Business Faculty Job Selection: Factors Affecting the Choice of an Initial Position

Steven C. Hunt, Western Illinois University

This study examines the factors new management faculty consider most important in accepting a particular academic position, their level of knowledge about these factors prior to accepting the position, and their level of confidence that they selected the correct school. Differences were found in importance of factors in job selection between those going to doctoral-granting vs. non-doctoral schools and between male and female respondents. Many applicants had poor levels of understanding of certain variables they ranked highly in their job acceptance decision. Also, information is presented on how interviews with universities were obtained and conducted, and applicants' satisfaction with the process. The results of this study are compared and contrasted to accounting and finance studies to determine general conclusions that apply across business disciplines versus those that are more related to management PhDs.

INTRODUCTION

Choosing the best employees is essential to the success of any organization. For the employee, selecting the best initial position is an important determinant of future success. Studying factors of importance to new management faculty in selecting their first academic position should add to the academic literature and also provide practical help to both new PhDs seeking positions and the universities recruiting them. Prospective faculty should find instructive the factors of importance in selecting a first academic position by new faculty who are well satisfied with their position. University administrators and departmental search committees should be interested in the importance applicants place on various factors in selecting a position, in order to attract desirable faculty members. While factors of importance in selecting academic positions have been examined in recent accounting and finance research, I am aware of no such studies in the management area. Research should be performed in individual academic areas because of a) differences in job markets for those in different academic areas of business and b) individual differences that may cause people to choose one major over another. However, this research should be of interest to those in other business areas, since it provides additional support for the generalizability of previous findings across disciplines as well as indicates where differences exist among members of different academic areas.

Selecting one's first academic position is a crucial step in a career. It is important that job applicants obtain sufficient amounts of accurate information about variables they consider important in the job decision. If applicants have a good understanding of the position and the university, they should be more likely to choose the position that is best for them. If applicants accept a position and later discover that they did not receive accurate information,

they are likely to become dissatisfied and leave. Those departments that are seen as particularly forthcoming in these areas may be viewed as more appealing by job applicants and thus be more likely to attract and retain the best faculty. Determining the variables on which applicants have low levels of understanding may help new PhDs focus on areas where they need to obtain more information. Applicants' levels of understanding of such factors have not been examined in previous research.

Prior to making a job decision, applicants must obtain, conduct, and draw inferences from interviews with universities. New management PhDs may benefit from knowing techniques that others have used successfully to obtain interviews. Research on areas of applicant dissatisfaction with the interviewing process may help prospective faculty know what to expect, thus increasing their chances of obtaining on-campus interviews with desirable universities. Such knowledge is important, because with more stringent tenure requirements, new PhDs are competing not only with each other but also with experienced faculty for assistant professor positions. Departmental search committees can use information about areas of applicant dissatisfaction to improve their recruiting processes and better attract and retain the interest of desired faculty. In many departments, those not on an official search committee can still influence hiring decisions through their interaction with potential faculty and their input to the committee; therefore, "department" will be used instead of "search committee" in this article.

The remainder of this study is organized as follows. The next section discusses the research questions. The third section briefly reviews the relevant literature. The fourth section discusses the research methodology used. The fifth section presents and discusses the results. Finally, conclusions, limitations and implications for future research are provided.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This research has five major purposes, which follow from the previous discussion. The primary purpose is to empirically examine which factors are important in the selection of academic positions by new management faculty. It also looks for differences in factors for those joining doctoral vs. nondoctoral schools. Information is obtained on actual job selection decisions. Faculty satisfaction with the position selected is also examined.

A second purpose of the research is to determine the extent to which management faculty applicants obtain a good understanding of factors important to their job decision. Some items of likely importance to academic job applicants, such as tenure criteria, may be complex issues for which accurate information may be difficult to obtain. Potential management faculty may have not pursued these issues sufficiently or may have received vague or even misleading information from the school.

A third purpose is to obtain quantitative and qualitative data about the interviewing process, which has received little attention in previous research. A fourth purpose is to empirically examine gender differences in job search and selection of new academic management positions. Finally, results are compared to those of recent accounting and finance studies.

