



www.ijonest.net

Advancing Faculty Research in a “Bricolage” Environment

Larita J. Killian 
Indiana University, United States

Sergio Garcia Agreda 
Universidad Privada Boliviana, Bolivia

Mariana Pérez Escobar 
Universidad Privada Boliviana, Bolivia

To cite this article:

Killian, L.J., Agreda, S.G., & Escobar, M.P. (2023). Advancing faculty research in a “Bricolage” environment. *International Journal on Engineering, Science, and Technology (IJONEST)*, 5(4), 339-352. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonest.184>

International Journal on Engineering, Science and Technology (IJONEST) is a peer-reviewed scholarly online journal. This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their articles. The journal owns the copyright of the articles. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material. All authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations regarding the submitted work.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Advancing Faculty Research in a “Bricolage” Environment

Larita J. Killian, Sergio Garcia Agreda, Mariana Pérez Escobar

Article Info

Article History

Received:

01 April 2023

Accepted:

16 September 2023

Keywords

Research development

Faculty development

Qualitative research

Bolivia

Bricolage

Abstract

In the typical, academic career path, individuals enter faculty roles immediately after graduate school, commencing their academic careers with research skills and a fledgling research agenda. Many faculty, however, take an indirect route to research. They may work in the commercial or nonprofit sector for years before joining the academy, allowing their research skills to fade. Some individuals who never completed research training are recruited as faculty due to their years of professional experience; this is especially true in business, engineering, and health care. When institutional expectations and personal goals change, however, these individuals may suddenly face the need to conduct research. They have the motivation but lack the necessary skills and confidence. This is especially true when institutions decide to seek accreditation that requires research activity among faculty. To help Bolivian faculty achieve research success, we developed a condensed workshop on qualitative, applied research and conducted it four times, in-person and online, following the action research model. The condensed workshop proved effective in helping faculty boost their research productivity, though participants expressed a desire for more extended coaching and support. Future workshops will include increased opportunity for collaboration. The workshop can be adapted to other regions.

Introduction

A typical path to academic research begins in graduate school. Individuals initiate research under a faculty mentor, may publish excerpts from their thesis or dissertation, and launch their faculty careers with an established research agenda and “wind in their sails.” For others, however, the route to academic research is indirect. They may spend years in commercial or nonprofit sectors before joining academe. During the interim, research skills they acquired as graduate students fade. Those who move directly from graduate school into faculty positions may conduct little research due to heavy teaching loads or lenient research expectations. When personal priorities or campus expectations change, they may aspire to conduct research but lack the skills or confidence for success. This occurs, for example, when institutions seek a new accreditation, prompting a sudden elevation in research expectations. Others who take the indirect route to research are those hired directly from the professions for their practical experience, and university administrators who pivot into faculty roles after years in administration. In their new roles, they discover the appeal and value of research but lack preparation to turn aspirations into action.

Generally, part-time and adjunct faculty are not expected to conduct research, but they may wish to conduct

research to enrich their academic experience, strengthen relationships with colleagues, and position themselves to move into full-time positions. Professional schools (such as business, accounting, and engineering) are encouraged to engage part-time faculty in research to enable reciprocal learning and cross-fertilization between full-time academics and those in professional practice (The Pathways Commission, 2014). At our private, doctoral-granting university in Bolivia, a significant portion of faculty take the indirect route to research. Due to some combination of factors cited above, they find themselves in faculty roles and understand the value and importance of research but are uncertain how to proceed. Moreover, our university recently adopted a program to improve our comparative rank among South American universities and to seek new accreditation, thereby increasing expectations for research among both full-time and part-time faculty. Research is now an expectation, not an option. While this goal is understood and accepted by faculty, increased expectations for research can have “deleterious effects” on faculty health and morale and even lead to lower quality research (Khoo, 2021, p. 1).

Previous authors have explored ways to promote successful research. Using a complexity theory framework, Reid and Marshall (2009) focused on the relationship between graduate students and their faculty mentors (“supervisors”) in Australia, seeking ways to improve both interactions and research outcomes. Their most salient finding is that efforts to promote high-quality research must address both individual and institutional factors. Khoo (2021) explored how digital skills could prepare faculty in Australia to participate in online forums where they receive and provide support.

