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ABSTRACT

Today is the best time in the history of the field of entrepreneurship for faculty in the field of entrepreneurship. This past year, the field had the highest number of open positions at colleges and universities. This article examines the job opportunities and candidates in the field of entrepreneurship from 1989-2018. In 2017/18 there were 557 advertisements for entrepreneurship positions. The number of candidates who advertised for entrepreneurship positions was a mere 99 for a ratio of 5.6 jobs per candidate. This was the highest ratio of jobs per candidate since the collection of data began for this study. The article examines the characteristics of jobs and candidates and concludes with a discussion on the implications to the field of entrepreneurship education.
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INTRODUCTION

Utilizing institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977) and institutional entrepreneurship (Maguire, Hardy, and Lawrence, 2004), this study examines the annual trends in the number and type of jobs and candidates over a 29-year period from 1989 to 2018. This article examines whether the field of entrepreneurship is institutionalized at Schools of Business Administration.

It is essential that schools, candidates, and doctoral students understand what the current trends are occurring within the field of entrepreneurship within higher education. By understanding these trends, schools can better prepare future faculty to teach in the field of
entrepreneurship. Faculty and doctoral students can target specific opportunities and then negotiate from strength based on the dynamics of the marketplace. The information from this study will allow them to better position themselves in the job market and assist them in negotiating a compensation package.

**Theoretical Development**

According to Maguire, Hardy, and Lawrence (2004: 657), institutional entrepreneurship refers to the activities of actors who have an interest in particular arrangements and who leverage resources to create new institutions or to transform existing ones.

Institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977) posits that organizations which adopt appropriate structures, increase their legitimacy and can use this legitimacy to increase support and ensure survival (Dowling and Pfeffer, 1975; Meyer and Rowan, 1977).

Scott (2008) stated that institutional theory is “a widely accepted theoretical posture that emphasizes rational myths, isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), and legitimacy institutionalized environments demonstrate that they are acting in a legitimate manner adopting the structures and activities that are perceived to be legitimate by their critical external resource providers (Finkle and Deeds, 2001).

Institutional theorists assert that the institutional environment can strongly influence the development of formal structures in an organization, often more profoundly than market pressures. Innovative structures that improve technical efficiency in early-adopting organizations are legitimized in the environment. Ultimately these innovations reach a level of legitimization where failure to adopt them is seen as "irrational and negligent" (or they become legal mandates). At this point new and existing organizations will adopt the structural form even if the form doesn't improve efficiency.
Meyer and Rowan (1977) argue that often these "institutional myths" are merely accepted ceremoniously for the organization to gain or maintain legitimacy in the institutional environment. Organizations adopt the "vocabularies of structure" prevalent in their environment such as specific job titles, procedures, and organizational roles. The adoption and prominent display of these institutionally-acceptable "trappings of legitimacy" help preserve an aura of organizational action based on "good faith". Legitimacy in the institutional environment helps ensure organizational survival.

However, these formal structures of legitimacy can reduce efficiency and hinder the organization's competitive position in their technical environment. To reduce this negative effect, organizations often will decouple their technical core from these legitimizing structures. Organizations will minimize or ceremonialize evaluation and neglect program implementation to maintain external (and internal) confidence in formal structures while reducing their efficiency impact.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) conclude that the net effect of institutional pressures is to increase the homogeneity of organizational structures in an institutional environment. Firms will adopt similar structures because of three types of pressures. Coercive pressures come from legal mandates or influence from organizations they are dependent upon. Mimetic pressures to copy successful forms arise during high uncertainty. Finally, normative pressures to homogeneity come from the similar attitudes and approaches of professional groups and associations brought into the firm through hiring practices.

Based on the theoretical foundation for the study, the following research questions will be answered: (1) What are the current market trends for entrepreneurship faculty and jobs in higher education? (2) What are the current market trends for entrepreneurship faculty and jobs in higher
education for tenure track positions (including tenure track AACSB positions and candidates)?

The results of this study will update the status of the field regarding its institutionalization. The study will not only answer the research questions, but also give an in-depth discussion on implications to the field of entrepreneurship education. The findings of this study will assist faculty and administrators in their future decisions and strategies.

