp. 103-126). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Collis, D.J. (2002). New Business Models for Higher Education. In Collis, D.J., (Ed) *The Future of the City of Intellect: The changing American University* (pp. 181-202). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Collis, David J. (2004) "The Paradox of Scope: A Challenge to the Governance of Higher Education." In *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance: Negotiating the Perfect Storm*, edited by William G. Tierney. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Conger, J. & Kanungo, R. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.

- Creswell, J. W. (1998). Data analysis and representation. In *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (pp. 147-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Czariawska-Joerges, B. & Wolff, R. (1991). Leaders, managers, entrepreneurs on and off the organizational stage. *Organizational Studies*, 12(4), 529-546.
- Davis, J. (2003). *Learning to lead: A handbook for postsecondary administrators*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers.
- DeMeuse, K.P., Guangrong, D. & Hellenbeck, G.S. (2010). Learning agility: A construct whose time has come. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 119-130.
- Donaldson, G.A., Jr. (2008). *How leaders learn: Cultivating capacities for school improvement*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Donaldson, J.F. (1998). The nature and role of organizational sponsor. In P.S. Cookson (Ed), *Program planning for the training and continuing education of adults* (p. 175-206). Melbourne, FL: Kreiger.
- Drew, G. (2010). Issues and challenges in higher education: Engaging for change. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 57-76.
- Duderstadt, J. J. (2006). *A university for the 21st century*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Emery, C. & Barker, K. (2007). Effect of commitment, job involvement, and teams on customer satisfaction and profit. *Team Performance Management*, 13, 90-101.

- Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation (2009). *Kauffman Thoughtbook*. Retrieved from Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation website; <http://www.kauffman.org/about-foundation/Kauffman-thoughtbook-2009.aspx>
- Fernald, L.W., Solomon, G.T. & Tarabishy, A. (2005). A new paradigm: Entrepreneurial leadership. *Southern Business Review*, 30(2), 1-10.
- Foreman, P.B. (1948). The theory of case studies. *Social Forces*, 26(4), 408-419.
- Fowler, F. (2000). Policy studies for educational leaders. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gardner, J.W. (2000). The nature of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, (pp. 3-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1991). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423-451.
- Grudzinskii, J.O. (2005). The university as an entrepreneurial organization. *Russian Education and Society*, 47(1), 7-25.
- Hackman, M.Z., & Johnson, C.E. (2000). *Leadership a communication perspective* (pp.129-160). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Hansson, F. & Monsted, M. (2008). Research leadership as entrepreneurial organizing for research. *Higher Education*, 55, 651-670.
- House, R., & Howell, J. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 81-108.
- Jablonski, M. (2000). *The leadership challenge for women college presidents*. In J. Ratcliff (Series Ed.) & J. Glazer-Raymo, B. K. Townsend, & B. Ropers-Huilman

- (Vol. Eds.), ASHE Reader Series. *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective* (pp. 243-251). Boston: Pearson Custom.
- Joiner, B. (2009). Creating a culture of agile leaders: A developmental approach. *ChangeWise*, 32(4), 29-35.
- Joiner, B. & Josephs, S. (2007). *Leadership agility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jones, A.L., Warner, B. & Kiser, P.M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: The new kid on the university block. *Planning for Higher Education*, 38(4), 44-51.
- Keller, R. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management*, 18(3), 489-501.
- Lawrence, F.L. (2006). *Leadership in higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2000). Changing leadership: A menu of possibilities. In *Changing leadership for changing times* (pp. 3-20). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Mars, M.M. & Metcalf, A.S. (2009). Entrepreneurship in the contemporary academy. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(5), 1-111.
- Mars, M.M. & Garrison, S. (2009). Socially-oriented ventures and traditional entrepreneurship education models: A case review. *Journal of Education for Business*, 84(5), 290-296.
- Mars, M.M. & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2010). Academic entrepreneurship (re)defined: Significance and implications for the scholarship of higher education. *Higher Education*, 59, 441-460.