He found online forums based in a community of practice can help scholars develop their research identity. Moreover, engagement with an online community provides an equitable means for faculty to develop their research identities when they are unable to attend in-person conferences (Khoo, 2021). Bojko and Kowalczyk (2021) studied three models of research activity among faculty in Poland to learn how different models impact job satisfaction, teamwork, and individual expectations related to job mobility or even leaving the academic profession. The models include formal mentorships (hierarchical relationships, such as between new and seasoned faculty), informal co-worker support, and faculty who work alone in their research. Among their findings, early-career faculty in formal mentoring relationships declare higher satisfaction than researchers receiving co-worker support or those working individually. Early-career mentees also felt more stable in their present jobs and expressed stronger intentions to remain with their current institution.

These authors employ different analytical frameworks, but their findings contain a common thread: to promote high quality research, social and institutional factors are as important as individual research skills. They recommend a multi-faceted approach that includes nurturing of social relationships and collaborations as well as opportunities to increase technical research skills. As Khoo (2021, p. 8) observes, successful interventions need to address “ecologies” as well as “economies” of research practice. We developed a workshop in applied, qualitative research to help faculty rise to the challenge of increased research expectations. We focused on qualitative research because it does not require sophisticated statistical skills, making it assessable to faculty who never studied inferential statistics or whose statistical skills have faded from disuse. Applied research focuses on practical problems or challenges within a particular setting; results are visible and can reinforce the motivation toward further research. Applied research also aligns with our university’s mission of making contributions of

social relevance to the community. We chose a condensed format for the workshop because our faculty often juggle multiple roles. Many serve as both faculty and administrator, and some who serve dual roles on campus also work as consultants or entrepreneurs off-campus.

This “resource leveraging” and “bricolage” of roles to increase economic security is common in poor and developing countries, and Bolivia is one of the poorest countries in South America. Life amid poverty often engenders adaptability, resiliency, and resource leveraging, even among individuals who are not personally impoverished. One manifestation is “bricolage,” the combining of a range of available resources or roles in response to social and economic challenges (Morris & Tucker, 2021, p. 11).

We believed a condensed format was essential to make the workshop accessible to diverse faculty. Borrowing from previous research, we encouraged participants to form teams and collaborate on research projects. Overall, the goal was for faculty to achieve near-term success in applied, qualitative research and for that success to reinforce aspirations for ongoing research productivity. We conducted the workshop twice in-person, on campus and twice online.

In both formats, the condensed workshop proved effective in boosting applied, qualitative research activity. It can be adapted to support research productivity elsewhere. We implemented the workshop following the action research model: plan, act, observe, reflect, then renew your efforts based on lessons learned (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Kuhne & Quigley, 1997). Action research, often called “a case study with an agenda,” is suitable for attempting specific improvements in defined situations. The remainder of this paper summarizes the learning objectives and materials, implementation, and results (the plan, act, and observe stages) of the initial workshop design. It presents conclusions and lessons learned (reflection) and plans for future improvement. The paper closes with recommendations for adapting the workshop to other locations.

Learning Objectives and Content (Plan)

The learning objectives address technical skills, such as data collection and coding techniques, but also include items related to broad research culture such as ethics, working with an internal review board (IRB) and finding research partners. The learning objectives are found in Table 1.

Table 1. Learning Objectives

1. Position your research question within a research paradigm.
2. Identify and manage ethical issues.
3. Select a qualitative model for your research.
4. Plan data collection techniques.
5. Collect and code your data.
6. Identify strategies for success.
7. Present a qualitative research proposal to your peers.

Position Your Research Question within a Research Paradigm

The first objective concerns how attitudes toward “truth” are reflected in various research paradigms. This helps participants appreciate the contributions of different paradigms and understand where their own, prospective research falls within the realm of inquiry. Participants explore how qualitative research contributes to problem solving, as well as its limitations. A basic tenet is that neither quantitative nor qualitative research is “value free.” Material for this objective draws from Dewey (1907), Plato (2012), and Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) sociological research paradigm. Participants review four research paradigms: “interpretive,” “radical humanist,” “functionalist,” and “radical structuralist” (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). They consider which paradigm most appeals to them; this provides insight into which research communities of practice and journals they will find most welcoming.