**EXTANT RESEARCH**

The first researchers to examine market trends for entrepreneurship faculty were Finkle and Deeds (2001; 2002). They concluded that the field of entrepreneurship was becoming increasingly institutionalized but was still lacking in many areas. They found that most entrepreneurship positions were not tenure track, and there was no universal mandate for entrepreneurship at Schools of Business Administration. Entrepreneurship education was an afterthought or electives, departments were extremely rare, and Colleges non-existent. Other studies that have built upon their initial study (see Finkle, 2006; 2007; 2008; 2010; 2012a; 2012b; 2013a; 2013b; 2015; 2016; Finkle & Kuratko, 2004).

Finkle (2007) examined market trends and AACSB positions. AACSB positions was included as an indicator of legitimacy. In other words, were schools devoting resources to hire faculty? And if so, this would indicate institutionalization.

According to the AACSB (2015), AACSB accreditation depicts the highest measure of achievement for schools of business worldwide. AACSB schools have to pass a voluntary, non-governmental review of educational institutions and programs. Schools that earn AACSB accreditation are committed to quality and continuous improvement. Finkle’s (2007b) study found that during 2004/05 there were 122 tenure track AACSB positions and 102 tenure track candidates or 1.2 tenure track AACSB positions per tenure track candidate. Overall, he found
that the field was making significant progress towards becoming more institutionalized on several fronts: There were increases in primary positions, strong recruitment of senior faculty, and several candidates for the Top 50 schools.

Finkle’s (2010) study found an increasing institutionalization of entrepreneurship on a world-wide basis. From 1989/90 to 2007/08, the total number of international jobs grew from 0 to 76. The study also found that the growth of international positions more than doubled from 2006/07 to 2007/08.

Finkle (2013a; 2013b) examined trends through 2011/12 and found a total of 319 available entrepreneurship positions and 245 candidates during the final year. One significant finding of the study was the increase in the number of schools that were seeking candidates with a primary interest in teaching/research. Out of the 319 advertisements, 202 (63%) were for primary candidates. At the time of the study, this was the highest number of primary advertisements. Another interesting finding was the advertisement of 203 tenure track positions. There was only one year which is the largest number since the beginning of the Great Recession in 2007. However, the number of tenure track candidates was higher at 231. The findings indicate an increase in the institutionalization of the field.

Finkle (2015) examined the trends in the market for entrepreneurship faculty from 1989/90 to 2013/14. He found that in 2013/14 there were only 147 candidates, which was 84% lower from its peak at 270 in 2008/09. The last time it was that low was in 2005/06 when there were 141 candidates. This was probably due to the financial crisis. In 2008/09, during the middle of the Great Recession, there were almost 100 more tenure track candidates than tenure track positions (260 versus 165). During 2013/14, there were 150 tenure track positions and 138 tenure track candidates. The findings show that the number of tenure track candidates in
2013/14 dropped to the second lowest level since 2005/06. Of the tenure track positions that were being advertised, 52% were for senior faculty (Associate or above). Finkle (2015) concluded that the field of entrepreneurship was continuing to be institutionalized.

**METHODOLOGY**

The foundation for this study was based on the author’s experiences in the doctoral program from 1989-1993. During that time frame, there were few jobs and the competition for entrepreneurship positions was fierce. In 1993, the year the author was on the market, there were 40 tenure track candidates (excluding applications from faculty at existing schools) for 23 tenure track positions in entrepreneurship. Out of the 23 tenure track positions, only 18 schools were seeking candidates with a primary interest in the field of entrepreneurship. So, the ratio of tenure track candidates per primary tenure track jobs was 2.2. The fierce competition for jobs, led the author to study this topic as a matter of survival.

The date for this study was collected from several sources over a 29-year period. In the late 1980’s and early 1990’s the *Academy of Management Placement* used to send out newspapers and pamphlets which listed a brief description of jobs and candidates. In addition to these, microfiche of old editions of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* were used to supplement the early documentation of the positions.

During the early days of the Internet, advertisements started appearing on the *Academy of Management Placement* site. Over the past decade, several other sites have also listed job opportunities for entrepreneurship faculty (See Exhibit 1). Job data was also collected through e-mails on a variety of networks and directly from universities themselves.