- McGee-Cooper A. & Trammell, D. (2002). From hero-as-leader to servant-as-leader. In L. Spears and M. Lawrence (Eds). *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st century*. (p. 141-151). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McLaurin, J.R. (2008). Leader-effectiveness across cultural boundaries: An organizational culture perspective. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, 12(1), 49-69.
- McLaurin, J. & Al-Amri, M. (2008). Developing an understanding of charismatic and transformational leadership. Proceedings of the Academy of Organizational Culture, *Communications and Conflict*, 13(2), 15.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Middlehurst, R. (2008). Not enough science or not enough learning? Exploring the gaps between leadership theory and practice. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 322 - 339.
- Misco, T. (2007). The frustrations of reader generalizability and grounded theory: Alternative considerations for transferability. *Journal of Research Practice*, 3(1), 1-11.
- Morgan, G. (2003). *Images of organization* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mullin, R. (2001). The undergraduate revolution: Change the system or give incrementalism another 30 years? *Change*, 33(5), 54-58.
- Newman, F. & Couturier, L.K. (2004). Rhetoric, reality and risks. *American Academy*, 1(1), 61-75.

- Nonaka, I. (1991). The knowledge-creating company. *Harvard Business Review*, November-December, 96-104.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: The Oxford University Press.
- Padilla, A. (2005). *Portraits in leadership: Six extraordinary university presidents*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Patton, M.Q. (1997). *Utilization-focuses evaluations: The new century text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Pearce, C.L., Hoch, J.E., Jeppesen, H.J., & Wegge, J. (2010). New forms of management: Shared and distributed leadership in organizations. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(4), 151-153.
- Piccolo, R. & Colquitt, J. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 327-340.
- Raskin, J.D. (2011). On essence in constructivist psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*. 31(4), 223-239.
- Santana, L.C. (2010, September 29). Five ways to boost your cross-culture agility. *Forbes.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/2010/09/29/cross-cultural-agility-globalization-leadership-managing-ccl-html>
- Schein, E.H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Schein, E.H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organizational studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 229-240.
- Sendjaya, S. & Sarros, J.C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9, 57-64.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (2000). *The lifeworld of leadership: Creating culture, community, and personal meaning in our schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, D. (2008). Academics or executives? Continuity and change in the roles of pro-vice chancellors. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 340-357.
- Spears, L.C. (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership*. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2001). Investigation school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28.
- St. George, E. (2006). Positioning higher education for the knowledge based economy. *Higher Education*, 52, 589-610.
- Staley, D.J. & Trinkle, D.A. (2011). The changing landscape of higher education. *Educause Review*, January/February, 16-32.
- Tarabishy, A. Fernald, Jr., L.W. & Sashkin, M. (2005). The entrepreneurial leader's impact on the organization's performance in dynamic markets. *The Journal of Private Equity*, 8(4), 20-29.

- Taylor, J.S., Machado, M. & Peterson, M.W. (2008). Leadership and strategic management: keys to institutional priorities and planning. *European Journal of Education, 43* (3), 369-386.
- Trani, E.P. & Holsworth, R.D.. (2010). *The Indispensable University*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Vecchio, R.P. (2003). Entrepreneurship and leadership: common trends and common threads. *Human Resource Management Review, 13*, 303-327.
- Weese, W. (1994). A leadership discussion with Dr. Bernard Bass. *Journal of Sports Management, 8*, 179-189.
- Welsh, D. & Krueger, N. (2009). Defining social entrepreneurship. *BizEd, 8(4)*, 36-37.
- Whetten, D.A. & Cameron, K.S. (1985). Administrative effectiveness in higher education. *Review of Higher Education, 9(1)*, 35-49.
- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research* (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yokoyama, K. (2006). Entrepreneurialism in Japanese and UK universities: Governance, management, leadership and funding. *Higher Education, 52*, 523-555.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (5th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2007). Trait-Based Perspectives of Leadership. *American Psychologist, 62(1)*, 6-16

Appendix A

Gatekeeper Permission Letter

Dear <Institutional President>,

I am seeking your permission to utilize faculty, staff and student participants over the age of 18 employed at <Name of Institution> in a dual case study examining the campus executive officer through an entrepreneurial lens.