Identify and Manage Ethical Issues

Typically, qualitative research involves interactions with others (e.g., interviews, surveys, observations). This creates the potential for misinformation, manipulation, and other harms. Steps to safeguard human subjects must be in place before data are gathered. Researchers must document these safeguards or risk their research being rejected by journals and conference organizers. Learning materials draw from the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research and its Belmont Report (1979). Materials and group discussions address the role of IRBs and steps that may be taken when the home institution lacks a formal IRB or comparable process.

Select a Qualitative Model for Your Research

This segment explores five models of qualitative research identified by Creswell (2013, 2015, 2016). Other material includes Merriam and Tisdell (2016), MacDonald (2012), Hancock and Algozzine (2011), Bringle *et al* (2009), Patterson and Williams (2002), and Smith (2020). Participants study five qualitative models: narrative, phenomenology, ethnography, case study, and grounded research. They also study action research, “a case study with an agenda,” and the benefits of mixed methods research. Each model asks a different question (Smith, 2020; Creswell, 2013). Narrative research asks, “What happened to this person(s) and what can we learn from his or her experience?” Phenomenology asks, “What is the same about their experiences, and what does it mean?” Ethnography asks, “What we can learn about this group, especially its intergroup mores and processes?” In case studies, the question is, “What may be learned from this case?” Some scholars view case studies as a choice of “what to study” rather than a separate model. To highlight the value of local, applied research, we include action research. Typically, researchers strive to minimize and correct for the impact of their own biases. In action research, certain values and desired outcomes are acknowledged and embraced. The questions are, “How can I improve this situation? How can I make this happen?” Grounded research is appropriate when existing theory or frameworks seem inadequate to explain the topic of concern. The researcher asks, “What new theory could explain this phenomenon?” Grounded research is often practical, seeking to address specific problems or issues (Creswell, 2013).

Workshop materials also address the value of conceptual frameworks: “mini-theories” or patterns of relationship among items of interest. Frameworks guide investigators in data collection and interpretation, helping them think in a logical, systematic manner. A suitable framework suggests concepts and terminology to be applied in a study. Interpreting data in relation to a framework helps elevate the study from mere description to analysis. We review framework examples such as Burrell and Morgan’s sociological research paradigm (1979), the organizational legitimacy framework (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975), and the significant learning taxonomy (Fink, 2013). We provide examples from sociology, economics, political science, and nursing that can be applied to other fields. If no suitable framework exists, researchers can contribute to a field by developing and testing a new framework.

Plan Data Collection Techniques

Participants review data collection from documents and archives, artifacts, observations, surveys, interviews, and focus groups. The material for this segment is drawn from Hancock and Algozzine (2011), Merriam and Tisdell (2016), Bringle *et al* (2009), Smith (2020), Patterson and Williams (2002), Giddings and Grant (2009), and Creswell (2013, 2016). Participants review the concepts of validity, reliability, and transferability. They study ways to enhance the quality of data, such as through triangulation (collecting data from diverse sources and through multiple means). Qualitative researchers do not claim transcendent, objective truth; the goal is to discover insights, patterns, and principles that can be usefully applied elsewhere (transferability). Workshop materials also address pitfalls such as faulty constructs, “self-selection” bias, “social desirability” bias, and “errors of omission.”

Collect and Code Your Data.

Participants consider practical concerns related to data collection and analysis. This includes capturing background details such as when, where, and by whom data were collected, and adhering to data-retention guidelines. We stress the value of adopting published protocols and rubrics to guide analysis, *where appropriate*; this helps “pre-validate” data collection and coding methods. Qualitative research often involves content analysis of documents, news articles, marketing reports, advertisements, Internet files, transcripts, photographs, and illustrations. Participants study form-oriented and meaning-oriented content analysis, and the importance of triangulation (e.g., multiple coders) to establish validity (Smith, 2020). The process may be streamlined through use of qualitative data analysis (QDA) software, though human coders still play a crucial role. As content analysis progresses, promising new avenues of inquiry may emerge and researchers may need to redirect their efforts. Qualitative research is “emergent” and rarely proceeds exactly to plan (Creswell, 2013; Smith, 2020).

Identify Strategies for Success

“You have to learn the rules of the game, and then you have to play better than anyone else.”

This quote is attributed to Albert Einstein. If one of the finest minds of the 20th Century could not escape the gamesmanship in human affairs, neither will most faculty researchers. This final segment features “insider tips” and lessons-learned regarding the publication process. Some scholars acquire this information by talking with

peers during coffee breaks at academic conferences, or from an effective faculty mentor. This workshop serves individuals who may lack these beneficial experiences. This segment also includes the practical benefits of a good literature review, such as identifying appropriate terminology, frameworks, and potential publication venues. Finally, participants review the benefits and challenges of working with research partners.