**Exhibit 1: List of Web Sites Used to Collect Data on Schools**

Academic Careers Online (http://www.academiccareers.com/)
Academic Jobs EU (http://www.academicjobseu.com/)
AcademicJobsOnline.org (https://academicjobsonline.org/)
Academic Positions (https://academicpositions.com/jobs)
Academy of International Business (https://aib.msu.edu/careercenter/jobpost.asp)
Academy of Management Placement Services (http://aom.org/placement/)
Akadeus.com https://www.akadeus.com/
Chronicle of Higher Education (http://www.chronicle.com/)
Glassdoor.com (https://www.glassdoor.com/)
HigherEdJobs.com (http://www.higheredjobs.com/)
JobLeads (https://www.jobleads.com/search/)
Jobs.ac.uk (http://www.jobs.ac.uk)
LinkedIn (https://www.linkedin.com/)
MidAtlantic Higher Ed (https://mid-atlantic.hercjobs.org/)
Neuvoo (https://Neuvoo.com/jobs)
Simply Hired (http://www.simplyhired.com/)
United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (USASBE) (http://usasbe.org/)
To collect and analyze the data, a database was created. The data was collected year-round from the end of the month of the Academy of Management Meeting until the start of the next year’s AOM meeting. All duplicates were dropped.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Five tables were constructed to answer the research questions. Since the tables documented the changes of numbers from 1989 through 2018, it gives the reader an ability to evaluate the trends in the field of entrepreneurship over a short and long period of time.

Table 1 examines the number of United States and international candidates and positions. These were then broken down into subtopics of interest. These subtopics were Primary, Secondary, or Tertiary areas of interest, which indicated the level of interest that a school or candidate has in teaching/research in the field of entrepreneurship.

Table 2 breaks down the total number of positions and candidates from Table 1 and determines the number and percentage that were tenure track. These tenure track positions were then broken down into the ranks that schools and candidates were advertising for. The ranks were Assistant, Associate, Full, Endowed, or Open. Open indicated that a school would accept applications for any position.

Table 3 examines the specific expertise that schools and candidates advertised. For instance, let’s assume that the University of Washington was seeking a candidate with a primary area in Entrepreneurship, a secondary interest in Strategy/Business Policy, and a tertiary interest in Technology and Innovation Management, Table 3 would categorize these areas into the table and turn them into percentages.

Tables 4 and 5 break down the number of AACSB tenure track positions into states within the United States in 2016/17 and 2017/18. It also denotes the positions’ rank, interest,
and if it is an advertised position for an associate or director of a Center for Entrepreneurship.

**Table 1: Entrepreneurship Positions and Candidates, 1989-2018**

Table 1 shows that the total number of advertised jobs (tenure track and non-tenure track) over the past 29 years. The total number of jobs was the highest ever this past academic year at 557 or 8.8% higher than 2016/17. Despite the record-breaking increase in jobs, there were only 99 advertised candidates in 2017/18. This was the second lowest number of candidates since 2003/04 when there were 98 candidates.

On a ratio basis, there were 5.6 jobs per candidate. This is an extremely positive number for candidates and the growth and institutionalization of the field of entrepreneurship. It shows that schools are increasing their advertisements for entrepreneurship positions at a record pace. Hence, schools appear to be integrating more entrepreneurship curriculum. It must be noted that these jobs include adjuncts, visiting and instructor positions as well as tenure track positions. Tenure track positions will be evaluated in Table 2.

**International**

Table 1 also examined international positions and candidates. During 2017/18, there were 195 international positions, which was the highest number since the study began. This number is 15% higher than 2016/17. It is continued proof that the field of entrepreneurship is increasingly being institutionalized on a global basis. Like non-international candidates during 2017/18, the number of international candidates was only 29. These numbers were extremely positive for candidates seeking international positions as the number of international jobs per international candidate was about 6.7. There were significant opportunities in the global job market.

**Interest Level**
Finally, Table 1 examined the number and percentage of jobs and candidates in terms of interest in the field. These were broken down by primary, secondary and tertiary interest. During this past year, there were 418 (75%) advertised primary positions, 81 (15%) secondary positions, and 58 (10%) tertiary positions.