The purpose of this dual case study is to examine the perceived effectiveness of a campus leader in an institution of higher education with a high incidence of successful management and vision for the 21st century organization. Institutional achievement, within this inquiry, is measured by the level of campus success evidenced by fiscal stewardship, faculty confidence, student satisfaction and leadership team collaboration. This study focuses on entrepreneurial characteristics and practice that lead to consistent achievement.

Data collection will consist of qualitative measures including interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and observation, and the data will be de-identified to protect the identity of the participants. Prior to completing the qualitative measures, participants will be provided with information regarding the study. Subject participation in this research is strictly voluntary. My approximation of the time that is needed to complete the qualitative data collection is two weeks. My intent is to conduct the interviews and focus groups face-to-face with the participants after obtaining their informed consent. I will work with the campus participants on dates and times that work accordingly with your schedule and the campus participants.

I will provide you with an executive summary of the dissertation which provides extensive literature of current evidence of entrepreneurial findings, research methodology, findings, and discussion. I can also set up a wrap up meeting to discuss the research outcomes including specific details that emerged from the <Name of Institution> case study.

Should you have any further questions, please contact me at (816) 721-0161 or by email pdb89b@missouri.edu. In addition, the contact information of my dissertation chair, Dr. Barbara N. Martin, is (816) 830-3904 or by email bmartin@ucmo.edu.

Thank you for your consideration of allowing faculty, staff, and students at <Name of Institution> If you would permit me to use <Name of Institution> as part of my case study sample population please sign this page and email back to me at pdb89b@missouri.edu .

Sincerely,

Phil D. Byrne, EdS

Doctoral Candidate, University of Missouri-Columbia

Signature of Institution President: _____ Date: _____

Appendix B

IRB Approval Letter



Campus Institutional Review Board
University of Missouri-Columbia

485 McReynolds Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-1150
PHONE: (573) 882-9585
FAX: (573) 884-0663

February 27, 2013

Principal Investigator: Byrne, Phillip D
Department: Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis

Your Application to project entitled *AN EXAMINATION OF THE CAMPUS EXECUTIVE OFFICER: A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY BETWEEN A TRADITIONAL AND NONTRADITIONAL CAREER PATHWAY FOR A ACADEMIC LEADER* was reviewed and approved by the MU Campus Institutional Review Board according to terms and conditions described below:

IRB Project Number	1206912
Initial Application Approval Date	February 27, 2013
IRB Expiration Date	February 27, 2014
Level of Review	Exempt
Project Status	Active - Open to Enrollment
Regulation	45 CFR 46.101b(2)
Risk Level	Minimal Risk

The principal investigator (PI) is responsible for all aspects and conduct of this study. The PI must comply with the following conditions of the approval:

1. No subjects may be involved in any study procedure prior to the IRB approval date or after the expiration date.
2. All unanticipated problems, serious adverse events, and deviations must be reported to the IRB within 5 days.
3. All modifications must be IRB approved by submitting the Exempt Amendment prior to implementation unless they are intended to reduce risk.
4. All recruitment materials and methods must be approved by the IRB prior to being used.
5. The Annual Exempt Form must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval at least 30 days prior to the project expiration date.
6. Maintain all research records for a period of seven years from the project completion date.
7. Utilize the IRB stamped document informing subjects of the research and other approved research documents located within the document storage section of eIRB.

If you have any questions, please contact the Campus IRB at 573-882-9585 or umcresearchcirb@missouri.edu.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Charles Borduin".

