Spring 2009

The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education

Volume 5 Issue 1

The Journal of Academic Administration In Higher Education

Contents

Volume Five Issue One
Spring 2009

The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education

JW Press

Martin, Tennessee

Published by

JW Press

P.O. Box 49

Martin, Tennessee 38237

Printed in the United States of America

Board of Reviewers

Editor

Dr. Edd R. Joyner
Edd@JWPress.com

The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education.

JAAHE is devoted to providing a venue for the distribution, discussion, and documentation of the art and science of administration of academic units in colleges and universities. A cornerstone of the philosophy that drives JAAHE, is that we all can learn from the research, practices, and techniques of administration in discipline-based units other than our own. The Information Systems Chair can share with and learn from the Chair of the English Department. To enhance this cross pollination, submitted manuscripts should not dwell on the disciplines involved but rather the methods, techniques, environments, etc that make administration more or less effective or efficient.

Manuscripts that support the advancement of the administration of academic units in higher education are actively sought for publication in The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education. Articles that report on innovative practices and articles that research theoretical issues in administration are equally desired. Additionally, papers that take a philosophical perspective on the state of higher education administration of yesterday, today and/or tomorrow are welcome.

The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education is listed in the 7th Ed. of Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Educational Psychology and Administration (2005-2006).

Subscription and submission information is available online at JWPress.com/JAAHE.htm

Demonstrating Faculty Qualifications to an AACSB International Peer Review Team

Carl Gooding
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, Alabama

Richard Cobb
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, Alabama

William Scroggins
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, Alabama

ABSTRACT

In a previous paper the authors suggested a schema to be used by an AACSB accredited business school at a regional university to determine who is and who is not "academically" or "professionally" qualified in accordance with the Standards of AACSB International. This paper provides a synopsis of an approach to demonstrate to a Peer Review Team that the attestations of faculty qualifications in the tables of the school's "Fifth Year Maintenance Report" are meritorious.

Introduction

Under the category "Basis for Judgment" for Standard #10 of the AACSB International standards for business accreditation is the stipulation that

> *"a school should develop appropriate criteria consistent with its mission for the classification of faculty as academically or professionally qualified"* (1, p. 43).

In a paper published in *The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education* (2) the authors offered an approach to the development of metrics which can be used by a business school at a regional university to satisfy the expectations of this stipulation.

In February 2008 an AACSB Peer Review Team (PRT) visited the College of Commerce and Business Administration at Jacksonville State University (JSU) and subsequently submitted a positive recommendation to AACSB which, in turn, led to maintenance of accreditation for the College. The authors received feedback from the PRT which indicated satisfaction with the metrics described in the aforementioned paper. At least as importantly, however, was the PRT's expressed appreciation for the documentation provided in advance of the visit to support claims, based on the metrics, as to who was and who was not "academically" or "professionally" qualified. The reason the College prepared this detailed documentation can be found under the category "Guidance for Documentation" for Standard 10. Specifically, the first bullet in this category reads:

> *"The school should provide information on academic and professional qualifications of each faculty member."* (1, p. 44).

One of the authors has substantial experience as an AACSB PRT member. He has experienced numerous situations where the school provides the necessary information in the form of faculty prepared academic vitae. These vitae typically do not follow a uniform format and PRT members have to waste valuable time trying to sort out whether or not they agree with the AQ or PQ claims cited in the school's Fifth Year Maintenance Report (Tables 10.1 and 10.2).

What follows is a description of a three-ring binder developed to provide the PRT with supporting details regarding faculty qualifications in an orderly, uniform format and with tables regarding journal articles to assist the team in evaluating the portfolio of aggregate faculty research productivity as specified in Standard 2 (1, p. 23).

Outline of Documentation

The Table of Contents for the binder of supporting documentation is reproduced as Table 1.

TABLE 1: Faculty Qualifications, Supporting Information

Tab A:	CCBA Policy re. Academic and Professional Qualifications
Tab B:	List of Journal Articles with Acceptance Rates: 2003-2007
Tab C:	Titles of Journal Articles: 2003-2007
Tab D:	Accounting Faculty Five Year Profiles
Tab E:	Economics Faculty Five Year Profiles
Tab F:	Finance Faculty Five Year Profiles
Tab G:	Legal Studies Faculty Five Year Profiles
Tab H:	Management Faculty Five Year Profiles
Tab I:	Marketing Faculty Five Year Profiles
Tab J:	Statistics/Quantitative Methods Faculty Five Year Profiles
Tab K:	Narrative Justifications Regarding AQ or PQ Status of Selected Faculty Members
Note:	Reference copies of AACSB Tables 10.1 and 10.2 are provided in the front pocket of this notebook.

Tab A

The first tab provides the policy the school followed to determine the AQ or PQ status of individual faculty members. The policy is described in reference 2. If the policy is sufficiently rigorous and relevant to the mission of the school, and if it is recognized as such by the PRT well in advance of the visit, then there should be few, if any, examples of discordance between the school's AQ/PQ assessments and those of the PRT. Those who would use reference 2 as a model for developing a policy, however, are reminded that it was developed for a business school in a regional university which has a substantial commitment to community outreach in the area of economic development. An AQ/PQ policy for a research university or a liberal arts college may be similar in structure, but would be markedly different in terms of metrics.

Tabs B and C

The PRT will make an assessment regarding the appropriateness of the faculty's portfolio of intellectual contributions across three areas: "Learning & Pedagogical Scholarship", "Discipline-Based Scholarship" and "Contributions to Practice". This assessment will be made with regard to the school's stated relative importance of these three areas as referenced in the school's mission. Also, PRT members are likely to raise questions about the quality of the school's intellectual contributions. Tabs B and C were developed for this binder to provide the PRT with a general feel for the types of journals and areas of research in the faculty portfolio. Tab B lists all the journal titles in which the faculty published during 2003-2007 and, as a relative indicator of quality, the acceptance rate for each of the journals. Tab C lists all of the titles of journal articles published during the five year period. In the case of our school's maintenance review, a cursory perusal of these two tables provided the PRT with evidence that the faculty was primarily involved in "contributions to practice" and, secondarily, in "learning and pedagogical scholarship" as appropriate to the mission of the school.

Tabs D through J

Using vitae and annual reports already in the files, the department heads and their administrative secretaries prepared a draft of a five year profile for every person who held faculty rank, both full-time and part-time. The individual faculty members were then asked to carefully review their profiles and additions and corrections were made as needed. This approach, as opposed to requesting self prepared profiles, relieved the faculty members of this time consuming task and ensured the school's administration that every profile was prepared following the same precise format. The purpose of this approach was to make the PRT's task of assessing these documents less onerous. Table 2 provides the standard content outline for the five year faculty profile.

The tabs containing these profiles were organized by teaching disciplines, not by academic department. This is a significant distinction. A school's organization structure is not a factor in accreditation evaluations (unless, somehow, it could be considered an impediment to overall high quality). Some schools lump together disparate disciplines which happen to be in the same department when preparing Tables 10.1 and 10.2. When this happens the PRT chairperson has to request that the tables be prepared anew prior to the visit. It is the teaching disciples, not arbitrary organizational constructs, which are separately evaluated in Standard 10. For instance, in the business school at Jacksonville State University there are only two academic departments but, as shown in Table 1, there are seven distinct teaching disciplines.

As indicated in Table 2 each faculty member's "validating experiences" are sorted into four categories. These experiences are delineated in the appendix of reference 2. All of the entries in Categories A and B and a few of those in C are counted for inclusion in AACSB Table 10.1. These intellectual contributions are distributed in this table across the three areas cited above: "learning and pedagogical scholarship" (L), "discipline-based scholarship" (D) and "contributions to practice" (P) and they are further distributed within these three categories as "peer reviewed journals" (PRJ) and "other intellectual contributions" (OIC). To facilitate the review process for PRT members, every intellectual contribution which is included in the cells of Table 10.1 is coded at the right margin of its listing on a faculty member's five year profile. An example of a Category A entry on a faculty profile is shown below:

> Zanzig, Jeff and Dale Flesher, *"GAAP Requirements for Nonpublic Companies,"* The CPA Journal, May 2006, pp.40-44. PRJ/P

TABLE 2:
OUTLINE OF FIVE YEAR FACULTY PROFILES

Name:	Primary Teaching Discipline:
Date of hire:	Participating or Supporting:
Tenure status:	Full-time or part-time:
(TT, NTT or date of tenure)	AQ, PQ or Other:
Courses Taught (most recent 5 years only)	
Education (all degrees and certifications with dates)	
Employment History (current and prior employment – include dates of promotion for academic ranks)	
Validating Experiences:	
Category A (peer reviewed journals and comparable contributions)	
Category B (other journals, proceedings, grant reports, etc.)	
Category C (presentations w/o proceedings, boards, faculty internships, etc.)	
Category D (professional activities not factored into the AQ or PQ decision)	
Works in Progress (which will lead to intellectual contributions)	

The notation in the right margin indicates that this entry is a "peer-reviewed journal" (PRJ) and a "contribution to practice" (P). Taken collectively, these right margin entries provide PRT members with a first impression of individual faculty member qualifications and a sense of the faculty's portfolio vis-à-vis the school's mission.

The final category on the five year profile is "Works in Process". It is important to provide evidence to the PRT that nearly every faculty member has a research agenda which will lead to an improved portfolio of intellectual contributions. This is especially true if a disproportionate number of the publications in the current portfolio are dated during the two most recent years in the accreditation cycle. Now that the 2003 standards have been fully implemented PRT's are expecting to see Tables 10.1 and 10.2 as attachments to each of first four annual maintenance reports which are submitted with the more in-depth fifth year report. This underscores the concept that the five year time period for the inclusion of intellectual contributions and other validating experiences for the maintenance of AQ or PQ status is a rolling five years, not just a snapshot at a point in time once every five years. In other words, the school needs to have 90% of its faculty academically or professionally qualified all of the time.

Tab K

The inclusion of this tab was suggested by visiting consultants. The entries are narrative summaries of the qualifications for faculty members who may be considered to be only marginally AQ or PQ. The purpose is to explain to the PRT how and why the qualification is merited. It may also be prudent to provide narratives for faculty members in the "Other" category who are nonetheless valued colleagues. On the other hand, the school loses credibility with its PRT if it attempts to claim AQ or PQ status for faculty members who clearly have not maintained an ongoing program of research and/or development activities.

Conclusion

It behooves business schools to be ever conscious of the fact that the members of the AACSB Peer Review Team are volunteers and, therefore, every effort should be made to facilitate the process for them. The authors believe that the attention to detail by our faculty and staff prior to the recent visit to our school enabled the PRT to completely evaluate our candidacy for maintenance of accreditation without being unduly burdened by the need to seek additional information. In this light, the PRT confirmed that the binder described in this paper made a significant contribution to our successful experience with the maintenance process.

References

Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation, AACSB International, adopted: April 2003, latest revision: January, 2008.

Gooding, Carl, Richard Cobb and William Scroggins, *"The AACSB Faculty Qualifications Standard: A Regional University's Metrics for Assessing AQ and PQ,"* The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education, Spring 2007, pp.1-5.

Trends in Collaborative Research: Changes in Collaborative Research in the Business Disciplines of Finance, Management, & Marketing

Shawn M. Keough
University of New England
Meghann J. Worthing
The University of Texas at Tyler

ABSTRACT:

This paper investigates whether the trend of increased levels of collaboration in journal articles found in disciplines such as science, technology, and medicine is occurring within the business disciplines of finance, management, and marketing. Results of the study indicate that the number of coauthored articles within all three disciplines have increased significantly over the past 25 years. Reasons driving the increase in collaboration are briefly discussed.

Introduction

In the realm of academic research, collaborative efforts provide a means to produce quality research more efficiently. Studies show that the level of collaborative research has increased dramatically over time in areas such as science, technology, medicine, and social work education (Bordons & Gomez, 2000; Cronin, 2001; Erlen, Siminoff, Sereika & Sutton, 1997; Epstein, 1993; Gelman & Gibelman, 1999; Luukkonen, Persson & Sivertsen, 1992; Norris, 1993). It has been suggested that "Coauthorship rates have risen across the board" (Cronin, Shaw, & LaBarre, 2003, p. 855).

A search of several business related databases was performed for studies investigating any changes in levels of collaborative efforts over time. No such studies were found. Thus, this study intends to address the question, "Are business-related disciplines facing the same trend toward increased numbers of coauthored studies as other disciplines?"

Method

Procedure

Because the academic area of business is divided into distinct, individual areas with journals specifically dedicated to those disciplines, it seemed prudent to focus on several areas of business individually. Further, while a number of business disciplines exist, this study only examined collaborative efforts within three areas: finance, management, and marketing. Thus, this study will examine whether or not the number of collaborative efforts within the business disciplines of finance, management, and marketing have increased over time.

To determine whether or not the number of coauthored journal articles within the disciplines of finance, management, and marketing has experienced significant change, recognized top journals within each functional area were examined. The list of recognized top journals in each discipline (See Table 1) was determined by drawing upon previous research involving journal rankings. Five top finance journals were identified; Journal of Business, Journal of Finance, Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, and Review of Financial Studies (Krishnan & Bricker, 2004; Werner & Brouthers, 2002). Six top management journals were included; Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Administrative Sciences Quarterly, Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Management, and Journal of Organizational Behavior (Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1992; Takai & Meyer, 1999; Werner & Brouthers, 2002). Six top marketing journals were examined; Journal of Academy of Marketing Science, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Retailing, and Marketing Science (Guidry, Hollier, Johnson, Tanner & Veltsos, 2004; Werner & Brouthers, 2002). For each journal, every issue from January 1980 to December 2007 was examined and the number of authors for each journal article was noted as a sole authorship, two authors, three authors, four authors, or five or more authors. Three timeframes were established for comparison; 1980-1989, 1990-1999, and 2000-2007.