In 2017/18, 53 (54%) of the candidates advertised entrepreneurship as their primary area of expertise. Additionally, 24 (24%) and 22 (22%) advertised entrepreneurship as their secondary and tertiary areas of interest.

According to the results of this study, 2017/18 was one of the best times to be a primary candidate in the field of entrepreneurship. There were 418 primary jobs for each primary candidate or 8 primary jobs per primary candidate. These numbers indicate a plethora of opportunities for candidates specializing in entrepreneurship as their primary area of expertise.

Table 2 documents all the advertised tenure track positions and candidates for entire period of the study from 1989 through 2018. The table breaks down the tenure track positions and candidates in the ranks of Assistant, Associate, Full, Endowed, and Open.

During 2017/18 there were 305 (55%) tenure track positions out of the 557 total advertised positions from Table 1. This was the largest number of tenure track positions since the inception of the study. It must be noted that the percentage of tenure track positions has leveled off over the past four years.

Only 205 (68%) of the 305 tenure track entrepreneurship jobs were tenure track AACSB positions. Out of those, 137 (67%) were AACSB tenure track positions located in the United States. In 2017/18, the total number of tenure track positions by rank were: 161 (53%) assistant,
47 (15%) associate, 23 (8%) full, 33 (11%) endowed chair, and 41 (13%) open positions. Overall, schools were seeking 144 (47%) senior level tenure track faculty.

In 2017/18 there were 98 tenure track candidates. The advertised rank of the candidates was: 87 (89%) assistant, 9 (9%) associate, 1 (1%) full, 1 (1%) endowed chair, and 0 open. In 2017/18, the ratio of all the tenure track positions (305) per tenure track candidates (98) was about 3.1.

The tenure track positions were also cross-listed with the schools listed on the AACSB web site. These tenure track positions were then determined to be AACSB tenure track positions. In 2017/18, the ratio of tenure track AACSB positions (205) per tenure track candidate (98) was 2.1. This is a buyer’s job market.

A closer examination of the characteristics of the 98 tenure track candidates reveals some interesting findings. There were 29 international candidates. Twenty-two of the candidates had entrepreneurship listed as at least one of their major areas during their Ph.D. program.

There were 52 tenure track candidates that advertised entrepreneurship as their primary area of expertise, 24 as their secondary area of expertise, and 22 as their tertiary. While 54 of the 98 tenure track candidates listed entrepreneurship as their primary area, their educational backgrounds did not match up with their advertised expertise. Only 22 of the candidates had entrepreneurship listed as part of their major degree. Five candidates listed other fields as other fields (e.g., Psychology, Sociology, Environmental Science, Educational Leadership, Engineering). Of the 98 tenure track candidates, only 19 listed entrepreneurship as their only major.

Finally, almost all of the candidates were seeking an assistant professor position. In regards to sex, data was obtained on 83 of the candidates and 64 (77%) of them were male.
These numbers of the candidates are extremely encouraging for candidates. Candidates must be aware that these trends are in their favor as they can use these numbers to negotiate strong compensation packages (e.g., teaching load, pay, grants, summer research money, stipends, computers, graduate assistants, travel funds, research, moving money, teaching and service expectations).

On the opposite side, this is one of the worst time for schools to be recruiting tenure track faculty in entrepreneurship. Not only are the numbers down significantly, but the areas of expertise do not appear to match up with what candidates are marketing themselves. Schools need to be careful that they are getting what applicants are selling. Due diligence must be done on these candidates to verify their qualifications. In defense of the applicants, it may be that they have significant experience in being an entrepreneur.

-----Insert Table 2 about here-----

**Table 3: Percentage of Applicants and Positions Cross-Listed by Field, 1989-2018**

Table 3 shows the specialties that candidates and schools have advertised in their profiles from 1989 through 2018. This table is critical, so the field can get an idea of where the trends in the field of entrepreneurship are heading. If candidates can see the specialties that schools are advertising, they can better prepare themselves for opportunities. If schools see the areas that candidates are studying, this will give them a better idea of what is available in the marketplace or maybe even what the trends are in the market.