This research focuses on the entire job search and selection process. It is useful to examine applicants' behavior and perceptions from the point of deciding on what schools to contact for initial interviews to conducting those interviews, obtaining information about various attributes of a school, follow-up interviews on campus, receipt of job offers, the acceptance of a position, and finally, later satisfaction with the choice. Knowledge of where in the process problems occur is useful in suggesting improvements.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many of the studies involving factors of interest to business faculty have been in the accounting area. Kida and Mannino (1980) sent questionnaires to new PhDs to find out factors that they would consider important in accepting a first academic position. Differences were found between those going to doctoral vs. non-doctoral schools. Holland and Arrington (1987) surveyed accounting faculty who actually accepted positions and found that personal and family matters, such as spouse's happiness, family happiness, and quality of life, were emphasized more than in Kida and Mannino (1980). Those moving to doctoral institutions showed greater concern over research opportunities and ability to get along with the department chair. Both groups considered salary to be important.

Eaton and Hunt (2002) examined factors for accepting faculty positions as well as interviewing factors. They found teaching load, compatibility with other faculty, and spouse's evaluation to be the most important factors. Eaton and Nofsinger (2000) found similar results in the area of finance. Both Eaton and Hunt (2002) and Eaton and Nofsinger (2000) found considerable differences between those going to doctoral and those going to non-doctoral schools. Both found, for example, much higher concern about the likelihood of getting tenure among those going to non-doctoral schools. None of these studies examined job applicants' levels of knowledge about factors of importance to them.

Eaton and Hunt (2002) also examined relocating faculty's decisions. Factors of importance were similar to those of new PhDs. Most left their previous employment voluntarily. The main reasons were incompatibility with other faculty and spouse's evaluation of the area. However, a number of respondents indicated that they were not dissatisfied, but had received an outstanding offer from another university. Those who left involuntarily either did not receive tenure or thought they would not in the future.

Several studies have examined the interviewing process. Hunt and Eaton (1999) and Eaton and Nofsinger (2000) obtained information about applicants obtaining interviews, both initial and on campus, and areas of dissatisfaction with the process. The former study found concern about schools not inviting spouses on the campus interview. Both studies reported complaints about not receiving replies to applications and waiting a long time for an offer, only to be told they had to accept or reject it immediately. Eaton and Hunt (2002) and Ostrowski (1986) obtained limited information on accounting interviewing.

One management study (Hunt & Sawhney, 2003) examined management PhDs' initial interviews at the Academy of Management conference. Respondents contacted approximately 18 schools for interviews and were successful in obtaining interviews about 70% of the time. A moderate level of satisfaction with the process was noted. Major complaints included

rushed interviews with little exchange of information and crowded conditions in a common interviewing room.

A great deal of research has been performed on job search and selection in the psychology, organization behavior and vocational behavior literature. Excellent reviews are provided by Breaugh and Starke (2000) and Ryan and Ployhart (2000). Selected relevant research is discussed below.

It has long been known that various individual differences, such as gender, affect the relative importance of various factors in job selection (Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab, 1980). A recent study by Thomas and Wise (1999), using factors that had proven to be important in previous research, found that both job factors (such as salary, opportunity to use abilities, and challenging and interesting work) and organizational factors (such as corporate reputation, location, job security, and opportunities for advancement) were very important in job selection. Both males and females found job factors to be more important. Females found job factors to be significantly more important than did males.

The effect of gender on job search is an important research area, since lower initial job search by females may lead to lower lifetime earnings (Bain & Fottler, 1980; Howell & Reese, 1986). Results of other research (Huffman & Torres, 2001; Steffy, Shaw, & Noe; 1989; Rynes & Rosen, 1983) has provided inconsistent results. Eaton and Hunt (2002) found few significant differences between males and females in job search. However, females were much more concerned about job opportunities for spouses and showed significantly less satisfaction that they had selected the best faculty position.