Implementing the Workshop (Act)

Our institution serves over 3,000 undergraduate and graduate students on a main campus and two satellite campuses in Bolivia. The total number of faculty fluctuates between 100 and 125; this includes full-time faculty, faculty who also serve as administrators, and professionals from the private and nonprofit sectors who combine teaching with their off-campus roles. Given the *bricolage* of roles that is characteristic of developing countries (and an increasing feature of some developed countries, witness the increase in “gig” workers), these distinctions are fluid. All faculty serve by renewable contract; a traditional “tenure” system does not apply. All faculty were invited to participate in the workshop, and participants reflected the varied nature of our faculty.

We conducted the workshop twice in-person, on campus. During the COVID-19 pandemic, we conducted it twice online (via Zoom) using the same objectives, materials, and small group activities. Like Huijser and Sim (2022), we found that what originated as a crisis proved to be an opportunity; the online format allowed us to include faculty from diverse locations, increasing possibilities for collaboration. In both formats, individual study of materials was followed by five, 2-hour group sessions (10 contact hours) that extended over one to two weeks. The first four sessions feature discussion and application of learning materials. In the last session, participants present draft proposals and receive feedback from peers; this sharing of research interests and goals opens another door to collaboration. Participants then finalize and submit their proposals in writing to workshop facilitators for confidential feedback. We accept both individual and team proposals.

Individual Study Prior to the First Group Session

For learning materials, we prepared a manual that is organized around learning objectives 1 through 6 (Table 1). Participants receive the manual in PDF form two weeks before the first group session. It is prepared in English, the host institution’s instructional language. We also created narrated, PowerPoint presentations for those who prefer an audio-visual format. The manual and PowerPoint slides contain extensive reference citations, allowing participants to pursue topics in more depth. Further, we ask participants to identify two or three academic articles that interest them and represent the type of research they aspire to conduct. Their choices offer clues into research paradigms and models that may best align with their individual interests and research goals. We encourage participants to submit questions prior to the initial group activity via an electronic message board.

Session 1: Position Your Research Question within a Research Paradigm and Identify Ethical Issues

After an overview of the workshop, facilitators lead a discussion of Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) sociological research model. In small groups of 4 to 6 individuals, participants discuss their chosen research articles in relation

to this model, using the following prompts:

- Do your chosen articles reflect a positivist or constructivist perspective?
- Do your papers embody a research paradigm described by Burrell and Morgan (1979)?
- Do the authors reveal these paradigms either explicitly or implicitly?
- How might researchers use different paradigms to investigate the same research topic?
- What models, theories, or conceptual frameworks are referenced in your chosen articles? (This encourages participants to consider the role of models and frameworks in guiding research.)

We also discuss ethical guidelines for working with human subjects, the role of IRBs, and steps to help ensure ethical research in the absence of a formal IRB process. In small groups, participants initiate their research plan by responding to the following prompts:

- What is your draft, proposed research question? (Questions may be revised during the workshop.)
- Why is this question important? Who will care about the results of your research?
- What research paradigm most closely aligns with your planned research?
- Are there existing models or conceptual frameworks that might guide your research? (Participants may identify models and frameworks during their individual article search or through group discussions).
- Will your research involve human subjects? If so, what ethical concerns does this raise (e.g., privacy, anonymity, reciprocity, justice)?

By the close of the first session, participants have identified a draft research question, associated it with a research paradigm, considered possible models or frameworks to guide their research, and made initial identification of potential ethical issues.

Session 2: Select a Qualitative Model for Your Research

During the second session, participants explore five qualitative research models, described above. We briefly review each model, then participants deepen their understanding through small-group activity. Exercises 1 and 2 stress the value of different research models and promote skills for assessing the research of others, an important component of a research culture. In Exercises 3 and 4, participants focus on their personal research objectives.

Exercise 1. The COVID-19 vaccination rate in Bolivia is below the global average and leaders wish to increase the vaccination rate. With your group, create 3 concise, focused research questions to help address different aspects of the problem, then suggest an appropriate research model for each question. Strive for a diversity of research questions and associated models. (Exercises 1 and 2 were designed specifically for participants in Bolivia. Alternate exercises can be developed for participants from other cultures and regions.)