An example of the table can be seen if candidate David Deeds advertised for an entrepreneurship only position, he would insert entrepreneurship only into his profile. If Stanford University is seeking a primary candidate in entrepreneurship with secondary and tertiary areas in Organizational Behavior and International Management, each column will be
selected. David Deeds could potentially be a candidate for the Stanford University position. He is not an ideal candidate, but a potential candidate. An ideal candidate would have all three areas that Stanford is advertising.

Table 3 is divided into positions and candidates. The table is broken down into five categories: Entrepreneurship only, Strategy, International, OB/HR (Organizational Behavior/Human Resources Management), and TIM (Technology and Innovation Management).

The percentages for the advertised candidates in 2017/18 were: Entrepreneurship Only (9%), Strategy (55%), International Business/Management (28%), OB/HR (19%), and Technology and Innovation Management (23%). The percentages for the other areas that candidates advertised for included: Organizational Theory (15%), Business Ethics/Business Society (9%), Operations (4%), Research Methods (4%), Consulting (3%), Gender & Diversity (2%), and Non-Profit (1%).

The percentages for the advertised jobs in 2017/18 were: Entrepreneurship Only (68%), Strategy (15%), International Management (4%), OB/HR (8%), and Technology and Innovation Management (2%).

The percentage for advertised jobs in other areas were: Management (9%), Marketing (4%), Real Estate (3%), Finance (2%), Accounting (1%), Creativity (1%), Economics (1%), Information Technology (1%), Organizational Theory (1%), Business Ethics/Business Society (1%), Digital/Ecommerce (1%), Law (1%), Real Estate (1%), and Operations (1%).

The percentages for the table were very similar to last year. The advertisements for candidates with a primary area only in entrepreneurship continues to grow. Strategy was the most correlated area with entrepreneurship. Strategy is a legitimized field within higher education, which is required at all AACSB schools. Hence, there are potentially more
opportunities for jobs in strategy versus entrepreneurship. The dynamic of strategy and entrepreneurship could give candidates a competitive advantage in the marketplace.

-----Insert Table 3 about here-----

Tables 4 & 5: AACSB Tenure Track Positions Advertised by State in the United States, 2016/17 & 2017/18

Tables 4 & 5 show the total number of AACSB positions which were advertised in 2016/17 and 2017/18 broken down by state in the United States, rank, and interest. Each position was also identified whether it had an opening for a Director or Co-Director of a Center for Entrepreneurship.

In 2016/17, there were 170 total tenure track AACSB positions. Of those, 113 (67%) were in the United States, which were comprised of 73, 29, and 11 primary, secondary, and tertiary positions.

The results also show that out of total tenure track AACSB positions in 2017/18 was 205. Of those, 137 (67%) were in the United States, which were comprised of 101, 28, and 8 primary, secondary, and tertiary positions.

In 2016/17, the largest number of jobs AACSB tenure track positions located in the United States were in the following states: California (10), New York (9), Massachusetts (8), Texas (6), North Carolina (6), Illinois (6), Ohio (6), and Arizona (4). Forty states advertised for at least one tenure track AACSB position in entrepreneurship in 2016/17.

In 2017/18, the largest number of jobs AACSB tenure track positions located in the United States were in the following states: Texas (11), California (11), Florida (10), New York (9), Pennsylvania (8), Indiana (6), Illinois (6), Massachusetts (6), Virginia (6), Louisiana (5), Alabama (4), Michigan (4), Missouri (4), New Jersey (3), North Carolina (3), and Ohio (3). There were another 13 states that had 2 tenure track openings and 11 states with one opening.
Forty states advertised for at least one tenure track AACSB position in entrepreneurship in 2017/18.

**Entrepreneurship Center Directors Advertisements in 2016/17 & 2017/18**

Tables 4 & 5 also show the number of advertisements for AACSB tenure track positions for directors or associate directors of Centers for Entrepreneurship in the United States. Overall, in 2016/17 and 2017/18 there were 37 and 36 openings for directors or associate directors for Centers for Entrepreneurship all over the world. There was a total of 8 and 2 that were AACSB tenure track positions, of which 6 and 1 were in the U.S.