One's first employment has significant influence over his or her subsequent career (Rosenbaum, 1979). Thus academic job seekers should apply to a large number of universities, which should lead to more initial interviews, campus interviews, and job offers (Dyer, 1973; Stumpf, Austin, & Hartman, 1984). Interviews are extremely important for both parties. As recruiters evaluate applicants, the applicants are evaluating the organization and the position (Breaugh, 1992). As interviewers, potential colleagues are viewed as particularly valuable sources of information. (Rynes & Barber, 1990).

Job seekers have to make job choices when many of the job characteristics are not known with certainty at the time. There is also the question of what applicants know at the time versus what they think they know (Schwab, Rynes, & Aldag, 1987). They may find later that the information they had obtained prior to a job decision was misleading or incomplete.

Faculty candidates who obtain sufficient accurate information about the university, department and the position should, if hired, be more satisfied, perform better (since their skills and interests are in line with what is required of them), and be less likely to leave (Wanous, 1992). Those who later find that their skills and interests do not fit well with the job or institution frequently blame the organization. Rousseau (1995) found that new hires often consider their employer to have failed to keep promises. So if job applicants receive inadequate or inaccurate information, the result can be poor job selection, followed by poor performance and job satisfaction and finally, eventual turnover (Breaugh & Starke, 2000).

Expectancy theory and signaling theory are useful in analyzing job search and selection. Expectancy theory indicates that applicants will be attracted to jobs that they believe will lead to positive outcomes. The expectancy of being hired times the attractiveness of the organization equals applicant effort to join the organization (Vroom, 1964; Wanous, Keon, & Latack, 1983). How the university treats the applicant during the recruitment process affects the applicant's perceptions of the likelihood of receiving an offer and how he or she would be treated while working there. Signaling theory (Rynes, 1991) also indicates that an organization sends signals about its hiring intentions and overall attractiveness by the way it treats applicants on a site visit. Applicants who are treated badly in the recruiting process expect similar poor treatment as faculty at that institution (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991, Rynes, 1991). This is especially the case since university personnel are expected to be on their "best behavior" during interviews (Ornstein & Isabella, 1993). Improving the recruiting process may benefit both parties. For the applicant, this means reduced stress and greater satisfaction. Benefits to the department include increasing the likelihood that top candidates apply for a position and accept offers (Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998). This should lead to greater satisfaction and lower turnover of new faculty.

Schwab et al. (1987) noted the importance of the timing issue in job selection. Employers can affect the acceptance of job offers through the amount of time they allow applicants to consider offers. Short time periods create problems for applicants, who may have to make a decision before other employers have made offers. This may result in applicants accepting a position reluctantly and then looking for a better position in the near future.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

I obtained the Academy of Management online academic listing. Faculty were selected if they started a U.S. faculty position in 1997 or 1998 (the listing ended in 1998) and received a Ph.D. degree in the year they started the position or were ABD. I omitted visiting professors, instructors and lecturers because of the likelihood that their positions were not tenure-track. Two hundred seven qualified persons were identified and sent a questionnaire asking for the following information:

- Demographic questions (age, gender, marital status)
- Importance of 32 factors (e.g., teaching load, class size, research funding, spouse's evaluation of the area) on the decision to accept employment at their current school. Respondents were asked to rate each variable on a seven-point scale as follows: 1=not at all important, 7=extremely important. The categories were those used in Eaton and Hunt (2002), which in turn had been adopted from Kida and Mannino (1980) with minor changes.
- The respondent's primary teaching and research areas
- Various characteristics of the respondent's new school
- The percentage of schools contacted by each of nine means of obtaining job interviews
- The number of schools contacted
- The number of on-campus interviews and interviews at management conferences

- The number of job offers received
- The level of confidence that the correct offer was accepted
- Areas of dissatisfaction with the interviewing process

Subjects were assured that their responses would be kept strictly confidential. Postage paid return envelopes were included in the mailing. A small number placed on the back of the return envelope was used to determine who responded to the initial mailing.