Table 1
Journals Examined by Discipline

Finance:
Journal of Business (JB)
Journal of Finance (JF)
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis (JFQA)
Journal of Financial Economics (JFE)
Review of Financial Studies (RFS)
Management:
Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)
Academy of Management Review (AMR)
Administrative Sciences Quarterly (ASQ)
Journal of Applied Psychology (JAP)
Journal of Management (JM)
Journal of Organizational Behavior (JOB)
Marketing:
Journal of Academy of Marketing Science (JAMS)
Journal of Consumer Research (JCR)
Journal of Marketing (JMkt)
Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)
Journal of Retailing (JR)
Marketing Science (MS)

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed to determine if significant differences in the mean number of authors has occurred over time within each business discipline. When significant differences were indicated, Tukey's HSD was performed to conduct pairwise comparisons among the three timeframes.

Results

A total of 20,155 articles were examined. Of these, 6027 (30%) were from finance journals, 8286 (41%) were from management journals, and 5842 (29%) were from marketing journals. The number of solo authored articles for all three disciplines decreased as a total percentage of articles published over time and the average number of authors per article increased (See Tables 2, 3, and 4). Only one of the sixteen journals examined did not mirror the overall trend, the Journal of Consumer Research, which saw a slight increase in the number and percentage of solely authored articles from the 1990-1999 timeframe to the 2000-2007 timeframe (See Table 4).

An ANOVA was computed for each of the three disciplines. The results of the ANOVAs are summarized in Table 5. The ANOVA results indicate statistically significant differences in the average number of authors between timeframes. The Tukey's procedure was performed to identify which timeframes experienced statically significant differences. This analysis indicated that for the finance and marketing disciplines, the average number of authors per article between timeframes increased significantly between both 1980-1989 to 1990-1999 and 1990-1999 to 2000-2007.

For the management discipline, the only significant increase in the average number of authors per article occurred between the 1980-1989 to 2000-2007 timeframes.

Discussion and Conclusion

The results clearly indicate that the business disciplines of finance, management, and marketing are experiencing the same type of migration toward increased levels of collaboration as other academic areas such as science, technology, and medicine. Some speculation has been made pertaining to the causes behind the trend toward increased collaboration including higher expectations by journals when considering articles for

Table 2
Top Finance Journals
Number of Authors and Percentage of Articles

		# Articles	1 Author	2 Authors	3 Authors	4 Authors	>4 Authors	Ave # Authors
JB	1980-1989	267	127 (48%)	112 (42%)	27 (10%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.63
	1990-1999	220	69 (31%)	114 (53%)	34 (15%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	1.87
	2000-2006	328	91 (28%)	143 (43%)	78 (24%)	15 (5%)	1 (< 1%)	2.06
JF	1980-1989	766	318 (42%)	348 (46%)	88 (11%)	10 (1%)	2 (< 1%)	1.73
	1990-1999	784	242 (31%)	375 (48%)	146 (19%)	19 (2%)	2 (< 1%)	1.93
	2000-2007	696	159 (23%)	300 (43%)	206 (30%)	31 (4%)	0 (0%)	2.16
JFQA	1980-1989	421	193 (45%)	184 (44%)	41 (10%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	1.65
	1990-1999	313	105 (34%)	149 (47%)	55 (18%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	1.87
	2000-2007	271	63 (23%)	120 (44%)	79 (29%)	9 (4%)	0 (0%)	2.13
JFE	1980-1989	320	119 (37%)	163 (51%)	34 (11%)	3 (1%)	1 (< 1%)	1.76
	1990-1999	406	119 (29%)	185 (46%)	99 (24%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	1.97
	2000-2007	580	123 (21%)	263 (45%)	171 (29%)	21 (4%)	2 (< 1%)	2.17
RFS	1980-1989	44	15 (34%)	25 (57%)	4 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.75
	1990-1999	322	110 (34%)	152 (47%)	54 (17%)	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	1.86
	2000-2007	289	83 (29%)	141 (49%)	55 (19%)	10 (3%)	0 (0%)	2.04
Period Totals	1980-1989	1818	772 (42%)	832 (46%)	194 (11%)	17 (1%)	3 (< 1%)	1.71
	1990-1999	2045	645 (32%)	975 (47%)	388 (19%)	35 (2%)	2 (< 1%)	1.91
	2000-2007	2164	519 (24%)	967 (45%)	589 (27%)	86 (4%)	3 (<1%)	2.12
Totals		6027	1936	2774	1171	138	8	1.92

publication, the demand for interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary research by funding agencies (Facione, 2006), and the growing need to perform international research (Cronin, Shaw, & La Barre, 2003). However, the primary culprit is often identified as higher tenure requirements.

Gelman & Gibelman (1999; p. 205) simply state, "the most obvious [reason] is the increased emphasis on scholarly production." The mantra "publish or perish" rings throughout the halls of academia. However, increased publishing requirements alone cannot be blamed for the marked rise in collaborative efforts. Ultimately, the blame can be laid upon time. Increased publishing requirements, larger student loads, an expectation of good teaching, advising requirements, committee participation, and grant writing all tap into the finite resource of time. At some point, collaboration becomes more of a requirement than a choice. The balance of publishing, teaching, and service suggested by many authors (Abbott & Sanders, 1991; Defleur, 2007; Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1992) must be maintained and while teaching and service components are not easily shared, publishing is.

Thus, faculty may be taking the only time-saving path readily available to them. Unfortunately, faculty taking the collaborative approach to publishing may be punished. Too many coauthored versus solo authored articles may not be acceptable for tenure requirements (Creamer, 2005; Facione, 2006). This presents an interesting conundrum for faculty and administrators alike.

Table 3
Top Management Journals
Number of Authors and Percentage of Articles

		# Articles	1 Author	2 Authors	3 Authors	4 Authors	>4 Authors	Ave # Authors
AMJ	1980-1989	550	160 (29%)	266 (48%)	95 (17%)	26 (5%)	3 (1%)	1.99
	1990-1999	556	124 (22%)	264 (48%)	122 (22%)	36 (6%)	10 (2%)	2.18
	2000-2007	528	107 (20%)	201 (38%)	147 (28%)	53 (10%)	20 (4%)	2.39
AMR	1980-1989	542	249 (46%)	234 (43%)	47 (9%)	10 (2%)	2 (< 1%)	1.68
	1990-1999	308	104 (34%)	148 (48%)	49 (16%)	7 (2%)	0 (0%)	1.87
	2000-2007	319	90 (28%)	129 (40%)	75 (24%)	20 (6%)	5 (2%)	2.13
ASQ	1980-1989	271	116 (43%)	118 (44%)	31 (11%)	4 (1%)	2 (1%)	1.74
	1990-1999	248	104 (41%)	98 (40%)	34 (14%)	8 (3%)	4 (2%)	1.83
	2000-2007	148	34 (23%)	72 (49%)	27 (18%)	9 (6%)	5 (4%)	2.16
JAP	1980-1989	958	217 (23%)	425 (44%)	218 (23%)	80 (8%)	18 (2%)	2.22
	1990-1999	861	137 (16%)	344 (40%)	242 (28%)	97 (11%)	41 (5%)	2.49
	2000-2007	840	65 (7%)	304 (36%)	286 (34%)	113 (14%)	72 (9%)	2.79
JM	1980-1989	271	95 (35%)	119 (45%)	47 (17%)	6 (2%)	4 (1%)	1.91
	1990-1999	377	88 (23%)	174 (46%)	83 (22%)	26 (7%)	6 (2%)	2.17
	2000-2007	335	65 (19%)	127 (38%)	100 (30%)	33 (10%)	10 (3%)	2.39
JOB	1980-1989	243	82 (34%)	107 (44%)	42 (17%)	10 (4%)	2 (1%)	1.94
	1990-1999	501	134 (27%)	215 (42%)	113 (23%)	29 (6%)	10 (2%)	2.13
	2000-2007	430	83 (19%)	175 (41%)	104 (24%)	45 (11%)	23 (5%)	2.42
Period Totals	1980-1989	2835	919 (32%)	1269 (45%)	480 (17%)	136 (5%)	31 (1%)	1.97
	1990-1999	2851	691 (24%)	1243 (44%)	643 (23%)	203 (7%)	71 (2%)	2.2
	2000-2007	2600	444 (17%)	1008 (39%)	739 (28%)	273 (11%)	135 (5%)	2.48
Totals		8286	2054	3520	1862	612	237	2.03

If the trend of increasing collaborative publishing continues to rise as the research suggests, administrators and faculty will be forced to re-evaluate faculty responsibilities and tenure requirements. Administrators may need to open their minds to new options for faculty to gain tenure. It may be that new requirements will need to be more appreciative of collaborative research as a means to meeting tenure requirements, or reduce the number of publications needed to gain tenure, or it could be that administrators will need reduce other faculty responsibilities in order to give faculty members the extra time required to research and publish on an individual basis if sole authorship of publications is a requirement administration is unwilling to give up. At this point, the trend is unmistakable, administrators and fac-

Table 5
ANOVA results with average number of authors as dependent variable

Independent Variable	F	P-value
Finance Timeframes	46.625	<.001
Management Timeframes	6.427	0.01
Marketing Timeframes	28.738	<.001

Table 4
Top Marketing Journals Number of Authors and Percentage of Articles

		# Articles	1 Author	2 Authors	3 Authors	4 Authors	>4 Authors	Ave # Authors
JAMS	1980-1989	367	120 (33%)	182 (50%)	60 (16%)	4 (1%)	1 (< 1%)	1.87
	1990-1999	325	112 (34%)	114 (36%)	82 (25%)	16 (5%)	1 (<1%)	2.02
	2000-2007	303	48 (16%)	98 (32%)	123 (41%)	33 (11%)	1 (<1%)	2.48
JCR	1980-1989	476	156 (33%)	223 (47%)	83 (17%)	9 (2%)	5 (1%)	1.92
	1990-1999	381	93 (24%)	188 (50%)	88 (23%)	9 (2%)	3 (1%)	2.06
	2000-2007	441	109 (25%)	214 (49%)	96 (21%)	15 (3%)	7 (2%)	2.09
JMkt	1980-1989	374	121 (32%)	180 (49%)	60 (16%)	13 (3%)	0 (0%)	1.91
	1990-1999	302	59 (20%)	129 (42%)	99 (33%)	10 (3%)	5 (2%)	2.25
	2000-2007	296	43 (15%)	107 (36%)	120 (41%)	22 (7%)	4 (1%)	2.45
JMR	1980-1989	460	139 (30%)	224 (49%)	82 (18%)	14 (3%)	1 (< 1%)	1.94
	1990-1999	395	79 (20%)	181 (45%)	115 (29%)	14 (4%)	6 (2%)	2.21
	2000-2007	368	54 (15%)	157 (43%)	132 (36%)	19 (5%)	5 (1%)	2.35
JR	1980-1989	241	90 (37%)	88 (37%)	56 (23%)	7 (3%)	0 (0%)	1.92
	1990-1999	204	37 (18%)	106 (53%)	56 (27%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)	2.14
	2000-2007	203	24 (12%)	84 (41%)	72 (35%)	20 (10%)	3 (2%)	2.48
MS	1980-1989	197	76 (38%)	90 (45%)	21 (11%)	5 (3%)	5 (3%)	1.85
	1990-1999	239	63 (26%)	105 (44%)	60 (25%)	9 (4%)	2 (1%)	2.09
	2000-2007	270	54 (20%)	107 (40%)	77 (29%)	28 (10%)	4 (1%)	2.34
Period Totals	1980-1989	2115	702 (33%)	987 (47%)	362 (17%)	52 (2%)	12 (1%)	1.91
	1990-1999	1846	443 (24%)	823 (45%)	500 (27%)	63 (3%)	17 (1%)	2.13
	2000-2007	1881	332 (18%)	767 (41%)	620 (33%)	137 (7%)	24 (1%)	2.34
Totals		5842	1477	2577	1482	252	53	2.11

ulty both will need to bow to the inevitable or do something useful to change it.

References

Abbott, D., & Sanders, G. (1991). On the road to tenure. *Family Relations,* 40(1), 106-109.

Bordons, M., & Gomez, I. (2000). Collaboration networks in science. In B. Cronin & H.B. Atkins, (Eds.). The web of knowledge: A Festschrift in honor of Eugene Garfield (pp. 197-213). Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. & ASIS.

Creamer, E. (2005). Promoting the effective evaluation of collaboratively produced scholarship: A call to action. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 102, 85-98.

Cronin, B. (2001). Hyperauthorship: A postmodern perversion or evidence of a structural shift in scholarly communication practices? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology,* 52(7), 558-569.

Cronin, B., Shaw, D., & La Barre, K. (2003). A cast of thousands: Coauthorships and subauthorship collaboration in the 20th century as manifested in the scholarly journal literature of psychology and philosophy. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology,* 54(9), 855-871.

Defleur, M. (2007). Raising the question #5 what is tenure and how do I get it? *Communication Education,* 56(1), 106-112.