In their search for a Director, higher education appears to be seeking more than the traditional skill set that academics bring to the table. Depending on the job, Directors can be required to perform a multitude of duties that are not traditional (e.g., technology transfer, fundraising, seminars, build and maintain advisory boards, manage budgets, hire employees). Directors need to be able to relate to people from industry for potential donations to the university. It is relatively common that the highest rated schools for entrepreneurship have two Directors; one for working with industry and another that is an academic that focuses on curriculum.

-----Insert Tables 4 & 5 about here-----

**IMPLICATIONS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATORS**

This study investigated whether the field of entrepreneurship has become increasingly institutionalized by answering the following research questions: (1) What are the current market trends for entrepreneurship faculty and jobs in higher education? (2) What are the current market trends for entrepreneurship faculty and jobs in higher education for tenure track positions (including tenure track AACSB positions and candidates)?
Table 1 shows that the field of entrepreneurship is becoming increasingly institutionalized. In 2017/18, the field saw the highest number of jobs, at 557. The ratio of the total jobs per candidate was 5.6, which was the highest ratio ever. The growth of international positions was also a sign that the field was becoming increasingly institutionalized. There were 195 international positions during 2017/18, which was the highest number since the study began. The ratio of international positions per international candidate during 2017/18 was 6.7. Another indicator of institutionalization was the high number of jobs which advertised for candidates with a primary area in entrepreneurship. Out of 557 jobs, 418 (75%) were targeted towards primary candidates. This is a strong indicator that schools are increasing their resources towards entrepreneurship.

The second research question asked: What are the market trends for entrepreneurship faculty in higher education for tenure track positions and candidates in entrepreneurship (including tenure track AACSB positions)? In 2017/18 there were 305 tenure track positions. This was the highest number of tenure track positions since the inception of the study. Fifty-five percent of all the advertised entrepreneurship jobs were tenure track positions. The others (252) were for adjuncts, non-tenure track positions, and visiting.

Two-hundred and five (67%) of the tenure track positions were at AACSB accredited institutions. One hundred and thirty-seven were at schools located in the United States. That was an increase of 21% from last year.

Schools were seeking approximately 50% senior level tenure track faculty. This is an indication of a need for senior level faculty to come in and either create or build upon the current infrastructure within the school enhancing its legitimacy. It is excellent time to be a senior level faculty member in the field of entrepreneurship. As schools seek these experienced faculty, it is
in tune with the field becoming increasingly institutionalized as schools are devoting more resources to senior level positions.

**Implications to Faculty & Doctoral Students**

This is a sellers’ market for entrepreneurship faculty. Factors contributing to the increase in the percentage of jobs per candidate may include the following:

1) The economy is now in its ninth year of expansion since the Great Recession. The unemployment rate is less than four-percent. When the economy is good, people do not tend to go back to school. It may be that fewer people want to spend four years getting a Ph.D., when there are so many job opportunities. The opportunity costs of getting a Ph.D. would be the combination of what you would earn at a job for four years plus the money you spend to earn the Ph.D. This could be a significant number, which could take years to recuperate. For the millennial generation (18 to 34-year old), who already have a debt level of over $1 Trillion, academia may not be so attractive. Only 22% of millennials are debt free.

2) The current state of academia and higher education is not as attractive as it has been in the past. On the positive side, there are more tenure track positions. However, as the number of advertisements for positions has increased, there has been a decrease in the percentage of entrepreneurship tenure track positions over the past 10 years. The percentage of tenure track positions has dropped from 76% to 55%. This is in tune to what has been happening in academia, which is an increasing movement towards adjuncts.

3) In recent years, academia has been heavily critiqued because of the high costs. Some universities are being pressured by state governments and other stakeholders to eliminate tenure and reduce costs. Other schools are being pressured by stakeholders to hold faculty more
accountable. They do this through the usual annual reviews, but many schools now have post tenure reviews. This has effectively eliminated the freedom faculty have had in the past to pursue personal interests.

4) Academia’s total compensation package cannot compete with many jobs in industry (Depending on the field). Academia can restrict faculties ability to earn money. In general, there is a defined salary and benefits with very limited abilities for outside income. This is also becoming increasingly restricted due to pressure on faculty after earning tenure.