Exercise 2. The Organization of American States (OAS) and Bolivia have partnered to promote digital commerce for micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs). The goal is to help thousands of small

businesses participate in the digital economy. You have been hired to assess the impact of this program, which can be assessed from multiple perspectives. With your group, create three concise, targeted research questions to help assess the impact of this program, then suggest an appropriate research model for each question.

Exercise 3. Refine your individual, prospective research question and share with others in the group, but do *not* immediately reveal your prospective choice of research model. Ask others in the group to provide feedback, using the prompts below:

- As the research question is currently stated, is it sufficiently focused to anchor a single project, or might it be separated into two or more distinct studies? (New researchers may be tempted to tackle too much in a single study.)
- As the research question is currently stated, what model or models seem most appropriate for this project?

Exercise 4. Based on your individual study and group discussion, select a prospective model for your research; share with other participants and facilitators for feedback.

By the close of the second session, participants have deepened their understanding of various research models, refined their research question, and tentatively selected a model for their own research.

Session 3: Plan data collection techniques; Collect and code your data

We briefly review various data collection techniques. In small groups, participants develop plans for their individual or team projects by discussing the following prompts:

- What data do you plan to collect?
- How, where, and when do you plan to collect it (e.g., collection technique, schedule, locations)?
- Must you seek permission from others to collect data? From whom?
- How will you address ethical issues (e.g., privacy, anonymity, reciprocity, justice)?
- If your research involves human subjects, how will you obtain ethics approval for the project (e.g., submission to an IRB or alternate approval, such as from a Dean)?
- Will you combine qualitative and quantitative data? (Demographic data are often used to add context to a qualitative study.)
- Have you identified conceptual frameworks, rubrics, interview protocols, or surveys from prior research that can be adapted for your study?
- How can you enhance the validity, reliability, and *transferability* of your results through use of outside experts, triangulation, or other means?

Participants present their data collection plans to other group members and facilitators for comment. To end the session, we review the “constant comparative” process for content analysis (Reid & Marshall 2009, pp. 153-154), coding systems, and options for qualitative data analysis (QDA) software.

Session 4: Identify strategies for success

During this session, we review strategies for presenting and publishing research results, including both academic and practitioner venues. In small groups, participants discuss the following prompts:

- Do you plan to recruit research partners? What are the potential advantages and disadvantages of research partners?
- What are 2-3 conferences where you might present your research and receive feedback from peers?
- What are 3 journals, newsletters, or other venues where you might publish your research report?

Facilitators and other participants offer suggestions regarding dissemination plans. To close this session, we review the research proposal outline, Appendix A, so expectations for the final group session are clear.

Session 5: Presentation of Research Proposals

During the final session, participants present their individual or team proposals and receive feedback from peers and facilitators. Participants then submit a refined research proposal to facilitators and receive private, written feedback.

Results (Observe)

We conducted this workshop four times from 2017 to 2021. Participants included 34 men and 26 women (60 total). Recently, we surveyed participants to learn their thoughts about the workshop, their scholarly activity since the workshop, and any suggestions for improvement. About half of participants (28) responded. Some early participants are no longer associated with the host university and their contact information may be out of date. Nevertheless, a 46% response rate is within the norms for academic studies (Holtom et al, 2022).

Of the respondents, 13 have published their research in peer-reviewed publications or currently have draft articles under review, and two more have made presentations at academic conferences, a first step toward dissemination. Their research projects reflect an array of applied topics such as reducing domestic violence, promoting digital tools among local businesses, increasing access to safe drinking water, and helping small farmers tap into the world market for quinoa. Results are similar for women and men. This gender parity is not surprising; compared to global averages, women play a significant role in political and social life in Bolivia (Salvatierra, 2019), and women are well-represented at all levels of faculty and administration at our university. Ideally, all participants would have completed presentations and publications since their workshop. This is not an ideal situation, however. Our faculty often perform two or three roles, a common challenge among scholars in developing countries. Several participants have had notable success. A participant from the first workshop (who performs multiple roles) has since published several articles and chairs a research committee of the Academy of International Business (AIB-Latin America and the Caribbean). Another early participant has published three articles since the workshop, has working papers in progress, and co-chaired a research conference with participants from multiple Latin American countries and the United States. Several participants who were both part-time faculty and graduate students used