Epstein, R. (1993). Six authors in search of a citation: Villains or victims of the Vancouver convention? *British Medical Journal,* 306(6880), 765-767.

Erlen, J., Siminoff, L., Sereika, S., & Sutton, L. (1997). Multiple authorship: Issues and ecommendations. *Journal of Professional Nursing,* 13(4), 262-270.

Facione, P. (2006). Significant contributions to collaborative scholarship & tenure. *Liberal Education,* 92(3), 38-45.

Gelman, S., & Gibelman, M. (1999). A quest for citations? An analysis of and commentary on the trend toward multiple authorship. *Journal of Social Work Education,* 35(2), 203-215.

Gomez-Mejia, L., & Balkin, D. (1992). Determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal,* 35(5), 921-955.

Guidry, J., Guidry-Hollier, B., Johnson, L., Tanner, J., & Veltsos, C. (2004). Surveying the cites: A ranking of marketing journals using citation analysis. *Marketing Education Review,* 14(1), 45-59.

Krishnan, C., & Bricker, R. (2004). Top finance journals: Do they add value? *Journal of Economics and Finance,* 28(3), 361-378.

Luukkonen, T., Persson, O., & Sivertsen, G. (1992). Understanding patterns of international scientific collaboration. *Science, Technology, & Human Values,* 17(1), 101-126.

Norris, R. (1993). Journal authorship patterns have changed considerably in the last 20 years. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research,* 25(3), 77.

Schoenfeld, A., & Magnan, R. (1992). Mentor in a manual: Climbing the academic ladder to tenure. Madison, WI: Magna Publications, Inc.

Tahai, A., & Meyer, M. (1999). A revealed preference study of management journals' direct influences. *Strategic Management Journal,* 20(3), 279-296.

Werner, S., & Brouthers, L. (2002). How international is management? *Journal of International Business Studies,* 33(3), 583-591.

Rankings as a Lever for Improving Program Performance

Stephen S. Standifird
School of Business Administration
University of San Diego
Associate Professor
Director of Undergraduate Programs

Jewel Leonard
Assistant Director of Undergraduate Programs
School of Business Administration
University of San Diego

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to discuss how the BusinessWeek ranking of undergraduate business programs can be used as a lever to improve the quality of a university's business programs. In doing so, we demonstrate how rankings can be used as a driving for improving organizational performance. The keys to doing so are to 1) have a strong internal data system, 2) take a long term perspective and 3) assure that there is broad based institutional support for doing so.

The Importance of Ranking Systems

Rankings systems such as the *BusinessWeek* ranking of undergraduate business programs can have a lasting impact on the reputation of an organization (Standifird, 2005; Schultz, Mouritsen and Gabrielsen, 2001; Black, Carnes & Richardson, 2000; Dunbar & Schwalbach, 2000; Fombrun, 1998). The bulk of the research concerning rankings has focused on for-profit corporations. However, rankings appear to have a substantial impact on academic organizations as well. For example, D'Aveni (1996) finds that the ranking of a business school can have a significant impact on the school's ability to attract high calibur students and place graduates of their programs in quality jobs. Monks and Ehrenberg (1999) find evidence to suggest that a university's ranking can significantly impact the ability of the university to attract new applicants. Given the importance of ranking systems, universities throughout the US have begun to pay specially attention to the criteria used in various rankings. For example, a variety of schools now send promotional material to peers in an attempt to influence the peer assessment score used by U.S. World News and Report (Argetsinger, 2002).

As noted by Vidaver-Cohen (2007, p. 278) "the validity of current ranking systems and league tables as credible measures of reputation has been soundly criticized by educators, scholars, accreditation agencies and business school consumers alike." One common criticism is that rankings distort the academic process by putting higher focus on test scores, class size and financial payout (Policano, 2005). To compensate, both Kreutzer and Wood (2007) and Tracy and Waldfogel (1997) suggest methods for adjusting rankings to more accurately reflect the value add of the school.

The purpose of our discussion is not to dispute the validity of the rankings (adjusted or otherwise). Instead, our focus is on how rankings can be used as a lever to improve the quality of our programs. We do so by focusing on the efforts of one particular school of business as related to the *BusinessWeek* undergraduate business school ranking. In doing so, we demonstrate how the rankings, while undoubtedly limited as a benchmark for organization success, can be used as a driving force for improving organizational performance.

The BusinessWeek Undergraduate Business School Ranking

BusinessWeek launched its ranking of undergraduate business programs in 2006. It has since then published rankings in 2007 and 2008. The *BusinessWeek* rankings focus specifically on measures of student satisfaction, post-graduation outcomes and academic quality (Gloeckler, 2008). *BusinessWeek* has been fairly transparent concerning the make up of these measures. An initial determination is made in regards to eligibility, which is based upon program size, age, test scores, grade point average for business majors, and the number of tenured faculty in addition to other factors. After the university meets the eligibility criteria, *BusinessWeek* then ranks schools based upon a student survey, a recruiter survey, median starting salaries, the number of graduates admitted to a top MBA program, and academic quality measure that comprises of test scores, full-time faculty-student ratios, average class size in core business classes, the percentage of business majors with internships, and the number of hours students spent studying per week. (Lavelle, 2008). Much of this data is provided by the schools themselves. The remaining data is collected via surveys of students and recruiters.

In 2008, student satisfaction was measured based on a survey of more then 80,000 graduating business students nationwide and accounted for 30% of the overall ranking (Lavelle, 2008). After receiving graduating senior email addresses from the schools, *BusinessWeek* conducted an online student survey, which asks students to rate teaching quality, course content, daily activities, and career services among other factors. If a school received a low response rate on its student surveys, then the school was eliminated from the ranking.

A survey of 618 recruiters nationwide accounted for 20% of the ranking in 2008 (Lavelle, 2008). Using a list of the top recruiters provided by the schools, *BusinessWeek* developed a list of companies recruiting from the schools. After a high-level recruiting contact was determined, *BusinessWeek* asks those recruiters to complete an online survey about the schools. Based upon the recruiters' responses, *BusinessWeek* calculated a 'recruiter' score.

Starting salaries and the placement of graduating students into top MBA programs each accounted for 10% of the 2008 ranking. The remaining 30% was based on the 'academic quality' of the school comprised of the five equally weighted measures of SAT scores, faculty-student ratio, average class size in major, the percent of students with internships and the hours student spent each week on school work. These measures were then used collectively to create an 'index number' for each school. This index number then becames the basis of the school's ranking.

BusinessWeek provides detailed information concerning the number of students reporting internships and the student reported hours spent studying per week (both collected via the student satisfaction survey). Individual schools do not get to see the raw scores concerning other student satisfaction factors or the results of the recruiter survey. However, the school's rank in these categories, i.e., student survey rank, recruiter survey rank, and academic quality rank, is provided. Moreover, *BusinessWeek* assigns each school a grade (ranking from C to A+) in the areas of Teaching Quality, Facilities and Service, and Job Placement based on the results of the student surveys. Collectively, this provides each school included in the rankings with a rich set of data concerning the school's performance in the areas identified by *BusinessWeek* as important.

Measuring School Success

For the purposes of this discussion, we focus on the activities of an undergraduate programs office from a private west coast university. The university's school of business undergraduate programs office was established in fall 2006 with the explicit mandate of improving the quality of the school's undergraduate business programs. The undergraduate programs office immediately started the process of collecting internal information concerning the programs performance through a variety of mechanisms, such as student focus groups, student surveys, and Educational Benchmarking (EBI) data. It was abundantly clear from the data collected that the students were frustrated with the quality and quantity of advising. In addition, career services were considered a weakness of the program. On the plus side, both the accounting program and teaching quality in general were considered program strengths.

From this information, the undergraduate programs office developed specific program performance metrics. Many of the metrics used by *BusinessWeek* were similar to the internal metrics being used by the undergraduate programs office. As a result of this realization, the decision was made to participate in the 2007 *BusinessWeek* ranking of undergraduate business programs.

BusinessWeek released their 2007 rankings on March 8, 2007. The university's undergraduate business program ranked in the top 50 in the country in 2007. The student comments highlighted from the *BusinessWeek* student survey largely mirrored comments received from internal surveys and focus groups. Students expressed frustration with advising but were largely happy with the accounting program. There were some surprises as well. The recruiter ranking of the school was surprisingly high. Nothing from the internal data suggested such high regard among recruiters. Equally surprising was the fact that the school received a B in the area of teaching. Internal analyses suggested teaching as one of the program's greatest strengths. Yet, the B rating was no better then average from the schools listed in the top 50. A summary comparison of the school's internal data with the results from the 2007 *BusinessWeek* ranking can be found in Table 1.

Table 1
Comparison between *BusinessWeek 2007* ranking and internal data

BusinessWeek 2007	Internal Data
Academic advising department almost nonexistent	▸ Focus Group (Dec. '06) Students dissatisfied with advising No personalized attention from advisors ▸ Town Hall meeting (SP07) Advisors not accessible No personalized attention ▸ Student satisfaction surveys (SP07 and FA07) High level of dissatisfaction with advising in all areas (interests, accessibility, helpfulness, and knowledge) ▸ EBI (2007) Advisor factor ranked 7 out of 7 select institutions Advisor factor ranked 137 out of 149 institutions
Accounting program makes the grade	▸ Town Hall meeting (SP07) Accounting is a close group Accounting group is connected to the business school
Positive remarks regarding teaching	▸ Focus Group (Dec. '06) Business & Society professors are great ▸ Town Hall meeting (SP07) Students prefer application of business theory ▸ Student satisfaction surveys (SP07 and FA07) Faculty accessibility, responsiveness, and teaching quality consistently ranked as program strengths

Targets of Improvement

Based on data collected in late 2006 and early 2007, the undergraduate programs office targeted both advising and teaching quality as areas of emphasis for 2007. In the area of advising, changes were made in reporting assignments and personnel, a new online appointment system was implemented, and extensive changes were made to administrative systems in order to better meet the needs of undergraduate business students. In the area of teaching, the primary focus was on highlighting the excellent work already being done in this area. This was done by creating two new undergraduate faculty awards. The Outstanding Undergraduate Business Educator award was created to be given on an annual basis to a faculty member who demonstrated outstanding contributions to the undergraduate programs both in the classroom and through student interaction. The Innovative Undergraduate Business Educator award was created to be given to a faculty member who introduced a new (to the SBA undergraduate programs) teaching practice or method that had improved the current practice of teaching. In addition, the importance and appreciation for high quality teaching was emphasized at several faculty meetings.

Throughout this time, internal data continued to be collected. Data collected in late 2007 seemed to confirm improvements in the targeted areas. The undergraduate programs office saw a significant drop in the frustration with advising. In addition, it continued to see very positive statements concerning teaching quality. The undergraduate programs office also saw an increased number of comments concerning frustration with career services. The results of the 2008 *BusinessWeek* ranking largely confirmed the internal data. Student satisfaction increased significantly from an overall ranking of 58 in 2007 to a rank of 47 in 2008. Internal data suggested that much of this improvement in student satisfaction came from changes made in the area of advising. In 2008, the undergraduate business program was one of 19 schools that received an A+ from students in the area of teaching. Thus, it appears that the efforts to promote high quality teaching had a positive impact on student perceptions. There was a significant drop in the recruiter satisfaction ranking. This was not a huge surprise since internal data suggested an inflated rating in 2007. One of the biggest issues identified by students in the *BusinessWeek 2008* survey was frustration with career services. This frustration was consistent with internally collected data. Not surprisingly, the undergraduate programs office has identified career services as a top priority to 2008. A summary comparison of our internal data with the results from the 2008 *BusinessWeek* ranking can be found in Table 2.

Table 2
Data Comparison between *BusinessWeek 2008* ranking and internal data

BusinessWeek 2008	Other Sources
Academic advising not mentioned	▸ Student satisfaction surveys (FA07 and SP08) Advisor's interest had a +0.47 differential from FA07
Career services needs improvement	▸ Student Organizations Input (SP07) Unaware of current career services Desire better quality of companies ▸ **Student satisfaction surveys (FA07 & SP08)** Placement/Internship factor had a +0,71 differential from FA07
Positive remarks regarding teaching and its personalized touch	▸ Student satisfaction surveys (FA07 and SP08) Faculty accessibility, responsiveness, and teaching quality consistently ranked as program strengths

Making Sense of it All

The school of business talked about in this discussion is now in its third round of 'preparing' for the rankings (to come out in 2009). What did the school learn as a result of the process? First and foremost, the school was able to make a series of targeted changes based largely on the results of the *BusinessWeek* rankings. Admittedly, many of same changes could have been made without the *BusinessWeek* ranking influence. However, the value of using the rankings as a lever is two-fold. One, the rankings (*BusinessWeek* or otherwise) provide external validity to the performance metrics collected internally. This makes it easier to make the argument for additional resources to address critical problems and provides a venue for publicly highlighting program improvements. Two, the results of the rankings provide the school with benchmark data concerning other top programs throughout the U.S. Collectively, the rankings provided the school with critical information needed to pursue program changes and promote improvements in targeted areas.

This process has worked well for the school for several key reasons. Perhaps most important, a strong internal data collection process with multiple measures of performance was developed that gave the school relatively clear insights into the strengths and weaknesses of its program. No one was particularly surprised by the results of the rankings. Moreover, the school was not rattled by results that deviated from its own internal data. As such, the undergraduate programs office was able to act aggressively in problematic areas (e.g., advising). The rankings gave the school increased motivation and support for doing so. However, things were not changed that seemed to be working well according to the school's internal results (e.g., teaching). Instead, the focus was on doing a better job of promoting successes in the area of teaching with the corresponding impact on the follow year's ranking.