I contacted those who had not returned the questionnaire within one month in one of several ways. Those with e-mail addresses in the listing were sent a personal e-mail requesting that they complete and return the questionnaire. I left voicemail messages for those without e-mail addresses. The few whose listing lacked either an e-mail address or voicemail number were mailed second requests. The e-mails were successful in improving the initial response rate of 21%. However, nobody responded to a second mailed request and only two responded to a voicemail message. The final response rate was 68/207 (32.9%). Twenty-seven individuals were no longer at the school on the online listing. Thus the response rate of those still at the original school was 68/180, or 37.8%. No significant differences between early and late responders were noted, except that those who went to doctoral-granting schools tended to take longer to respond than those accepting positions at non-doctoral schools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Information

A description of various demographic variables relating to the respondents is shown in Table 1. Thirty-two percent of the respondents were female. Average age of respondents was 38.9 years. Approximately three-quarters were married. Sixty percent selected positions at non-doctoral schools. The largest number of faculty was in the area of strategic policy/entrepreneurship for teaching and organizational behavior/human resources for research. Twice as many went to teaching-oriented as to research-oriented schools. The selection process, which was designed to select only tenure-track individuals, was supported when all respondents indicated that they were in tenure-track positions, except one who was in a non-tenured institution. The great majority indicated that they were in AACSB accredited business programs. Most came from public, as opposed to private, institutions.

Factors of Importance in Selecting a Position

Rankings and mean scores of importance are shown in Table 2. Professional issues dominated for faculty accepting positions at both doctoral and non-doctoral institutions. The most important areas for doctoral faculty were (from first to fifth) teaching load, likelihood of obtaining tenure, compatibility with other faculty, spouse's evaluation of the area, and support available for research. Non-doctoral faculty put teaching load first, followed by compatibility with other faculty, likelihood of obtaining tenure, criteria used for promotion and tenure decisions, and opportunity to teach desired courses. Whereas spouse's evaluation of the area was important (tied for fourth-fifth for doctoral, sixth for non-doctoral), job opportunities for spouse were considered relatively unimportant for both groups. Base salary was of some importance to both groups, (12 for doctoral and 9 for non-doctoral), but opportunities to

TABLE 1
Demographic Factors

Factor	Percentage
Gender:	
Male	67.7
Female	32.3
Age (median):	38.9
Marital Status:	
Married	73.8
Single	26.2
Type of School:	
Doctoral	40.2
Non-doctoral	59.8
Primarily teaching-oriented	41.8
Primarily research oriented	19.4
Equally weighted	38.8
Public	61.2
Private	38.8
Accredited by AACSB	
Yes	84.6
No	15.4
Teaching Area:	
Strategy & Policy / Entrepreneurship	29.9
Organizational Behavior / Human Resources	28.3
Operations Management	20.9
Other (primarily Management Information Systems)	13.4
Management Theory	3.0
International	3.0
General	1.5
Research Area:	
Organizational Behavior / Human Resources	30.3
Strategy & Policy / Entrepreneurship	9.8
Operations Management	9.7
Other (primarily Management Information Systems)	12.2
International	4.5
General	3.0
Management Theory	1.5

TABLE 2
Importance of Factors and Knowledge in Accepting a Faculty Position (Respondents at Doctoral vs. Non-doctoral Schools)

	Importance of Factors				Knowledge of Factors	
	Doctoral		Non-doctoral		Doctoral	Non-doctoral
Variable	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean
Teaching load	6.41	1	6.03	1	6.23	6.46
Likelihood of obtaining tenure	6.00	2	5.78	3	4.56	5.10
Compatibility with other faculty	5.93	3	5.95	2	4.46	4.60
Spouse's evaluation of area	5.63	4,5	5.48	6	5.21	5.65
Support available for research, research assistants, release time for research and secretarial assistance	5.63	4,5	5.20	12	4.65	5.18
Availability of funds for travel to meetings	5.56	6, 7	5.40	7	5.35	5.51
Criteria used for promotion and tenure decisions (e.g., relative emphasis on teaching, research, writing, service)	5.56	6,7	5.73	4	4.62	5.18
Prestige of school or department	5.44	8	4.53**	22	5.62	5.93
Background, interests and research orientation of other faculty	5.37	9	4.58**	21	5.19	4.20**
Library and computer facilities	5.30	10	5.23	11	5.00	5.43
Opportunity to teach desired courses	5.19	11	5.63	5	4.85	5.60
Base salary	5.15	12	5.30	9	6.42	6.22
Compatibility with dept. head	5.12	13	4.90	12	4.40	4.58
Existence of Ph.D. program	4.96	14	2.44**	32	6.15	6.67*
Fringe benefits package	4.85	15	4.63	17,18	5.19	5.08
Geographic location of school (e.g., particular part of country)	4.74	16,17	5.33	8	6.54	6.80