the workshop to initiate proposals for doctoral dissertations; their proposals were accepted and their research is ongoing. Finally, several participants from on-campus workshops returned for an online workshop because the interaction helps energize their scholarship. This reflects earlier findings on the benefits of social support and membership in a research culture (Reid & Marshall 2009; Khoo 2021; Bojko & Kowalczyk 2021). Like Khoo (2021) and Imad *et al* (2022), we find online sessions are effective for engaging faculty in research; results do not vary between on-campus and online workshops. In assessing outcomes, “qualitative and relational” measures are as important as numerical data (van der Rijst *et al*, 2022, 1). This is especially true when the goal is to promote a research culture, not merely to impart skills. The survey invited open-ended comments to assess outcomes from the perspective of participants. Here are representative, positive comments:

- The workshop's content was innovative.
- The workshop's content managed to update my research skills.
- The workshop's content encouraged me to do more research and publications.

Participants also offered suggestions for improvement, such as the following:

- I suggest realizing the course in two parts, one to standardize the knowledge and the second part of prioritizing a field and a particular research with respective coaching.
- I found many ways to apply but we need more coaching and monitoring.
- Dig deeper into research.

Discussion and Conclusions (Reflect)

Based on research productivity, survey data, and participant comments, the condensed workshop is successful in helping faculty advance their research agenda. However, in our desire to limit time requirements to make the workshop accessible to diverse faculty who perform multiple roles, we may have underestimated the importance of *sustained* collaboration. To use Khoo's typology, the original design was more effective in promoting the “economies” than the “ecologies” of research (2021, p. 8). Upon reflection, the requests for more sustained coaching and collaboration suggest that the value of increased support will mitigate any potential strain of increased time requirements, as will continued use of the online format.

Thus, future workshops will have added sessions to support participants past the point of developing their research proposal. First, we plan to add two sessions where participants discuss findings from their literature reviews; this should help participants refine their analytical frameworks and research methodologies and make progress in their literature reviews. Another planned addition is a panel session with editors of academic and practitioner journals. Participants will “pitch” their proposals to editors and receive immediate feedback to help improve their projects. The interaction with editors should reinforce momentum to carry projects forward to publication. Together, the added sessions and interactions will provide more space for participants to organize and solidify their learning (Sweet *et al*, 2017) and develop “academic identities” as members of a research community of practice (Khoo 2021, p. 8). As facilitators, we must commit to more extended engagement with participants, changing our role from “change agent” to “partners in arms” (Sheffield and Timmermans 2021, p. 117). In the spirit of action research, we will continue to assess outcomes and make adjustments as warranted to promote a collaborative

community of faculty researchers.

Recommendations

This workshop can be adapted for academic development in other regions. The pre-workshop, self-study materials apply universally, as do the exercises in Session 1 and the data collection strategies discussed in Session 3. In our workshops, the first two exercises for Session 2 involve developing research questions related to “real world” challenges in Bolivia. For workshops in other regions, different examples of well-defined, practical, local challenges may be substituted. The strategies for success, explored in Session 4, are broadly applicable to North and South America, though we cannot comment on their applicability to publishing in academic and practitioner journals in the Eastern hemisphere. We welcome queries from colleagues who want more information on the learning materials for the workshop, or who may wish to collaborate in future workshops. Please feel free to contact any author.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank participants of the International Conference on Entrepreneurship, Education, and Digital Transformation (2022), and participants of the Effective Learning Strategies – American Accounting Association Annual meeting (2022) for beneficial suggestions regarding this paper.

References

- Marta Bojko M., & Kowalczyk, B. (2021). Mentoring models in research in Polish academia. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 1-15. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1360144X.2021.1970558?journalCode=rja20>
- Bringle, R., Steinberg, K., & Williams, M. (2009). *Service Learning Research Primer*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Indiana University-Purdue University Center for Service and Learning.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*. Newcastle, Great Britain: Athanaeum Press Ltd.,
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- ____ (2015). *A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- ____ (2016). *Thirty Essential Skills for the Qualitative Researcher*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE..
- Dewey, J. (1907). Reality and the criterion for truth of ideas. *Mind*, 16, 317–342.
- Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational legitimacy: Social values and organizational behavior. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 18(1), 122-136.
- Fink, L. D. (2013). *Creating Significant Learning Experiences*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Giddings, L., & Grant, B. (2009). From rigour to trustworthiness: Validating mixed methods. *Mixed Methods Research for Nursing and the Health Sciences*. S. Andrew & E. Halcomb (Eds.). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.