Another key component to using rankings as a lever for improving program performance was the school's willingness to take a long term perspective when doing so. It is important to see rankings for what they are, a snap shot picture of program performance. There are a variety of extenuating circumstances that might cause yearly fluctuations. The school has yet to determine why the 2007 recruiter ranking was artificially high or why the teaching rating was lower then expected. Fortunately, the focus is on the long term improvement of the program. As such, the undergraduate programs office was less destabilized by unexpected ranking outcomes. Instead, internal data provided the school with the conviction to maintain focus on one or two of the most critical issues facing the organization.

Finally, it's critical to have broad based institutional support for both pursuit of the rankings and program improvements in general. The school's undergraduate programs office was able to identify those areas in need of improvement. However, the improvements themselves were entirely dependant on others. Faculty support was critical especially as related to improving teaching quality. Many of the changes made in advising would not have been possible without both the moral and financial support of the dean. Rankings can serve as a powerful lever for improving program performance but only to the extent that the bulk of the organization is actively involved in doing so.

The debate concerning the value of ranking systems will undoubtedly continue. There are and will continue to be weaknesses and limitations to any ranking system developed. However, it would be a mistake to discard rankings as irrelevant and/or destructive. Our discussion demonstrates how the rankings can be used as a lever for improving organizational performance. The key to doing so is to make sure that the school 1) has a strong internal data system, 2) takes a long term perspective in terms of program improvements, and 3) has the benefit of broad based institutional support for both pursuing rankings and improving the performance of our programs in general.

References

Argetsinger, A (2002) "Colleges lobby to move up in the polls: Schools politicking each other to advance in annual rankings", *The Washington Post*, September 14, A1

Black, E.L., Carnes, T.A., Richardson, V.J. (2000), "The market valuation of corporate reputation", *Corporate Reputation Review*, 3(1), pp.31-42

D'Aveni, R. (1996) "A multiple-constituency, status-based approach to interorganizational mobility of faculty and input-output competition among to business schools", *Organization Science*, 7(2), 166-189

Dunbar, R. and Schwalbach, J. (2000) "Corporate reputation and performance in Germany", *Corporate Reputation Review*, 3(2), 115-123.

Fombrun, C (1998) "Indices of Corporate Reputation: An Analysis of Media Rankings and Social Monitors' Ratings", *Corporate Reputation Review*, 4(1), pp. 327-340

Gloeckler, G. (2008) "The best undergrad B-schools", *BusinessWeek*, March 10, 56-60.

Kreutzer, D. and Wood, W. (2007) Value-added adjustment in undergraduate business school ranking", *Journal of Education for Business*, 82(6), pp. 357 - 362

Lavelle, L. (2008) "Behind the *BusinessWeek* Rankings", http://www.businessweek.com/bschools/content/feb2008/bs20080226_632362.htm?chan=magazine+channel_in+depth, February 26, 2008 (accessed February 28, 2008)

Monks, J., and Ehrenberg R. (1999) "U.S. News & World Report's college rankings: Why they do matter", *Change*, 31(6), pp. 43-51

Policano, A. (2005), "What price rankings?", *BizEd*, September/October, pp. 26-33

Schultz, M., Mouritsen, J. and Gabrielsen, G. (2001) "Sticky reputation: analyzing a ranking system", *Corporate Reputation Review*, 4(1), pp. 24-41

Standifird, S. (2005) "Reputation among peer academic institutions: An investigation of the *US News & World Report's* rankings", *Corporate Reputation Review*, 8(3), pp. 233-244

Tracy, J. and Waldfogel, J. (1997) "The Best Business Schools: A Market Based Approach", *Journal of Business*, 70(1), pp. 1-31

Vidaver-Cohen, D. (2007) "Reputation Beyond the Rankings: A Conceptual Framework for Business School Research", *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(4), pp. 278-304

Accounting Doctoral Faculty: Problem, Data, and Solutions

Martha M. Pointer
East Tennessee State University

ABSTRACT

The shortage of doctoral-qualified faculty in accounting has been discussed and researched for many years. However, no one solution has been presented, and the problem appears to be getting worse. In the following discussion, the lack of qualified faculty will be documented, the reasons for the few numbers of doctoral students in accounting will be given, and some of the solutions will be presented. All schools in the United States of America that offer doctoral degrees in accounting have been listed on a web site accessible at http://www.etsu.edu/cbat/acctdoc.html. The data on the web site will be discussed, with the intention of the web site that of making information more readily available to potential accounting doctoral students, thereby addressing one of the solutions.

Introduction

The shortage of doctoral-qualified faculty in accounting has been discussed and researched for many years. However, no solution has been presented, and the problem appears to be getting worse. The scarcity of doctoral accounting faculty affects the education of future accounting education. Steps must be taken to increase the number of doctorally qualified faculty. In the following discussion, the lack of qualified faculty will be documented, the reasons for the few numbers of doctoral students in accounting will be given, and some of the solutions will be presented.

Shortage of Doctoral Accounting Faculty

In 2005, the American Accounting Association and the Accounting Programs Leadership Group (AACSB/APLG) formed the Ad Hoc Committee to Assess the Supply and Demand for Accounting Ph.D.s. The committee found that graduating doctoral candidates will fill less than half of the demand for doctoral-qualified faculty positions. Two areas of accounting, audit and tax, were expected to be able to fill approximately one fourth of the vacant faculty positions. The committee was formed in response to several studies that found the number of accounting doctoral students was declining. For example, in 2004 it was noted that the number of graduating doctoral students who posted their resumes for job interviews at the American Accounting Association annual meeting had dropped from 180 in 1992 to 64 in 2002. (Carpenter & Robson) Compounding the problem of low doctoral candidate output is the increasing number of current accounting faculty who are retiring. In 1990, a model predicting accounting faculty retirements indicated that a significant number of current faculty members will retire in the next few years. (Campbell, Hasselback, Hermanson, and Turner) Another factor influencing the shortage of accounting faculty is the increasing demand. More schools are seeking accreditation by The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – International (AACSB). To gain accreditation, schools need to have a substantial number of doctoral-qualified faculty. The AACSB/APLG reported that the planned growth in business faculty positions (including accounting) for 2007 was 4.7 percent, and the total shortage would be approximately 2,400 positions by 2012. (AACSB and APLG)

Shortage of Doctoral Students in Accounting

The number of doctoral degrees in accounting has dropped from approximately 200 in 1993 to approximately 70 ten years later. (Noland, Francisco, and Sinclair, 2007) The reasons for the decline include the lower number of students in doctoral programs and the increased time to complete a doctoral program. A survey of doctoral accounting programs with information listed on their web sites in April 2008 indicated that of the 87 schools with accounting doctoral programs, 67 reported the number of students in their programs. The total number of reported students was 649, with an average of 9.69 students in each program. If it is assumed that the average number of students in the 67 reporting programs is valid for all 87 schools, the total number of doctoral students would be approximately 843. However, that number represents all students in the programs.

Further information found on the schools' web sites indicates that doctoral programs take an average of 4.5 years to complete the programs. Table 1 summarizes the web site information regarding the length of time it takes to complete doctoral programs.

Table 1
Time Required to Complete Doctoral Programs in Accounting

Number of Schools Reporting	Length to time to Complete Program (in years)
1	3+
1	3 - 4
1	4+
29	4
33	4 - 5
14	5
2	4 - 6
Average	4.5

If it is assumed that there are approximately 843 students currently in doctoral programs in accounting and that it takes approximately 4.5 years to complete a program, only 187 will graduate each year if all of the current students remain in the programs.

Possible solutions

The list of ways to increase the number of doctoral accounting graduates includes: (1) increasing the number of doctoral programs in accounting, (2) increasing the number of students in doctoral programs in accounting, and (3) decreasing the amount of time it takes to complete a doctoral program in accounting. The first item has been partially addressed. Bentley College in Waltham, Massachusetts, has initiated a new doctoral program in accounting. In order for other schools to do the same, the schools will need additional resources including doctoral-qualified faculty, funds to hire the faculty, and space to house the new programs. In times of scarce resources, it is difficult to defend starting a new program.

Increasing the number of students in accounting doctoral programs could be accomplished if each existing doctoral program increased the number of students in the program. However, the problem of scarce resources again arises. More students would require more faculty and other resources. Perhaps a better approach would be to reduce the time it takes to complete a doctoral program in accounting. A reduction to three years in the time to complete a program would result in an increase in graduates to approximately 281, much closer to the demand for graduates.

However, decreasing the time required for a doctoral degree would result in fewer preparatory courses for doctoral students. This issue can be addressed at the master's level. Currently master's programs in accounting are aimed at fulfilling the 150-hour education requirement necessary for becoming a Certified Public Accountant in most jurisdictions. Frecka and Nichols (2004) found that the average enrollments of accounting master's programs were not as large as other business programs (MBA) and that these programs were similar. In general, master's level accounting programs do not provide a strong foundation for accounting doctoral programs. This deficiency was addressed by Plumlee, Kachelmeier, Madeo, Pratt, and Krull (2006) who suggested that master's programs begin offering doctoral program tracks. These tracks could significantly reduce the time spent in doctoral programs. For example, accounting doctoral programs require students to complete from nine to thirty-six hours of statistics courses. Most master's programs require one statistics course. By redesigning master's programs to include more doctoral program foundation courses, a year of course work could be moved from the doctoral level to the master's level. This approach also was suggested by Plumlee, et al. (2006) when it was suggested that master's programs begin offering doctoral program tracks.

An additional alternative, similar to that offered by Plumlee, et al. (2006) would be for non-doctoral accounting institutions to combine resources and offer a joint doctoral program. For example, East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee, Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina, and Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, North Carolina, could pool their resources and offer a doctoral program since the three universities are within 60 miles of each other. Many similar situations exist around the country, and by instituting joint programs, additional programs would be available to interested students.

Increasing the number of doctoral students also would require improving the perceptions of potential students. Plumlee, et al. suggested that five approaches for increasing potential students' concepts of doctoral programs: increase information to potential students, increase financial support for doctoral students, reduce the costs for doctoral students, reduce costs to doctoral programs, and increase the diversity of training across teaching specialties. To address the first suggestion, a web site has been developed at http://www.etsu.edu/cbat/acctdoc. The web site lists all current doctoral programs in the United States of America. Included in the listing is information about the location of the program, the length of time for completion of the program, the GMAT and TOEFL requirements and averages for each program, and the number of students in each program. The site lists 87 programs and will include general information about doctoral program requirements and the application process. Having this resource available for potential doctoral accounting students should aid in the program selection process.

The increasing of financial support for doctoral students is of great importance. Carpenter and Robson (2004) reported that over twenty percent of doctoral accounting program directors cited insufficient financial support as a factor in declining enrollments. Programs have been addressing the problem, with the University of Maryland leading the way. The Robert H. Smith School of Business announced in February 2008 that doctoral stipends would increase 45 percent to $32,500. Additionally, doctoral students will have a dissertation support office, research support, and increased travel funds. Other universities also are increasing the funds for doctoral students. The Moore School of Business at The University of South Carolina offers a minimum of $18,000 to graduate assistantships with some areas offering more. Although information is not readily available for most schools, Bentley College is offering $21,500 and Florida State University is offering $15,000.

An additional hurdle for increasing the number of doctoral-qualified faculty is the lack of interest in academia. In fact, this lack of interest was seen as the greatest cause of declining doctoral program enrollments by doctoral program administrators (Carpenter & Robson, 2004). Various approaches have been taken to address this problem. A number of articles have appeared in professional accounting journals encouraging practicing accountants to consider a teaching career. For example, in June 2006, the *Journal of Accountancy* published "Teaching for the Love of It" (Myers, 2006) attacks the myths of low salary for academics and little work. *The CPA*

Journal published and article entitled "Pursuing a PhD in Accounting: What to Expect" (Noland, Francisco, & Sinclair, 2007) which encouraged accountants to consider returning to school for a doctoral degree. The article explained how to get admitted to a program, what to expect in a program, and the rewards of finishing a program. In 2000, the *Journal Accountancy* published "Those Who Can . . Teach" which guided professionals considering a career in academia on the steps necessary to determine if teaching would be a viable alternative. Although these articles are a beginning, more information needs to be presented to practicing accountants. Additionally, students in master's-level accounting programs need to be encouraged to continue their educations at doctoral programs.

A further approach to increasing the pool of doctoral-qualified candidates in accounting was presented by Marshall, Dombrowski, and Garner (2006). In support of the AACSB's report "Sustaining Scholarship in Business Schools" (2003), the study found that faculty with doctoral degrees in areas other than business, but who were CPAs, were as effective in the classroom and in research as those faculty who had received their doctoral degrees in business. Therefore, the recruiting of doctoral-qualified faculty from other disciplines appears to be an additional way of recruiting faculty. The disadvantage of this approach is that the faculty would be required to have earned their CPA license. Completing the educational requirements, passing the CPA exam, and fulfilling the experience requirement would consume three to four years or more – the amount of time it takes to complete a doctoral program in accounting.