* Significant at .10 level in Mann-Whitney U test.
** Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 2 (continued)
Importance of Factors and Knowledge in Accepting a Faculty Position (Respondents at Doctoral vs. Non-doctoral Schools)

	Importance of Factors				Knowledge of Factors	
	Doctoral		Non-doctoral		Doctoral	Non-doctoral
Variable	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean
Availability of supplementary research grants	4.74	16,17	4.10	25,26	4.69	4.15
Quality and motivation of students	4.70	18	4.75	14	4.00	4.18
Cost of living in area	4.67	19	4.63	17-18	4.97	5.70*
Physical facilities (e.g., condition of faculty offices, classrooms, etc.)	4.50	20	4.60	19,20	5.73	5.63
Salary history and salary projection for school	4.11	25	4.28	24	3.24	3.95
Available recreational and cultural activities	4.41	21	4.73	15,16	4.50	5.33*
Existence of Master's program	4.30	22	4.60	19,20	5.89	6.60*
Location of school (i.e., urban vs. rural)	4.22	23	4.78	13	6.15	6.83*
Amount of committee work	4.19	24	4.10	25,26	5.73	5.63
Class size	3.89	26	4.73**	15,16	4.12	5.58**
Compatibility with dean	3.37	27	4.36**	23	2.81	3.69*
Job opportunities for spouse	3.11	28	3.90	27	3.63	4.82*
Distribution of decision-making power: among schools, within university, among departments within business school	3.00	29	3.23	28	2.81	2.60
Availability of summer teaching	2.89	30	3.28	29	5.19	5.40
Consulting opportunities	2.78	31	2. 77	31	3.19	3.90
Family ties to region	2.70	32	2.78	30	6.16	6.67

* Significant at .10 level in Mann-Whitney U test.
** Significant at .05 level.

make additional money (consulting and summer teaching) ranked near the bottom. Respondents were asked to identify other important variables in their decision. Very few did so, which indicates that the 32 variables in the questionnaire well captured the significant factors in the decision to accept a faculty position.

Factors of greatest importance in the current study are somewhat similar to those in Eaton and Hunt (2002) and Eaton and Nofsinger (2000). However, several surprising differences were noted. In the other studies, likelihood of obtaining tenure was significantly more important for those at non-doctoral than at doctoral schools. In the current study, those at doctoral schools placed slightly higher importance on it than those at non-doctoral schools. The previous studies found that those going to doctoral schools found significantly greater concern for research support than did others. Both groups considered it highly important in the current study. Management faculty at all types of institutions seem to be concerned about getting tenure and the related need for research. As compared to accounting and finance faculty, management faculty may be less confident that they will get tenure or perhaps have more interest in a long-term role at their first school, as opposed to simply going elsewhere if they do not obtain tenure. A management colleague suggested that management is a more flexible field than accounting. Faculty may be able to teach in a number of the many areas of management. This may lead to more competition for positions and more uncertainty over obtaining tenure, because faculty might be more easily replaced than in accounting.

The finding that quality and motivation of students did not rank highly (18th for those at doctoral schools and 14th for non-doctoral) might appear somewhat surprising, in view of the teaching orientation of the respondents' schools. Similar results, however, were found in Eaton and Hunt (2002).