Charles Borduin, PhD
Campus IRB Chair

Appendix C

Campus Executive Interview/Protocol

Interview Question	Applicable Research Question
1. The presidency of the American university in many institutions has undergone a significant change for the 21 st century. Can you explain your role identity?	RQ 2
2. It is clear that the new model of university leadership and governance will require rapid responsiveness. Please explain your leadership style.	RQ 1
3. Entrepreneurship provides guidance in becoming effective agents of change in higher education (Borasi & Finnigan, 2010). How would you describe entrepreneurship in your institution?	RQ 2
4. The overall perception of entrepreneurship maintains a guarded acceptance from higher education stakeholders. How do you enlist stakeholder acceptance of entrepreneurship?	RQ 2, RQ 3
5. One researcher once wrote that “culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs.” To what degree do you believe this quote applies to the culture here at your University? Explain.	RQ 3
6. What would you identify as your greatest success in terms of achieving successful outcomes? What do you see as your greatest obstacle in maintaining achievement success?	RQ 1
7. The core mission of knowledge creation and entrepreneurship thrive in postsecondary education (Mars and Metcalf, 2009). How is knowledge creation perceived in a knowledge capital economy?	RQ 4, RQ 5
8. The campus executive officer for the knowledge academy brings a dynamic blend of entrepreneurial characteristics and traits to the leadership position. How do you see yourself as a leaders and entrepreneur?	RQ 1, RQ 5
9. The university leaders, who develop ways to operate efficiently and connect their programs to mission are more likely to maintain robust enrollments, provide excellent academic programs, balance budgets and prosper in the 21 st century (Burnett & Collins, 2010). Can you summarize your vision and strategy?	RQ 2, RQ 3
10. Finally, the movement for higher education institutions and leaders to integrate entrepreneurial activities demonstrates the changing environment to adapt the mission and vision for the future. How do you view higher education in an entrepreneurial construct?	RQ 2, RQ 5
11. Is there anything you would like to add?	Wrap Up

Appendix D
Individual Interview/Protocol

Interviewer: _____

Interviewee: _____

When: _____

Place: _____ Time: _____

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) OPENING
 - a. Name and Position
- 2) INTRODUCTORY QUESTION
 - a. What is your role in the University?
- 3) TRANSITION QUESTION
 - a. What comes to mind when I say entrepreneurial academy? [RQ 2]
- 4) KEY QUESTIONS
 - a. What leadership qualities does a university president possess that lead the institution to consistently achieve successful outcomes? [RQ 1]
 - b. What processes does the university president implement that encourage an entrepreneurial academy? [RQ2]
 - c. What structures does the president implement that lead to acceptance in the higher education culture? [RQ 3]
 - d. How does the university president establish collaboration among various stakeholders? [RQ 4]
 - e. How have entrepreneurial strategies been integrated into the institutional plan? [RQ 5]
 - f. In a knowledge economy, how does the institution establish knowledge creation? [RQ 2, RQ 5]
- 5) ENDING QUESTION
 - a. How do you perceive the legacy of the president? [RQ 1]

Appendix E

Focus Group Protocol

Date: _____ Start Time: _____

Moderator: _____ Assistants: _____

Names and Titles of Participants:

Introduction:

Good afternoon and welcome. Thank you for taking the time to join our discussion about educational leadership at <Name of Institution>. My name is Phil Byrne, and I will serve as the moderator for today's focus group. The purpose of today's discussion is to get information from you about the vision and leadership at <Name of Institution>. You were invited because you are all leaders here at the school.

Please remember, there are no right or wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said. If you want to follow-up on something that someone has said, you want to agree, disagree or give an example, feel free to do that. I want this to be more of a conversation among yourselves, so don't feel like you have to respond to me all of the time. I am here to ask questions, listen and make sure everyone has a chance to share. We are interested in hearing from each of you. Please speak up and remember only one person should talk at a time.

Our session will last about an hour and we will not be taking a formal break. Feel free to leave the table for any reason if you need to. We have placed name cards in front of you to help me facilitate the discussion, but no names will be included in any reports. Let's begin by going around the room and finding out more about each other.