- Hancock, D., & Algozzine, B. (2011). *Doing Case Study Research: A Practical Guide for Beginning Researchers* (2nd ed). Columbia University, New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Holtom, B., Baruch, Y., & Aguinis, H. (2022). Survey response rates: Trends and a validity assessment framework. *Human Relations*, 75(8), 1560–1584.
- Huijser, H., & Sim, K. N. (2022). Academic development in times of crisis. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 27(2), 111-113.
- Imad, M., Dewsbury, B., & Foote, S. (2022). (Re)engaging faculty in the age of burnout: A wicked problem. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 36(3), 82-86.
- Khoo, T. (2021) Creating spaces to develop research culture. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 28(2), 217-229. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1360144X.2021.1987913>
- Kuhne, G., & Quigley, B. (1997). Understanding and using action research in practice settings. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 73, 23-40.
- Merriam, S., & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morris, M. H., & Tucker, R. (2021). The entrepreneurial mindset and poverty. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(1), 102-131.
- MacDonald, C. (2012). Understanding participatory action research: A qualitative research methodology option. *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 13(2), 34-50.
- National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report*. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html>
- Patterson, M., & Williams, D. (2002). Collecting and analyzing qualitative data: Hermeneutic principles, methods and case examples. *Advances in Tourism Applications Series*, 9. Sagamore Publishing: Champaign, IL. Retrieved from https://www.fs.usda.gov/rm/pubs_other/rmrs_2002_patterson_m001.pdf
- Plato. (2012). *The Republic*. B. Jowett, translator. Luton, Bedfordshire, UK: Andrews UK, Limited.
- Reid, A., & Marshall, S. (2009). Institutional development for the enhancement of research and research training. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14(2), 145–157.
- Van der Rijst, R., Dean, B., & Laksov, K. (2022). Revisiting the impact of academic development: scholarship and practice. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 27(1), 1-3.
- Sheffield, S., & Timmermans, J. (2021). Creating a collaborative community spirit for the future of academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 26(2), 117-120.
- Smith, M. (2020). *Research Methods in Accounting* (5th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Sweet, C., Carpenter, R., & Blyth, H. (2017). Reaching those faculty not easily reached: How CTLs can improve participation in faculty programming through faculty innovators and online instruction. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 9, 73-83.
- The Pathways Commission. (2014). *How Integrating Professionally Oriented Faculty Enhances an Institution's Mission*. Sarasota, FL: American Accounting Association and American Institute of CPAs. Retrieved from <http://www2.aaahq.org/images/PathwaysReport1.pdf>
- Salvatierra, A. (2019). Ask a Senator: How does Bolivia have such a high representation of women in politics,

and why is it important to include women's voices in politics? *UN-Women* February 27, 2019. Retrieved from [https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2019/2/ask-a-senator-about-politics-in-\[Country ID\]](https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2019/2/ask-a-senator-about-politics-in-[Country ID])

Author Information

Larita J. Killian

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4143-621X>

Indiana University

Columbus,

United States

Contact e-mail: lkillia@iupuc.edu


Sergio Garcia Agreda

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0580-6172>

Universidad Privada Boliviana,

Bolivia

Mariana Pérez Escobar

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1839-5245>

Universidad Privada Boliviana,

Bolivia

Appendix A: Create a Research Proposal

(This proposal outline was used in the four workshops presented in this paper).

1. What is your research question?
2. Why is this research question important? Who will care about the results of this research?
3. Will your research methodology be primarily guided by positivism or constructivism?
4. What research model will guide this project?
5. Will your research involve interaction with human subjects? If so, how will you obtain informed consent from them? How will you demonstrate respect for the autonomy of the subjects, safeguard anonymity of subjects, and demonstrate reciprocity?
6. What types of data will you collect? Please be specific.
7. How will you enhance the validity and transferability of the data and your results?
8. Where can you present the results of this research? (Identify meetings, conferences, newsletters, journals, or other venues).
9. Do you expect to conduct this research alone or with a partner? If you expect to have a partner, explain the benefit of having a partner.