Only five items showed significant differences between those at doctoral schools and those at non-doctoral ones. Those at doctoral schools placed higher importance on existence of a Ph.D. program; prestige of school or department; and background, interests, and research orientation of other faculty. Faculty at non-doctoral schools placed greater emphasis on class size and compatibility with the Dean. Overall, new management PhDs showed considerably less variation between those going to doctoral-granting and those going to non-doctoral schools than did other new PhDs in Eaton and Hunt (2002) or Eaton and Nofsinger (2000). This may indicate some important differences in the characteristics of management, as opposed to accounting and finance, PhDs.

The most important factors in accepting a faculty position were similar for male and female respondents, as shown in Table 3. Female respondents' mean scores were highest for teaching load, followed by compatibility with other faculty, spouse's evaluation of the area, availability of funds to travel to meetings, and research support. Males placed greatest importance on teaching load, likelihood of obtaining tenure, criteria used for tenure and promotion decisions, compatibility with other faculty, and availability of funds to travel to meetings.

However, considerable gender differences were found. Generally, females found more items to be important in their decisions than did males. This was found in neither Eaton and Hunt (2002) nor Eaton and Nofsinger (2000). In the current study, females gave 18 of the 32 items an average of 5 or better on a 7-point scale of importance. On the other hand, males had only

11 items with an average of 5 or higher. Females also had significantly higher importance scores than men in ten areas: availability of funds to travel to meetings; job opportunities for spouse; spouse's evaluation of the area; class size; opportunity to teach desired courses; compatibility with other faculty; background, interests, and research orientation of other faculty; quality and motivation of students; location of school (urban vs. rural); and amount of committee work. This and other tests of significance in this study were performed using two-tailed Mann-Whitney U tests.

The significantly greater concern on the part of female subjects over spouse's evaluation of the area and job opportunities is consistent with Eaton and Hunt (2002). Eaton and Nofsinger (2000) also found significantly higher concern by females for spouse job opportunities.

Level of Knowledge

Generally, both groups of faculty indicated a high level of knowledge about the items they considered important in their decision, as shown in Table 2. Although both groups considered compatibility with other faculty to be very important, they rated their knowledge of that factor relatively low. Both doctoral and non-doctoral respondents indicated lower knowledge of research support, likelihood of obtaining tenure and the criteria for tenure decisions than their high importance ranking would indicate. Compatibility with the department head and dean were also ranked relatively low on knowledge.

Those going to non-doctoral schools stated a greater awareness of factors dealing with the community as opposed to the university. This was shown by higher knowledge scores for cost of living in the area, available recreational and cultural activities, and job opportunities for one's spouse.

Few gender differences were found in the level of knowledge about various items. This is somewhat surprising, considering the fact that females rated eleven items significantly higher than males in importance to their job decision. Females, however, reported significantly higher knowledge of research support, university funding for travel to meetings, and job opportunities for spouse. Females reported significantly lower levels of knowledge regarding the likelihood of getting tenure.

Interviewing

Considerable information was obtained about the interviewing process. Respondents contacted an average of 31.1 schools. The range was from one to 100. No significant differences were noted between males and females. These numbers are difficult to compare to those in Hunt and Sawhney (2003), which looked only at conference interviews. However, they are considerably lower than for new finance PhDs in Eaton and Nofsinger (2000). Nearly half (47.7%) of respondents attended a national meeting of the Academy of Management. Only 13.4% attended a regional meeting. The most common methods of obtaining interviews were replying to advertisements in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, replying to a school advertisement on the Academy of Management website, and having a resume placed on file at the Academy of Management national meeting. In contrast, the most popular method for new accounting PhDs in Eaton and Hunt (2002) was to respond to schools cold (not in response to an advertisement).