In 2007, Hahn and Bowlin examined the publication records of graduates from traditional and non-traditional programs. Non-traditional programs were defined as programs that do not include long-term student residency, i.e., on-line programs. Schools that were listed as having non-traditional programs are listed in Table 2. The study found that publication records of the two groups differed, but that a majority of graduates (56.1%) from traditional programs had not published in academic journals, and that research productivity was a function of institutional resources and individual motivation. Therefore, hiring more graduates from non-traditional doctoral programs may provide another source for accounting programs. However, a search for non-traditional doctoral accounting programs resulted in only four possibilities.

Table 2
List of Current Non-traditional Business Programs

Institution	Type of Accounting Doctoral Degree
Anitoch University	None
Capella University	None
Central Michigan University	None
Colorado State University	None
Fielding Institute	None
Nova Southeastern University	DBA
Regent University	None
Touro University International	None
Union Institute	None
University of Phoenix	Ph.D.
University of Sarasota (Argosy)	DBA
Walden University	Ph.D.

Conclusion

The problem of a shortage in doctoral-qualified faculty has no short-term solution. Instead, the use of a combination of long-term options is necessary to alleviate the scarcity of accounting faculty. Potential doctoral students must be made aware of the benefits of pursuing a career in academia. This approach may be addressed by making more information available through classroom discussions at the undergraduate and master's level and through additional, and more complete, doctoral accounting program information on the web. The later point has been partially addressed through the new web site at http://www.etsu.edu/cbat/acctdoc. Also, recruiting faculty from non-traditional doctoral programs and transitioning doctoral faculty from other disciplines would assist in increasing the supply of accounting faculty with terminal degrees.

Further, traditional doctoral accounting programs need to be made more accessible to potential students. The programs need to be shortened, perhaps through the use of doctoral-track accounting master's programs. The students in the doctoral programs need to be adequately reimbursed for their efforts, and the universities offering doctoral programs need to have additional resources available to support additional students. Perhaps the only short-term solution is to require existing doctoral-qualified accounting faculty now employed to remain in academia longer. Enticements such as increased salaries, reduced teaching loads, and more vacation time are needed for this approach to be effective. All of the proposed solutions have costs; funding agencies for universities need to be made aware of the problem and to become part of the solution.

REFERENCES

American Accounting Association and Accounting Programs Leadership Group. (2005). *Report of the AAA/APLG ad hoc committee to address the supply and demand for accounting Ph.D.s.*

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – International. (2003).*Sustaining scholarship in business schools*.

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – International. (2007). *Becoming a business professor.*

Campbell, T. L., Hasselback, J. R., Hermanson, R. H., & Turner, D. H. (1990). Retirement demand and the market for accounting doctorates. *Issues in Accounting Education, Fall,* 209-221.

Carpenter, C. G., & Robson, G. S. (2004). Declining doctoral output in accounting. *CPA Journal, 75,* 68-69.

Frecka, T. J., & Nichols, W. D. (2004). Characteristics of master's in accounting degree programs. *Issues in Accounting Education, 19*, 165-188.

Hahn, W., & Bowlin, L. (2007). The incidence of publishing among business disciplines: An examination of nontraditional and traditional doctoral programs. *Journal of Education for Business, 83,* 77-86.

Kinney, W. R., Jr. (2003). New accounting scholars – Does it matter what we teach them? *Issues in Accounting Education*. *18, 37-47.*

Marshall, P. D., Dombrowski, R. F., & Garner, R. M. (2006). An examination of alternative sources of doctoral accounting faculty. *Journal of Education in Business, 82,* 44-48.

Meyer, M. J., & Titard, P. L. (2000). Those who can . . . teach. *Journal of Accountancy, 190,* 49-58.

Myers, R. (2006). Teaching for the love of it. *Journal of Accountancy, 201,* 30-38.

Noland, T. G., Francisco, B. & Sinclair, D. (2007). Pursuing a PhD in accounting: What to expect*, CPA Journal, 77,* 66-68.

Plumlee, R. D., Kachelmeier, S. J., Madeo, S. A., Pratt, J., & Krull, G. (2006). Assessing the shortage of accounting faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education, 21,* 113-125.

From Faculty to Administrator: The Time Management Challenge

Stephen S. Standifird
Associate Professor
Director of Undergraduate Programs
School of Business Administration
University of San Diego

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to discuss the time management challenges of transitioning from faculty member to administrator. For faculty, time management is critical for adding structure to an otherwise unstructured environment. For administrators, time management is critical to avoid becoming overwhelmed by the barrage of daily expectations. My advice to new administrators is to rethink how you prioritize, work through others and be action oriented.

Introduction

Time management is a key ingredient for success in many fields of endeavor. In academia, time management skills are paramount. This is true whether you serve in the role of faculty member or administrator. However, the time management challenges are substantially different for administrators versus faculty member. Not surprisingly, many who try to make the transition from faculty member to administrator become overwhelmed and frustrated by the process. The purpose of this article is to articulate time management challenges I've experienced in my transition from faculty member to administrator and to provide some guidance for new administrators as to how to manage this process successfully. I begin by discussing the unique time management challenges associated with being a faculty member and an administrator respectively. I then highlight the distinct differences between the two and, in doing so, provide specific advice for managing the transition from faculty member to administrator.

Faculty Time Management

Time management skills are important in many different industries (Barling, Kelloway & Cheung, 1996). However, academia is unique in that faculty members operate in a fairly unstructured environment (Massy & Zemsky, 1994). The key to time management for most faculty member is to impose a structure in our otherwise unstructured environment. The availability of time is not the biggest constraint facing most faculty members. The challenge is having the discipline to structure the time needed to do good work.

At most universities, faculty members are responsible for producing academic research, teaching and community service (Mancing, 1991). The balance between these three varies from institution to institution. For the vast majority of schools, community service takes a distant third priority. Actual classroom commitments are relatively low even at the more teaching oriented institutions. The structuring of the one's schedule outside the classroom commitment becomes the prerogative of the individual faculty member.

This is not to suggest that the average faculty member works less hours then other professions. Many of the most successful faculty members work grueling hours, and the demand on faculty time has increased over time (Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000). Much of the faculty member's time is consumed in the rigors of research. Quality research requires significant chunks of uninterrupted time. However, the hours of activity are incredibly flexible (Massy & Zemsky, 1994). There is no official start time to the day (short of classroom requirements) nor do faculty clock out at the end of the day. Many faculty work at home and at odd hours. It is not uncommon for a faculty member to do some of her or his best work in the wee hours of the morning or during the weekend. Faculty are not immune to external demands such as committee meetings and the like. However, these demands are relatively minimal compared to most professions. The flexibility in schedule is one of the biggest attractions of being a faculty member.

In this unstructured environment, focus is key. The most productive faculty are most productive partly because they are able to impose some type of structure in there otherwise unstructured environment. This structure can take many forms. The overarching purpose of the structure is to avoid the temptations of the otherwise unstructured work environment. Indeed, when faculty fail to get tenure, the root cause can often be traced back to the inability of the faculty member to remain disciplined on her or his research, in other words, the inability of the faculty member to impose some type of structure in there otherwise unstructured environment.

Administrator Time Management

Life as an administrator is quite different. Whereas faculty must be particularly attuned to adding structure to their daily activities, administrators must be resistant to becoming overwhelmed by structural demands. Most administrators are inundated with opportunities and obligations (Gremelch & Burns, 1993). Much of one's day is spent attending meetings and answer e-mails. The day to day demands on ones time can become overwhelming. As an administrator, the challenge is to avoid becoming consumed by the barrage of obligations and expectations that are thrown your direction on a daily basis (Gremelch & Miskin, 2004). This challenge increases with increased levels of responsibility.

Many administrators continue to engage in research and teaching. However, the service component increasingly becomes the dominant theme (Trocchia & Andrus, 2003). Committee work often increases significantly. For example, I currently serve on six committees internal to the School of Business and five university wide committees. I am periodically asked to serve of various short term ad hoc committees. In addition, I have regularly scheduled meetings with my staff and participate in the management team meetings of the school. Unlike faculty, there is an expectation that administrators will be in her or his office (or in meetings) during normal working hours. With this expectation comes the multitude of interruptions associated with visitors, phone calls and e-mails begging for immediate response.

The ability to prioritize becomes a key determinant of success. The most successful administrators are able to sort through the noise and clearly identify those tasks requiring immediate attention. This prioritization should be driven by a clear understanding of the goals and objectives associated with the administrative position. Failure to do so can be devastating both in terms of time and energy. Indeed, it's the inability to prioritize that causes the sense of being overwhelmed followed by burnout that is often experienced by those trying to make the transition from faculty member to administrator.

For faculty, time management is critical for adding structure to an otherwise unstructured environment. For administrators, time management is critical to avoid becoming overwhelmed by the barrage of daily expectations. The ability to master those skills needed to be an effective faculty member in no way prepares you for the time management challenges you are like to experience as an administrator.

Transition from Faculty to Administrator

What then is the key to making the transition from faculty to administrators (from a time management perspective)? The key for me has been to recognize the differences in time management demands and to adjust my time management behaviors accordingly. What follows is a discussion of three key differences that I've noticed in my transition from faculty to administrator and the corresponding advice for faculty taking on new administrative responsibilities.

Issue #1: Identifying priorities. Prioritizing ones activities is important for faculty and administrators alike but for very different reasons. As a faculty member, we are afforded tremendous flexibility in how we manage our schedules. Without prioritization, it would be easy to spend much of the day on wasted efforts. Prioritization is important in that it helps a faculty member to identify what to work on. Administrators need to prioritize as well. The difference is that as an administrator, my day is defined by a multitude of interruptions. It is not uncommon to have several meetings, dozens of e-mails and a multitude of unexpected visitors all making specific requests of my time. It would be impossible to give each of these demands my attention while, at the same time, dealing with other issues that are important in my role as an administrator. Prioritization is key to being able to determine which of these interruptions requires my immediate attention and which can be ignored for another day (or altogether).

Recommendation: Tools for prioritization. Focus more on tools that help you prioritize and less on tools that establish structure. Task lists are a great time management tool for faculty in that they add much needed structure to an otherwise unstructured environment. As a faculty member, I was very fond of my task lists. I would start each week by outlining key projects. I would then identify specific tasks to be completed that week in order for me to maintain progress on my defined projects.

Task lists do not work nearly as well for administrators. The administrator's daily schedule is often characterized by a series of meetings and unexpected interruptions. Task lists can prove quite frustrating in that the administrator often finds little progress at the end of the day towards daily defined tasks. This can lead to the inappropriate assumption and corresponding frustration that little was accomplished on a particular day. In retrospect, much may have been accomplished, albeit not in the form of specific tasks. The important question is whether the day's activities were appropriately focused or merely reactive to the multitude of requests coming your direction. The primary tool for addressing this question is the over arching goals and objectives you establish in your role as an administrator.

Your goals and objectives become the primary gatekeepers of your time. In my role as administrator, I have five key goals that provide daily direction. When I'm at my best, I evaluate each request I received against the established goals. I'm not always perfectly effective at doing so and there are certain requests that must be addressed regardless. At the end of the week, I sit down and review my progress toward the identified goals. I update goals on a monthly basis. Doing so assures that I continue to make progress towards things that are important for success in my role as an administrator. In order for goals and objectives to have their maximum impact, it is important to develop specific metrics for measuring the performance toward your chosen goals. However, from a day to day time management perspective, having clearly established goals and objectives is the key. The primary advantage of a goals approach is that it allows the administrator to prioritize activities without imposing the constraining and, more often then not, frustrating structure associated with task lists.

Issue #2: Getting things done. Faculty tend to work independently and (often) alone. Productivity is often enhanced by isolation. Many faculty members are most productive in home offices or other locations away from the university. Even in cases where faculty work on joint research projects, the work is often done in series where one faculty member works on the project and then passes it off to another. Rarely is the work done in parallel. As an administrator, I spend the majority of my day interacting with others. Meetings, e-mails and phone calls dominate my daily activities. Most of what I do as an administrator involves working directly with others. Indeed, it would be impossible to achieve my objectives as an administration without the direct involvement of others. This is arguably the greatest differences between being an effective faculty member and being an effective administrator. Whereas faculty excel by relying on their own intellectually capabilities, administrators succeed by effectively engaging the capabilities of others.

Recommendation: Focus more on getting things done through others and less of doing things individually. This can be counter intuitive for the faculty member who had previously excelled based on her or his individual efforts. While this individualist approach works well for project oriented research, it does not work particularly well for activities that inherently require the cooperation of others, as is usually the case in administrative roles. I would argue that, as an administrator, it's not what you individually do that matters. It's what you get done. And, you often get more done by working with others.

The key here is the identify ways of effectively engaging others in pursuing your goals and interests. Much has been written on the topic of influence. As noted by Pfeffer (1994), before attempting to influence others, it's critical that you have a clear sense of what it is you are trying to accomplish. In addition, you must understand your interdependence with others. This is something often overlooked by recently appointed administrators used to working in isolation. The next step is to analyze the views of those with whom you have an interdependent relationship and determining their power base. Only then can you begin to understanding your influence in the organization and the appropriate strategies and tactics for engaging the efforts of others.

In my role as Director of Undergraduate Programs, I rely on the assistance of a multitude of individuals, most critically the support of faculty. The faculty are the primary service providers for our program. Therefore, it's critical that I be able to positively influence faculty in the pursuit of building a better program. One of the best ways of doing so is to get individual faculty excited about the goals and objectives of the undergraduate programs office. This is done by having a clear sense of not only our program goals and objectives but also the goals and objectives of individual faculty. The alignment of interests creates the positive energy that allows me to accomplish the goals and objectives I seek to achieve in my role as Director of Undergraduate Programs. I am most successful in my role as administrator when I focus on working effectively with others and focus less of doing things alone.