Questions	Information
-----------	-------------

Opening Question: 5 min

1. Tell us your name and your position within the school.	Learn about participants
---	--------------------------

Introductory Question: 5-10 min

2. What drew you to become a part of <Name of Institution>?	RQ 1, RQ 3
---	------------

Transition Questions: 5-10 min

<p>3. What do you envision as your ideal environment at <Name of Institution>?</p> <p>Probes: Would you give me an example of what you mean?</p>	RQ 1, RQ 3
--	------------

Key Question: 10-15 min

<p>4. How does the president establish collaboration among various stakeholders?</p> <p>Probes: Would you explain further?</p> <p>Explain the president's personal vision and what is the shared vision or common purpose in the organization?</p>	RQ 3, RQ 5
--	------------

Key Question: 10-15 min

<p>5 How would you describe the President's leadership style at the University?</p> <p>Probes: What are your perspectives of President impact?</p> <p>Which of his responsibilities are most critical?</p>	<p>RQ 1, RQ 3</p>
--	-------------------

Key Question: 10-15 min

<p>6. What processes does the university president implement that encourage an entrepreneurial academy?</p> <p>Probes: Explain some examples of entrepreneurial activity.</p>	<p>RQ 2</p>
---	-------------

Ending Question: 5-10 min

<p>7. How have entrepreneurial strategies been integrated into the institutional plan?</p> <p>Probes: Can you provide examples of entrepreneurial strategies?</p>	<p>RQ 3, RQ 4</p>
---	-------------------

Ending Question: 5 min

<p>8. Is there anything you wish to tell me about the University that I have not asked?</p>	
---	--

Appendix F

Participant Informed Consent Form

I, (Name _____), (Date _____) consent to participate in this research project and understand the following:

PROJECT BACKGROUND: This project involves gathering data through site observation, focus groups, and personal interviews. The data will be collected for analysis and may be published. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this dual case study was to examine the perceived effectiveness of a campus leader in an institution of higher education with a high incidence of successful management and vision for the 21st century organization.

VOLUNTARY: You may refuse to answer any question or choose to withdraw from participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

WHAT DO YOU DO? The participant will be involved in one of three qualitative data collection means: observation, focus group, and personal interview.

BENEFITS: Your participation in this research project will enrich the information base. Improving understanding of the context, content, and application of learning within diverse organizations and studying various domains of knowledge creation in effective learning organizations can improve performance within the organization in many distinct realms.

RISKS: This project does not involve any risks greater than those encountered in everyday life.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your confidentiality will be maintained in that a participant's name will not appear on the survey or in the published study itself. The data will only be reported in aggregate form.

INJURY: It is not the policy of the University of Missouri to compensate human subjects in the event the research results in injury. The University of Missouri does have medical, professional and general liability self-insurance coverage for any injury caused by the negligence of its faculty and staff. Within the limitations of the laws of the State of Missouri, the University of Missouri will also provide facilities and medical attention to subjects who suffer injuries while participating in the research projects of the University of Missouri. In the event you have suffered injury as the result of participating in this research project, you are to immediately contact the Campus Institutional Review Board Compliance Officer at (573) 882-9585 and the Risk Management Officer at (573) 882-3735 to review the matter and provide you further information. This statement is not to be construed as an admission of liability.

Thank you for your assistance in providing current information on the status of transition programming for students with challenging behaviors. Your efforts are greatly appreciated. If you have any questions regarding the study, please contact Dr. Principal Investigator at (572) 882-4141. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research, please feel free to contact the Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585.

VITA

Phillip Daniel Byrne was born in Kansas City, Missouri on January 20, 1969, the son of John and Isabel Byrne. After obtaining his high school diploma from O'Hara High School, Kansas City, Missouri, in 1987, he entered Kansas State University, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Science in Social Science in May, 1992. Following graduation, he worked as a cross country coach for the University of Missouri Kansas City while completing a Master's of Arts degree in Higher Education Administration in May 1995. Following his graduation, he began employment in the higher education field in a series of career roles including fundraising, enrollment management, and administration. In 2003, he decided to return back to school to pursue a Education Specialist degree in Higher Education Administration graduating in May 2005. Today, Phil continues to work in higher education, supporting faculty development, as well as adjunct teaching for several area institutions.