TABLE 3
Importance of Factors and Knowledge by Gender

	Importance of Factors				Knowledge of Factors	
	Male		Female		Male	Female
Factor	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean
Teaching load	6.11	1	6.47	1	6.19	6.67
Likelihood of getting tenure	5.84	2	5.81	7-9	5.20	4.43**
Criteria used for promotion and tenure decisions (e.g., relative emphasis on teaching, research, writing, service)	5.39	3	5.81	7-9	4.91	5.33
Compatibility with other faculty	5.73	4	6.33**	2	4.47	4.62
Availability of funds to travel to meetings	5.32	5	5.95*	4,5	5.17	6.00**
Opportunity to teach desired courses	5.25	6	5.86*	6	5.16	5.57
Support available for research, research assistants, release time for research, and secretarial assistance	5.20	7	5.95	4,5	4.58	5.57**
Base salary	5.18	8,9	5.38	11,12	6.26	6.33
Spouse's evaluation of the area	5.18	8,9	6.00**	3	5.06	5.89
Library and computer facilities	5.14	10	5.48	10	5.14	5.29
Compatibility with department head	5.00	11	5.14	15,16	4.43	4.62
Prestige of school or department	4.91	12	5.05	17	5.72	5.90
Fringe benefit package	4.80	13	4.71	21-23	5.23	5.62
Geographic location of school (i.e., particular part of country)	4.72	14	5.81*	7-9	6.60	6.90
Background, interests, and research orientation of other faculty	4.62	15,16	5.38**	11,12	4.65	4.43
Cost of living in area	4.62	15,16	4.71	21-23	5.00	5.43

* Significant at .10 level using two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.
** Significant at .05 level

TABLE 3 (continued)
Importance of Factors and Knowledge by Gender

	Importance of Factors				Knowledge of Factors	
	Male		Female		Male	Female
Factor	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean
Physical facilities (e.g., condition of faculty offices, classrooms, etc.)	4.47	17	4.91	19	5.65	5.62
Quality and motivation of students	4.45	18	5.23*	14	4.14	4.05
Existence of Master's program	4.36	19	4.57	24	6.26	6.38
Available recreational and cultural activities	4.34	20	5.14	15,16	4.91	5.05
Availability of supplemental research grants	4.27	21	4.53	25	4.33	4.14
Salary history and salary projection for school	4.20	22	4.10	26	3.67	3.50
Class size	4.16	23	5.00*	18	4.95	5.10
Location of school (i.e., urban vs. rural)	4.09	24	5.33**	13	6.56	6.52
Compatibility with dean	3.98	25	4.00	27	4.45	4.62
Amount of committee work	3.91	26	4.76*	20	3.95	4.10
Existence of a Ph.D. program	3.43	27	3.55	28	6.33	6.70
Availability of summer teaching	3.11	28	3.10	30	5.14	5.71
Distribution of decision-making power (among schools, within university, among departments within business school)	3.09	29	3.29	29	2.77	2.67
Family ties to region	2.89	30	2.81	31	6.36	6.65
Job opportunities for spouse	2.88	31	4.71**	21-23	4.06	4.72**
Consulting opportunities	2.84	32	2.50	32	3.63	3.33

* Significant at .10 level using two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.
** Significant at .05 level

Respondents received an average of 3.8 on-campus interviews. Male respondents reported 2.73 job offers and females had an average of 2.19. Those who went to doctoral schools had 2.67 offers, while those at non-doctoral schools had 2.52 offers. Neither difference was significant at the .1 level in a two-tailed Mann Whitney U test. These results are similar to those in Hunt and Eaton (2002), but the on-campus interviews and offers are lower than in Eaton and Nofsinger (2000), reflecting a lower number of schools contacted.

Participants were asked to identify negative experiences in the interviewing process in order to provide information to schools as to how they could better attract desired faculty. Approximately one-third of the respondents mentioned problems. Most of these respondents mentioned multiple problems. The most common was schools keeping applicants waiting for a long time after the campus interview without any word of their status. Rynes et al. (1991) observed this phenomenon and indicated it decreased applicants' interest in accepting offers if they eventually were made. On the other hand, once an offer is made, universities often expect an immediate reply. Several participants complained that schools did not respond to applications or even contact them after campus interviews. These complaints were noted in Hunt and Eaton (1999) and Ostrowski (1986).