Meetings are the venue through which involvement is often created. One common complaint expressed by new administrators is the burden of meetings. I value the opportunity to participate in meetings since meetings are my opportunity to engage others. Unfortunately, many meetings fail to achieve their true potential. For this reason, I try to walk into each meeting with a sense of what I hope to accomplish through my participation. Doing so requires a clear sense of goals and objectives. It also requires having a sense of who's likely to be participating in the meeting and their individual goals and objectives. With this information in hand, meetings can be a powerful tool for engaging the efforts of others.

Issue #3: Timeliness of action. Faculty members succeed by wrestling with ideas, by focusing on a particular issue sufficiently long so as to identify eloquent solutions. One of the true joys of being a faculty is the opportunity to reflect and digest complex problems and from the complexity identify eloquent models and solutions. As an administrator, I rarely have the luxury of struggling with an idea for extended periods of time. Certain issues such as student cheating or inappropriate employee behavior can quick spin out of control if left unchecked. Quick albeit less then ideal actions are often required. Increased competition fueled by external factors such as rankings heightens the need for timely action. The failure to act quickly to changes in the environment can cause a rapid decline in a school's external reputation and ranking. As such, timeliness of action is an important success factor in my role as an administrator.

Recommendation: Focus more of taking action and less of achieving perfection. Don't wait for optimal solutions before making decisions. Our mode is to try lots of things, get lots of feedback, keep what's working and stop doing what does not. Again, this may be counterintuitive for a faculty member who has made a successful career out of thinking through research designs in great detail before moving forward. However, as an administrator, I rarely have the luxury of reflective thought. The importance of timely action often supersedes the advantages of reflective thinking.

I do not advocating moving forward without a clear sense of direction. As noted by Collins (2001), most great companies are great because the company's leaders have a clear sense of what they are trying to accomplish. They know what they are passionate about, what their organization can be best at and what is likely to drive the organization to success (the hedgehog concept according to Collins). However, once you have a clear sense of direction, action becomes critically important to the success of the organization.

A predisposition toward action must be balanced with a willingness to accept and learn from failure. Failures become learning opportunities provided actions are taken within the framework of organizational priorities. One of our greatest failures (a town hall meeting that no one attended) lead to one of our greatest learnings (we must go to students and not expect them to come to us). Subsequently, we've had several highly successful events based on the knowledge gained from what appeared to be one of our greatest failures. Our ability to accept and learn from our failures has been a key component to the continued improvement of our programs.

Organizations are complex and dynamic places. Perfect solutions rarely exist. Waiting for the perfect solution is a formula for inaction. Unfortunately, most organizations are going to evolve with or without your influence. The primary advantage of timely action is that it affords you the opportunity to guide the evolution of the organization in a positive direction instead of constantly reacting to organizational crises.

Conclusion: Have Fun and Don't Forget Your Roots

Time management is important whether you serve as a faculty member or an administrator. Yet, as outlined above, the time management challenges are quite different depending on your role in the organization. For faculty, the challenge is one of imposing structure in our otherwise unstructured environment. For administrators, the challenge is one of avoiding becoming consumed by the barrage of obligations and expectations that are thrown your direction on a daily basis. Successfully managing the transition from faculty to administrators requires recognizing these differences in time management demands and adjusting your my time management behaviors accordingly. In my roles as an administrator, I find that it's important that I focus more on tools that help me prioritize and less on tools that establish structure. I focus more on getting things done through others and less of doing things myself. In addition, timeliness of action is an important success factor in my role as an administrator.

Finally, I think it's important to recognize that no amount of time management expertise can compare to the energy that passion and enthusiasm brings to a position. I am passionate about the opportunity to positively influence the educational journey of others. For me, my greatest 'time management' tool is the passion for the work I do as an administrator. Unfortunately, even the most passionate individuals can become overwhelmed and burned out without appropriate time management behavior. My advice to new administrators (from a time management perspective) is to rethink how you prioritize, work through others and be action oriented. These time management techniques, combined with a passion for the work, are key components to successfully managing the transition from faculty member to administrator.

REFERENCES

Barling, Julian, Kelloway, E. Kevin & Cheung, Dominic (1996) "Time management and achievement striving interact to predict car sales performance", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 81(6), 821-826

Collins, James C. (2001) **Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap and Others Do Not**, HarperCollins Pub., New York

Gremelch, Walter H. & Burns, James S. (1993), "The cost of academic leadership: department chair stress", **Innovative Higher Education**, 17, 259-70

Gremelch, Walther H. & Miskin, Val D. (2004) **Chairing an Academic Department (2nd edition)**, Atwood Publishing, Madison, WI

Massy, William F. & Zemsky, Robert (1994) "Faculty Discretionary Time: Departments and the "Academic Ratchet"", **Journal of Higher Education**, 65(1), 1-22

Mancing, Howard (1991). "Teaching, research, service: The concept of faculty workload", **ADFL Bulletin**, 22(3), 44-50

Milem, Jeffrey F., Berger, Joseph B. & Dey, Eric L. (2000) "Faculty Time Allocation: A Study of Change over Twenty Years", **Journal of Higher Education**, 71(4), 454-475

Pfeffer, Jeffrey (1994) **Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organizations**, Harvard Business School Press, Boston MA

Trocchia, Philip J. & Andrus, David M.. (2003) "Perceived characteristics and abilities of an effective marketing department head", **Journal of Marketing Education**, 25(1), 5-15

Understanding Organizational Culture from Multiple Perspectives: Faculty-Staff Relations Analysis

Bela Florenthal, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Marketing
College of Business
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Yulia Tolstikov-Mast, Ph.D.
Instructor in Management
College of Business
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Nazli Basak Yilmazsoy
MBA student
College of Business
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

ABSTRACT

With increased competition between universities, students' satisfaction with their education and overall experience on campus become more important than ever (Elliott & Healy, 2001). Reportedly, students are attracted to the university when they observe positive relations between faculty and staff (Kusku, 2003). Faculty and staff also state importance of positive relations between two groups that influence (a) the amount of work they complete, (b) attitudes toward their work place, and (c) their sense of community so that the best educational experience for students is provided (Biemiller, 2008). The research utilizes the organizational culture perspective proposed by Martin (2002) to examine faculty-staff relations in terms of creating a community that helps fulfill organizational mission. In-depth interviews were conducted with faculty and staff members at one of private Midwestern universities. The results revealed that (a) faculty and staff understand importance of constructive workplace relations; consider their overall relations as positive; and show mutual respect as a strong foundation for relationship development. Simultaneously, (b) perception of each others' roles, responsibilities, and attitudes differed between groups that could potentially lead to unproductive work and further unwillingness of faculty and staff to cooperate in their everyday activities. Suggestions to strengthen the relationships and create a sense of community are offered.

Literature Review

Increased worldwide competition and the 'reputation race' drive public and private universities to reassess their policies and institutional management strategies (Del Rey & Romero, 2004; Van Vaught, 2008). With that, students' satisfaction with their education and overall experience on campus become more important than ever. Research reveals that in addition to instructional effectiveness, campus culture has a strong impact on how satisfied a student is with his/her overall educational experience (Elliott & Healy, 2001).

Research on university organizational culture is scarce. Existing studies in the United States and overseas (e.g., South Africa; Nishii, L, & Dominguez, 2000; Organizational Culture Webstie; Mabokela, 2003) show the importance of developing a sense of community among employees in academic institutes to increase employees' commitment to organizational goals. Strong faculty-staff relations apparent to incoming and existing students could contribute to students' satisfaction with their campus life and education.

Faculty-Staff Relations

Faculty-staff relations have been recently more extensively researched (Krebs, 2003; Szekeres, 2006). In particularly, studies on this subject have increased in popularity in the United States (Helmes & Price, 2005; Task force report, 2004) as well as globally (e.g., Australia, United Kingdom; Szekeres, 2006); Whitchurch, 2007). Repeatedly, differences in perceptions on roles, responsibilities, and/or organizational goals have been detected as the main causes for relational problems (Krebs, 2003; Whitchurch, 2007). Poor communication, different views of job responsibilities (more structured/less structured), and lack of respect for administrative staff (Biggs, 1981; McCluskey-Titus, 2005; Whitchurch, 2007) were also mentioned by faculty and staff as recurrent issues that lead to mutual tensions.

Although these studies are valuable, a broader framework that explains the importance of faculty-staff relations within organizational context is required. When both administrative staff and academic personnel are happy, the institution is productive and students are more drawn to the institute (Kusku, 2003). More specifically, to achieve organizational goals effectively, it is important to correct the "us versus them" mentality held by many faculty members (Olson, 2006). For staff, their job satisfaction and commitment to organizational goals are high when they feel appreciated and engaged (Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006). Finally, both faculty and staff stated that the work environment influences (a) the amount of work they complete, (b) attitudes toward their work place, and (c) their sense of community so that the best educational experience for students is provided (Biemiller, 2008).

The framework adopted for our research is the organizational culture perspective. This framework allows examination of faculty-staff relations in terms how a sense of community can be created to (a) fulfill organizational mission and (b) generate effective instructional environment for students.

Organizational Culture Perspective

Organizational culture is the personality of an organization (Budd, 1996; Schein, 1992). There is no single definition of an organizational culture and the phenomenon is evaluated and understood from different perspectives. What is commonly agreed on is that culture encompasses organizational values, beliefs, and norms (intangible signs) and organizational artifacts (tangible signs) that are expressed by organizational members through their behavior within the organization (Martin, 2002; Meyerson, 1991; Schein, 1992). There is a group of researchers who look at organizational culture only from the perspective of what is shared (values, language, symbols, etc.; Shein, 1992). In other words, for organizational culture to be effective, members should agree on everything that takes places within and outside of the organization. Other scholars (Meyerson, 1991; Martin, 2002) show that organizational members rarely agree on all the organizational practices. Individuals are bound by multiple identities, have diverse value systems, and could apply different meanings to organizational manifestations. Thus, according to Martin's (2002) typology of organizational culture, some events receive organization-wide consensus (integration), other events could bring forth conflicting interpretation across groups but reach consensus within each group (differentiation); and still some events can elicit ambiguity or uncertainty in interpretation within one or more subgroup (fragmentation).

This research utilizes Martin's (2002) three theoretical perspectives (integration, differentiation, and fragmentation) to understand relations between faculty and staff in achieving organizational goals. Organizational culture is defined as a manifestation of organizational life that includes shared meanings, conflicts between opposing views, and ambiguity of organizational issues. The study aims to achieve two goals. First, determine (a) what organizational actions receive shared or conflicting interpretations of faculty and staff with and across the two groups and why; and (b) whether these interpretations inhibit faculty-staff effective collaboration in achieving university goals.

The usefulness of Martin's (2002) perspective is evident in former studies. For examples, scholars reported that all participants mentioned communication and perception issues as main challenges in faculty-staff relations showing consistency across groups (Badke, 2008; Davies & Owen, 2001). In particularly, older faculty members were more inclined to be disrespectful toward staff members causing fragmentation within faculty group (Class issues outside the classroom, 2006). To improve culture of academic institutes, staff suggested changing management style and improving faculty/staff involvement indicating consistency within that subgroup (Davies & Owen, 2001).

This study aims examine robustness of previous results and suggest new methods to strengthen faculty-staff relations. The previous results suggested the following strategies: (1) a better understanding of faculty/staff schedules and responsibilities by both faculty and staff (McCluskey-Titus, 2005), (2) higher level of faculty-staff interaction opportunities (e.g., workshops attended by both faculty and staff) to help form productive partnership (Task force report, 2004), (3) inclusion of faculty in university administration hiring processes (Barden, 2005), (4) additional opportunity for staff and faculty to work together (Davies & Owen, 2001); (Szekeres, 2006); (5) clarity in communicating organizational strategies and goals (Class issues outside the classroom, 2006).

Methodology

Qualitative method of data collection was used. The data was collected as part of a marketing research course in a private Midwestern university. The data collection process was supervised by faculty-staff relations committee. In-depth interviews were performed with faculty and staff members. The interviews were done face-to-face on campus in the participants' offices. The participants were picked by the faculty-staff relations committee choosing participants from across the university to increase representativeness of all colleges and departments. Participants were categories either as experts (administrators) or non-experts (faculty or staff members). The experts were faculty or staff members that have held administrative position and could view the organizational culture from a more objective and strategic perspective. Thus, we differentiate between two qualitative methods: (1) in-depth interviews with non-expert faculty and staff and (2) key informant interviews with administrators who can be faculty or staff. The interviews lasted about 45-60 min.

The following six open-end questions designed by the faculty-staff committee were used to interview both experts and non-experts. At the end of the interview the participants were give time to express any additional comments.