5) Due to the decrease in the number of high school students coming out, there has been an increase in pressure on universities to offer larger financial aid packages and find specific niches in the marketplace to survive. The availability of technology into the competitive realm of higher education is making it easier for potential students to apply for financial aid and scholarships.

6) Many schools have been increasing their tenure and post tenure requirements, which has put increasing stress on faculty and their families. This has created a dilapidating culture. Some jobs in academia are less appealing than others due to all the forces above.

   Doctoral students have five primary options available after they graduate: 1) Go to a research school, which places a heavy emphasis on quality research. These schools typically pay more money. However, competition will be stronger for these positions due to the appeal of more compensation and lower teaching loads. 2) Students can go to a more balanced school where research and teaching are more equally weighted. These schools may be more suited for candidates that are not as motivated to spend most of their time doing research and enjoy teaching. 3) Candidates can go to traditional teaching-oriented schools. These schools put most of their emphasis on teaching and tend to have higher teaching loads. They generally do not
tend to pay as much. 4) Candidates can go into industry and become an entrepreneur or work for someone in government or industry.

A good potential strategy for doctoral students is to obtain a job at a doctoral institution due to all of the benefits that come with that job. In academia, it is extremely difficult to move up (e.g., moving from a teaching or balanced school to a research-oriented school). By starting at a doctoral school, this will give you more time and resources to build up your research base. The currency in academia tends to be research and your name is your brand. By writing some strong articles early in your career, you can build up your brand and enhance future opportunities. Even if you decide that you do not want to stay at a research school, you can always move down to balanced or teaching schools.

An important question that candidates must ask themselves is if they want to join an entrepreneurship program or create their own program. Candidates must ask the right questions when interviewing to determine if a school has the appropriate resources for either choice. Schools value candidates with an entrepreneurial mindset. Candidates that can use practical skills (e.g., build and market a program and/or the create and run a Center for Entrepreneurship) will have a significant advantage in the market.

**Implications to Administrators**

The numbers in the study indicate that schools seeking entrepreneurship candidates will have difficulties filling their slots. This is one of the worst times for schools to be recruiting tenure track faculty in entrepreneurship. Not only are the numbers down significantly, but the areas of expertise do not appear to match how candidates are marketing themselves. Administrators need to be careful in their hiring practices. Candidates may not have the skill set that they are looking for.
Furthermore, given that almost half of the tenure track jobs were for senior level candidates, schools need to create a strategy to attract senior candidates. It is recommended that schools target candidates that fulfill their needs. This may mean being creative in the compensation packages. To attract quality entrepreneurship faculty, schools must be willing to offer a strong compensation package (Salary, course release, grants, research funding, travel allowance, graduate assistants, computers, etc.). In some of the higher cost cities, like Seattle, schools may want to add a housing allowance.

**LIMITATIONS**

Limitations of this study may include a reduction in the number of entrepreneurship positions due to budget cuts. Some schools may not be able to find a quality candidate. Therefore, they may postpone the hiring of a faculty member.

Another limitation may be candidates or positions that the author missed when performing research. Despite the daily examination of job opportunities, the author may have missed some. Finally, the study was not able to capture the names and descriptions of faculty that do not advertise their profile but apply directly to a school. These would include faculty at existing institutions.

**FUTURE RESEARCH**

Future opportunities for research should include an in-depth longitudinal study that focuses on the profiles of candidates and their careers. What are they hired as? What is their salary, teaching load, and service requirements? This would enable the field to see how new hires are being institutionalized into schools. Furthermore, it is essential to determine if faculty are earning tenure and being promoted. Are entrepreneurship faculties moving up in schools to
management levels (e.g., Deans, Chairs of Departments, etc.)? The field has come a long way. Initially it received little respect, but over time it has become increasingly legitimized.

Another area of research would be the examination of the advertised jobs. Who are the schools hiring and for what reasons? What courses do they teach? Are entrepreneurship faculty expected to teach in other areas? What requirements or demands are being placed on entrepreneurship faculty? How are schools valuing entrepreneurship journals?
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