1. How do you perceive the current atmosphere of faculty/staff relations (within the last year)? Give some specific examples if you can?
2. How do you describe the present morale among the faculty and staff? Can you give some examples?
3. How do you describe faculty's view toward staff?
4. How do you describe staff's view toward faculty?
5. Do you think it is important to have a good relationship between faculty and staff? If so, why; if not, why not?
6. Do you think the working relationships between faculty and staff can be improved? If so, how? (Please give specific solutions)

Data Analysis

In-depth Interviews with Faculty and Staff

A summary of themes that emerged for each question, number of faculty and staff members that mentioned that theme, and one example for each group are presented in Table 1. Total of 11 faculty members and 16 staff members were interviewed. The university employs more staff that faculty members, therefore, more staff members were interviewed. Martin's (2002) three perspective (integration, differentiation, and fragmentation) can be identified in Table 1. In discussing the data analysis we denote F as faculty and S as staff to represent in parentheses the percentages of each group in mentioning the theme.

Integration. Several themes seem to fit integration at various degrees. Faculty and staff members agreed mostly on the following issues: (1) Overall positive atmosphere with room for improvement; relations are generally good (F: 100%; S: 100%), (2) A good and positive relationship is a key to success in the workplace (F: 82%; S: 63%), (3) Faculty and staff depend on each other in everyday work-related activities (F: 82%; S: 50%), (4) There is an existing hierarchy between faculty and staff; faculty are viewed as intimidating and self-centered (F: 55%; S: 88%), (5) More faculty and staff events (including outside of work) will bring the two groups together (F:45%; S: 31%), (6) There is a mutual respect between faculty and staff members (F: 45%; S: 44%), (7) Communication between faculty and staff should increase and improve (F: 36%; S: 31%), and (8) Socialization outside of work needs to be increased (F: 36%; S: 25%).

Differentiation. Some themes were mentioned more times by one group but not by the other. The themes that were mostly or solely mentioned by faculty members were: (1) The morale is on the rise (especially with new faculty); overall positive but varies by department (F: 90%; S: 44%), (2) Faculty members see the staff as a support team who play a key role in fostering an environment conducive to higher learning (F: 72%; S: 38%), and (3) Major changes implemented in the university decrease morale (F: 27%; S: 0%).

The themes that were mostly or solely mentioned by staff members were: (1) Not enough communication between faculty and staff ; staff feels under informed (F: 0%; S: 69%), (2) Both groups have common goals – provide high quality education experience (F: 0%; S: 31%), (3) Faculty members do not treat staff as equals (F: 0%; S: 44%), (4) Working in an organization is all about teamwork where everyone has similar goals (F: 18%; S: 69%), (5) If the relationship between the faculty and staff goes bad, it affects students' learning experience (F: 27%; S: 50%), (6) Faculty should cooperate better with staff; personal commitment of staff and faculty members to cooperation should increase (F: 27%; S: 44%), and (7) Some faculty members have superiority complex; some staff members feel and do not get the respect they deserve (F: 46%; S: 81%).

Fragmentation. For some themes faculty and staff had opposite perceptions. For example, staff members believed that there is mutual respect between faculty and staff (S: 44%) but at the same time staff members believed that they do not receive the respect they deserve (S: 81%). Another example is in relation to team work. Many faculty and staff members believe that staff is faculty's support team (F:72%; S:38%) but also they believe that hierarchy between faculty and staff exist and faculty are viewed as intimidating and self-centered (F:55%; S:88%). Finally, both faculty and staff members on one hand state that relationship is generally good and the atmosphere is positive (F:100%; S:100%) but they also say that faculty demand too much of their staff (F:27%; S:29%), the staff members feel overloaded (F:18%; S:13%)and treated unequally by faculty members (F:0%; S:44%).

The results of in-depth interviews support previous findings. The dimension of roles and responsibilities emerged as one of the causes for faculty-staff tension in our study which is consistent with findings in other universities. More staff than faculty members mentioned the role inequality, work load, definition of responsibility and expectations, hierarchy issues and disrespect toward staff members.

Table 1
Themes Emerging in In-depth Interviews

Themes	Faculty/Staff that Mentioned the Theme		Examples (F - denotes Faculty and S – denotes Staff)
	Faculty (Total 11)	Staff (Total 16)	
Overall positive atmosphere with room for improvement; relations are generally good.	11 (100%)	16 (100%)	F: "faculty members have thrown files at staff member's desk without paying attention, but this rarely happens" S: "The atmosphere is great because the campus is small, allowing everyone to get to know each other."
Both groups have common goals – provide high quality educational experience	-	5 (31%)	S: "The effort to work on relationship will increase everyone's happiness and eventually improve overall performance as well."
A good and positive relationship is a key to success in the workplace	9 (82%)	10 (63%)	F: "If relationships are good it makes work more pleasant and effective; it makes goals easier to reach." S: "The two groups should lead by example and get along with each other because the ultimate goal is to serve students and help them succeed."
Reinforce existing methods to strengthen relationship more often	-	3 (19%)	S: "The respondent felt that past faculty/staff events, such as yearly picnics, were unsuccessful."
If the relationship between the faculty and staff goes bad, it affects students' learning experience	3 (27%)	8 (50%)	F: "If there was a bad relationship, how would this reflect upon Butler and the students?" S: "A good working atmosphere funnels down to the students. Stress with faculty and staff creates problems for students as well."
The morale is on the rise (especially with new faculty); overall positive but varies by department	10 (90%)	7 (44%)	F: "Many of the faculty compared the morale to the atmosphere in that it was positive." S: "The morale between faculty and staff is different in every department. Operation's morale is high because the VP makes
Working in an organization is all about teamwork where everyone has similar goals	2 (18%)	11 (69%)	F: "We all have our sources of power; we just need to use them properly." S: "Many faculty members view themselves as independent educators and not part of the university community. The 'us' vs. 'them' mentality should change."
Faculty and staff depend on each other in everyday work-related activities.	9 (82%)	8 (50%)	F: "If a teacher needed something set up in the west gym or something has broken, then maintenance could be counted on to fix it in a very timely manner." S: "Staff is a wanted and needed group of people. How would faculty do their work without them?"
Faculty should cooperate better with staff; personal commitment of staff and faculty members to cooperation should increase	3 (27%)	7 (44%)	F: "There is a positive cooperation that needs to happen so work gets done." S: "When faculty and staff are focused on one goal and not individual goals, they are more successful as a whole."

Table 1
Themes Emerging in In-depth Interviews

Themes	Faculty/Staff that Mentioned the Theme		Examples (F - denotes Faculty and S – denotes Staff)
	Faculty (Total 11)	Staff (Total 16)	
Faculty members see the staff as being their support team who play a key role in fostering an environment conducive to higher learning.	8 (72%)	6 (38%)	F: "...very dependent on the staff members' expertise as I could not get along and do his job effectively without their assistance." S: "For example, faculty members depend on maintenance staff to maintain clean rooms with good lighting."
There is mutual respect between faculty and staff members.	5 (45%)	7 (44%)	F: "They all have common courtesy and respect for each other." S: "The faculty members are very respectful towards my team as the faculty members rely heavily on them."
Some faculty members have superiority complex; some staff members feel underappreciated and do not get the respect they deserve.	5 (46%)	8 (81%)	F: "faculty members have thrown files at staff member's desk without paying attention, but this rarely happens." S: "Many departmental secretaries do not feel the faculty members treat them respectfully or equally."
Some faculty members feel their needs are more important than those of the staff's; faculty demand too much of staff to do for them.	3 (27%)	3 (19%)	F: "It would be better if roles were more clearly defined." S: "Some faculty members often make unreasonable demands. Faculty brings in handouts, exams, personal items, musical scores and photos to be printed, often demanding results in an unmanageable timeframe."
Faculty and staff responsibilities should be clearly defined and communicated by university and colleges (departments)	2 (18%)	5 (31%)	F: "If the roles and responsibilities are better communicated to all staff members, people would not feel like they are being taken advantage of and faculty would feel more comfortable with what they ask from the staff." S: "Relationships can improve if opportunities were created for each group to share what their role within the university is in order to create greater awareness of what each group does."
There is an existing hierarchy between faculty and staff; faculty are viewed as intimidating and self-centered	6 (55%)	14 (88%)	F: "It is very easy to have a two-tiered hierarchy in this institution but everyone should be treated with respect and as members of Butler family." S: "The staff seemed to put the faculty on a pedestal because of the lack of equality that they receive from them."
Faculty members do not treat staff as equals	-	7 (44%)	S: "There are always a few faculty members that think they are on some pedestal of their own."
Not enough vertical and faculty-staff communication; staff feels under informed.	-	11 (69%)	S: "The major concern is that there is not enough communication between faculty and staff." S: "There is a lack of vertical communication within the university."

Table 1
Themes Emerging in In-depth Interviews

Themes	Faculty/Staff that Mentioned the Theme		Examples (F - denotes Faculty and S – denotes Staff)
	Faculty (Total 11)	Staff (Total 16)	
Communication between faculty and staff should increase and improve	4 (36%)	5 (31%)	F: "Better communication and more interaction could lead to a more positive experience." S: "Everyone can become better listeners and try to see certain situations from other perspectives and try to improve themselves as individuals."
Problems are specific to certain faculty and staff members; Few problems arising between faculty and staff from personal conflicts	-	3 (19%)	S: "Work relationships are similar to familial relationships in that there is always one member who is disliked or unpleasant to be around." S: "Any problems that arise are usually due to personal conflicts."
Staff feel they are not paid enough and are overloaded with extra responsibilities that are not part of their job description	2 (18%)	2 (13%)	F: "For instance, right now our secretary is blowing up balloons for national PA week." S: "Pay is also an issue that has negatively affected the morale."
Pay is one of the issues that negatively affect the morale of staff.	2 (18%)	2 (13%)	F: "There is a growing importance in ensuring the recruitment of people to come to Butler, given the economic crisis." S: "There was a compensation study, but the faculty and staff were not updated; therefore many individuals are very anxious to see the results."
Major changes implemented in the university decrease morale.	3 (27%)	-	F: "The morale is uncertain because a new strategic plan is being implemented in the College of Pharmacy."
More faculty and staff events (including outside the work) will bring the two groups together	5 (45%)	5 (31%)	F: "We could do with more interaction; perhaps adding an additional assembly so there is one every semester rather than just once a year." S: "The functions and committees involving both the faculty and staff would be beneficial in improving relationships."
More training (self-development) opportunities for staff members are needed.	2 (18%)	-	F: "It is important to make sure staff members are given opportunities to develop their skills and in order for them to have these opportunities, financial support is required."
Socialization outside of work needs to increase	4 (36%)	4 (25%)	F: "There needs to be an increase in socialization outside of work whether it be cultural events, athletic events or a cook out." S: "Team building activities, retreats, reading books together and all benefit everyone and bring them together."

Communication asymmetry was the second dimension that was addressed in several ways. This dimension was also mentioned more times by staff than faculty members. Lack of vertical communication, and insufficient interaction and communication between faculty and staff were mainly mentioned. Suggestions were offered mostly by staff to increase and improve faculty-staff and top-down communication.

Another dimension that was address by faculty and staff was the dependence dimension which includes, team work and dependence of faculty on staff members to accomplish university goals. Both groups addressed this dimension realizing that collaboration and cooperation are necessary not only to foster a positive work environment for both groups but also to create a positive learning environment for the students. As previous studies concluded, students are attracted to the university when they observe positive relations between faculty and staff (Kusku, 2003). Faculty and staff, in their turn, feel more engaged and satisfied with their work when faculty-staff relations are positive and both groups are working together to achieve university goals.

Key Informant Interviews with Experienced Faculty and Staff

A summary of themes that emerged from the interviews, number of faculty and staff members that mentioned that theme, and one example for each group are presented in Table 2. Total of 4 experienced faculty members and 6 experienced staff members were interviewed. The interviews support the main themes and dimensions found in the in-depth interviews. All experts agree that good faculty-staff relations are critical to the workplace (F: 100%; S: 100%). Most experts agree that faculty and staff work toward one goal which is to provide educational environment for students (F: 50%; S: 100%). The experts also recognize that relationships can be good or bad; differences can arias due to variations in personality and job descriptions; and that there is always room for improvement (F: 100%; S: 100%). Many experts recognize the issue of hierarchy between faculty and staff (F: 75%; S: 50%) and that the resources that staff members have to work with are limited (F: 50%; S: 33%). Several experts identified the problem of insufficient communication between faculty and staff that can cause tension and needs improvement both vertically and horizontally (F: 25%; S: 67%).

The experts suggested some solutions to improve faculty-staff relations. For example, five experts suggested increase in appreciation messages more faculty involvement on campus. Two experts suggested that faculty members take management classes and training to handle faculty-staff situations more effectively. Finally, five experts argued that mutual respect and kindness can improve faculty-staff relations.

Conclusion

Organizational culture is a complex phenomenon. Its analysis requires multiples lenses to evaluate ideational and physical manifestations of an organization that influences (a) employees attitudes toward and behavior within that organization; and (b) the "image" that an organization communicates to an outside environment. This study is an attempt to look at one significant aspect of a university organizational culture – relations between its faculty and staff. What image of a university does our most important customer – a student - retain as he or she observes numerous interactions between faculty and staff across campus? At the same time, if positive relations are apparent, faculty and staff feel more engaged and satisfied with their job that helps create a sense of community and provide the best educational experience for students (Biemiller, 2008; Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006).

Based on Martin's (2002) organizational culture perspective, a private Midwestern university's employees understand that their relationships are instrumental in achieving organizational goals effectively. Faculty and staff overwhelmingly indicate that they understand the importance of constructive workplace relations and consider their overall relations as positive. In addition, mutual respect was reported by both groups, pointing to the strong foundation for relationship development and positive organizational environment. Simultaneously, interpretation of each others' roles, responsibilities, and attitudes differed between groups. Based on the interviews, this interpretation inhibits faculty-staff collaboration (and ultimately achievement of university goals) as staff members feel unappreciated and controlled by faculty. Still the staff believes that faculty and staff should work as a team to deliver education (common goal). Most faculty members, however, do not believe that teamwork is essential for reaching organizational goals. Faculty members think that they collaborate with staff and demonstrate their appreciation. When faculty members indicate that they need staff's assistance to do their job, staff thinks that faculty could do it without their help.

The reported as an overall positive atmosphere with occasional tensions could lead to unproductive work in some departments and further unwillingness of faculty and staff to cooperate in their everyday activities (Biemiller, 2008). The importance of clear top-down communication emerged from the analysis as well as soliciting feedback from employees to determine overall organizational climate and its effectiveness in achieving educational goals. With that, the role of management (especially at a department or college levels) becomes critical as both faculty and staff reported that morale and treatment of staff varies by department; and that faculty and staff responsibilities should be clearly defined by university and colleges.

Suggestions

Previous studies stressed the importance of (1) a better understanding of faculty/staff schedules and responsibilities by both faculty and staff (McCluskey-Titus, 2005), (2) higher level of faculty-staff interaction opportunities (e.g., workshops attended by both faculty and staff) to help form productive partnership (Task force report, 2004), (3) additional opportunity for staff and faculty to work together (Davies & Owen, 2001; Szekeres, 2006); and (4) clarity in communicating organizational strategies and goals (Class issues outside the classroom, 2006).

Faculty and staff in this study provided similar suggestions indicating that some challenges exist across the university. In addition, this study shows that perception of faculty and staff about each other's work responsibilities is a key to effective relations. With that, organizational messages at a departmental and college levels should clearly communicate (a) faculty and staff jobs and current tasks; (b) performance feedback of collaborative faculty and staff projects; (c) needs and accomplishments of staff; and (d) university goals and faculty and staff roles in working toward achieving these goals. These objectives should become integrated into university's every day communication strategies (D'Aprix, 1996). This clarity will help (a) faculty and staff to understand their roles within smaller units (department or colleges); (b) staff to feel engaged and appreciated; (c) eliminate ambiguity of work responsibilities; and (d) demonstrate importance of faculty and staff collaboration (D'Aprix, 1996).

Limitations and Future Research

Our research is not without limitations. Being qualitative in nature it has limited ability to be generalized but more illuminate issues that would need a more quantitative investigation. Though the faculty and staff members were chosen carefully to capture a broad range of opinions and experiences, the sample size is very small. In addition, being interviewed face-to-face the faculty and staff might have biased their answers toward more positive direction. The themes revealed in this study should be followed up with a quantitative method (e.g., survey) using a representative sample and providing anonymity to respondents. The quantitative study can triangulate our findings in this qualitative study, though two methods were used increase reliability of emerging themes (in-depth and key information interviews).

Table 2
Themes Emerging in Key Informant Interviews

Themes	Faculty/Staff that Mentioned the Theme: Faculty (Total 4)	Faculty/Staff that Mentioned the Theme: Staff (Total 6)	Examples (F - denotes Faculty and S – denotes Staff)
Both roles in the university work towards the same goal of providing an educational environment for students; the students need to be the focus.	2 (50%)	6 (100%)	S: "Both work for the same goal, which helps improve how each group views the other." S: "Good relationship will create a positive and constructive environment."
It will be difficult to encourage people to work when the environment is not hospitable; mutual respect and kindness are the ultimate solution.	3 (75%)	2 (33%)	F: "It is important to have a unity between the two, otherwise the work will suffer." S: "Faculty and staff can try out new techniques to strengthen the relationship already there."
Good faculty-staff relations are critical to the workplace; without a positive relationship, the goal would not be accomplished as quickly and with the same efficiency	4 (100%)	6 (100%)	F: "There should be mutual respect." S: "It is important to have good relationships between faculty and staff especially at a smaller school like Butler."
Some relationships are good and some are off and on; many relations as cordial; there is always room for improvement	4 (100%)	6 (100%)	F: "Relations are cordial but problems have arisen." S: "I am optimistic that relations can improve between faculty and staff."
A two way street; very positive and equitable relationship; faculty realize that they are working towards the same goals as the staff so they treat them with courtesy and respect	1 (25%)	4 (67%)	F: "There are those faculty members who do an excellent job in working with staff and trying to make it like they are on the same level." S: "Most of the faculty respects the staff that they work with."
Staff feel they work side by side with faculty and supported by faculty members	2 (50%)	2 (33%)	F: "I believe that staff feels supported by the faculty." S: "Staff feel included in the majority of situations and decision processes."
Differences arise due to differences in job description and personal differences between staff and faculty members.	4 (100%)	6 (100%)	F: "Faculty members are taught to think outside the box, while staff must stay within the box and obey rules." S: "Instances arise from someone having a bad day and also from a few individuals with certain type of personality."
Diversity of backgrounds create clashes (faculty are often nationally recruited where as the staff is usually locally recruited)	2 (50%)	-	F: "This diversity should not be an issue and that there needs to be a work done into tapping into this problem and not allow these distinctions and differences to cause any problems at work."
There is a difference in the way staff and faculty members are treated.	-	2 (33%)	S: "Past year, staff was not offered the retirement package that faculty was offered."
Appreciation messages need to start from senior leadership; one way to improve this relationship is through the faculty senate and staff assembly; The lack of involvement of faculty on campus needs improvement.	1 (25%)	4 (67%)	F: "Senior leadership needs to set the example for those below them." S: "There is a need for communication both vertically and horizontally within the university."

Table 2
Themes Emerging in Key Informant Interviews

Themes	Faculty/Staff that Mentioned the Theme		Examples (F - denotes Faculty and S – denotes Staff)
	Faculty (Total 4)	Staff (Total 6)	
There are faculty members that believe in hierarchy and that staff is there to serve them; faculty members overstep their position and take advantage of staff members.	3 (75%)	3 (50%)	S: "Staff feel taken advantage of or spoken harshly to."
Faculty members sometimes make staff feel like they are taken advantage, harshly spoken to or as a resource to be exploited	-	2 (33%)	S: "Faculty view staff as more of a resource to get the job done."
Faculty should take management classes and training on how to handle situations and how to delegate tasks more effectively; that would help improve the relationship.	2 (50%)	-	F: "The faculty members have never been 'managers' per-say."
The biggest problems arise from the lack of good communication between faculty and staff members; need for communication horizontally and vertically within the university	1 (25%)	4 (67%)	F: "Some faculty expects staff members to do as told and do the work they are given." S: "There are initiatives to bring faculty and staff closer together through more communication and collaboration."
Morale of the staff is very high; with continued collaboration and communication as well as new initiatives, morale will continue to improve.	-	4 (67%)	S: "The morale seems to be positive and lack any significant problems or negative feelings."
The morale of some members was not very good and many felt undermined.	3 (75%)	1 (17%)	F: "There are issues of respect that have come up over the years."S: "A relationship can easily be hurt by an elitist or entitled attitude by the faculty over staff."
Resources that staff has to work with are not up to par	2 (50%)	2 (33%)	F: "There is a general concern about the future and salaries maybe a concern for problems." S: "Staff members are paid considerably less than faculty members."
Both faculty and staff are worried about Butler's strategic plan and its future.	2 (50%)	-	F: "There is a general concern about the future and salaries maybe a concern for problems."
Staff members believe they contribute to an important cause; there is a strong chemistry between staff members making them enjoy their work-day.	-	2 (33%)	

Bibliography

Badke, W. (2008). Information literacy and faculty. *Online , 32* (3), 47-49.

Barden, D. M. (2005). The age of reason. *Chronicle of Higher Education , 52* (13), 2-3.

Biemiller, L. (2008). To college employees, the work environment is all important. *The Chronicle of Higher Education , 54* (45), 12-15.

Biggs, M. (1981). Sources of tension and conflict between librarians and faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education , 52* (2), 182-201.

Budd, J. M. (1996). The organizational culture of the research university: Implications for LIS education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science , 37* (2), 154-162.

Class issues outside the classroom. (2006). *Academe , 92* (5).

D'Aprix, R. (1996). *Communicating for change: Connecting the workplace with the marketplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davies, P., & Owen, J. (2001). Listening the staff. *Listening and Skills Development Agency* , 2-43.

Del Rey, E., & Romero, L. (2004). Competition between public and private universities: Quality, prices and exams. *Economics Working Paper* .

Elliott, K., & Healy, M. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education , 10* (4), 1-11.

Helmes, R., & Price, T. (2005). Who needs a faculty senate? *Academe , 91* (6), 34-36.

Houston, D., Meyer, L., & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workloads and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management , 28* (1), 17-30.

Krebs, P. M. (2003). The faculty-staff divide. *Chronicle of Higher Education , 50* (12), B5.

Kusku, F. (2003). Employee satisfaction in higher education: The case of academic and administrative staff in Turkey. *Career development international , 8* (7), 347-356.

Mabokela, R. O. (2003). "Donkeys of the university": Organizational culture and its impact on South African women administrators. *Journal of Higher Education , 46* (2), 129-145.

Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCluskey-Titus, P. (2005). The housing professionals' challenge: To involve faculty members meaningfully in our residence hall programs. *Journal of College and Student Housing , 33* (2), 10-13.

Meyerson, D. (1991). *Normal ambiguity? A glimpse of an occupational culture, in Frost, P. J., Moore, L. Louis, M., Lundberg, C., Martin, J. (Eds).* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nishii, L. H., L, R. J., & Dominguez, A. L. (2000). *Results of the Maryland Libraries' organizational culture and diversity assessment.* University of Maryland, Industrial/ Organizational Psychology Program.

Olson, G. (2006). What conspiracy? *Chronicle of Higher Education , 52* (25).

Organizational Culture. (n.d.). Retrieved June 30, 2009, from Organizational Culture - Business Library - University of Western Ontorio: http://www.lib.uwo.ca/programs/careerinformation/orgculture.html

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Szekeres, J. (2006). General staff experiences in the corporate university. *Journal of Higher Education , 28* (2), 133-145.

(2004). *Task force report*. University of California.

Van Vaught, F. (2008). Mission diversity and reputation in higher education. *Higher Education Policy , 21* (2), 151-174.

Whitchurch, C. (2007). The changing roles and identities of professional managers in UK higher education. *Perspectives , 11* (2), 53-60.

JOINT CONFERENCE
May 31st, June 1st, and June 2nd 2010 in Nashville, TN at the legendary Opryland Hotel

Academic Business World International Conference (ABWIC.org)

The aim of Academic Business World is to promote inclusiveness in research by offering a forum for the discussion of research in early stages as well as research that may differ from 'traditional' paradigms. We wish our conferences to have a reputation for providing a peer-reviewed venue that is open to the full range of researchers in business as well as reference disciplines within the social sciences.

Business Disciplines

We encourage the submission of manuscripts, presentation outlines, and abstracts pertaining to any business or related discipline topic. We believe that all disciplines are interrelated and that looking at our disciplines and how they relate to each other is preferable to focusing only on our individual 'silos of knowledge'. The ideal presentation would cross discipline. borders so as to be more relevant than a topic only of interest to a small subset of a single discipline. Of course, single domain topics are needed as well.

Conferences

Academic Business World (ABW) sponsors an annual international conference for the exchange of research ideas and practices within the traditional business disciplines. The aim of each Academic Business World conference is to provide a forum for the discussion of research within business and reference disciplines in the social sciences. A secondary but important objective of the conference is to encourage the cross pollination of disciplines by bringing together professors, from multiple countries and disciplines, for social and intellectual interaction.

Prior to this year, the Academic Business World International Conference included a significant track in Learning and Administration. Because of increased interest in that Track, we have promoted Learning and Administration to a Conference in its own right. For the full call for papers and more information go to http://ABWIC.org and http://ICLAHE.org

International Conference on Learning and Administration in Higher Education (ICLAHE.org)

All too often learning takes a back seat to discipline related research. The International Conference on Learning and Administration in Higher Education seeks to focus exclusively on all aspects of learning and administration in higher education. We wish to bring together, a wide variety of individuals from all countries and all disciplines, for the purpose of exchanging experiences, ideas, and research findings in the processes involved in learning and administration in the academic environment of higher education.

We encourage the submission of manuscripts, presentation outlines, and abstracts in either of the following areas:

Learning

We encourage the submission of manuscripts pertaining to pedagogical topics. We believe that much of the learning process is not discipline specific and that we can all benefit from looking at research and practices outside our own discipline. The ideal submission would take a general focus on learning rather than a discipline-specific perspective. For example, instead of focusing on "Motivating Students in Group Projects in Marketing Management", you might broaden the perspective to "Motivating Students in Group Projects in Upper Division Courses" or simply "Motivating Students in Group Projects" The objective here is to share your work with the larger audience.

Academic Administration

We encourage the submission of manuscripts pertaining to the administration of academic units in colleges and universities. We believe that many of the challenges facing academic departments are not discipline specific and that learning how different departments address these challenges will be beneficial. The ideal paper would provide information that many administrators would find useful, regardless of their own disciplines

Conferences

Prior to this year, Learning and Administration was a primary track of the annual Academic Business World International Conference. Because of increased interest, we have promoted Learning and Administration from a Track to Conference in its own right. For the full call for papers and more information go to http://ICLAHE.org and http://ABWIC.org.