Several also indicated that interviewers were less than forthcoming about their school's research support and tenure requirements. Three respondents mentioned inappropriate interviewer behavior: sexual overtures or drunkenness. One respondent indicated that he considered reopening his law practice with a specialty in employment law, defending college professors interviewing prospective faculty! No one mentioned a failure of schools to pay for a spouse visit, a major complaint in Hunt and Eaton (1999).

Confidence in Selecting the Right Position

Respondents indicated high levels of confidence that they selected the right faculty position. On a scale of 1 to 7, with 7 representing that one was sure that he or she had chosen the correct offer, those at doctoral schools averaged 6.04, while the mean for those at non-doctoral schools was 6.19. The figures for males versus females were 6.00 vs. 6.45. Neither of these differences was significant. These results contrast with those of Eaton and Hunt (2002), in which accounting faculty at doctoral schools displayed significantly greater confidence than those at non-doctoral schools, and males displayed greater satisfaction than females.

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Conclusions

Respondents provided valuable information about factors affecting their decisions to accept particular job offers. Teaching load, likelihood of obtaining tenure, compatibility with other faculty, spouse's evaluation of the area, criteria for tenure, availability of funds to travel to meetings, opportunity to teach desired courses and research support were highly rated factors. These, then, are items that should be stressed in interviews with faculty candidates.

Salaries were not among the top factors of importance for applicants. This implies that schools unable to pay high salaries may still attract desirable faculty by focusing on the issues above and demonstrating concern for the applicants.

A number of differences were found between male and female applicants in factors of importance in accepting a position. Knowledge of these may help universities to target their job announcements and interview approaches to increase the gender diversity of their faculty. For example, females were more concerned about spouse's evaluation of the area and job opportunities for spouses. While inviting spouses to the campus visit might be viewed as a signal of consideration by most applicants, it might be particularly helpful in attracting female faculty. Applicants and spouses should not be rushed onto the plane as soon as the interview is completed, but should be allowed ample time to visit the community. This is particularly important in view of Eaton and Hunt's (2002) finding that spouse's evaluation of the area was a major reason for faculty to leave a previous position. Females are more interested in the geographical location of the school and whether it is in a rural or urban area. This may cause them to automatically dismiss certain schools from consideration. To prevent this, schools need to consider including information on the community in their advertisements. For example, a rural school might mention that it is only 50 miles from a major urban area, while an urban school might discuss its proximity to beaches, mountains, or wilderness areas. Females considered a large number of factors to be highly important in their decision. Recruiting departments need to be prepared to address a wide variety of applicant interests during interviews.

Differences between those going to doctoral vs. non-doctoral schools were less numerous. However, knowledge of them should enable departments to better focus on items of particular importance to applicants. For example, non-doctoral schools may wish to emphasize class size and collegiality of the dean more than doctoral schools. Also, various aspects of the community are more important for those going to non-doctoral schools. This should be emphasized in advertisements and interviews. Those at doctoral schools may wish to emphasize the school's prestige and the research interests of its management faculty.

Some of the results of this study provide further support for findings in the areas of accounting and finance and thus suggest that they may apply to other business areas as well. Overall, factors of importance for job selection of new PhDs are similar across management, accounting, and finance. As in the earlier studies, females were much more concerned with spouse's evaluation of the area and spouse's career opportunities than were males. This indicates that those looking for business faculty would do well to consider these areas of applicant concern.

Areas of applicant dissatisfaction with the recruitment process reflected similarities with previous research. Concerns existed about schools' failure to respond quickly to applications and interviews and to expect rapid replies to job offers. These behaviors are likely to reduce applicant interest in the position.

The results differed sufficiently, however, to demonstrate the need to look at different business disciplines separately and not simply apply the results of a study in one area to the entire spectrum of business faculty. Major differences between the current and previous research include the level of differences in factors of importance between those going to doctoral and

non-doctoral schools. There was less variation in the current study; items such as likelihood of getting tenure and availability of research support are almost equally ranked by those going to doctoral vs. non-doctoral schools, whereas in previous studies, those going to doctoral schools ranked them more highly. In the current study, the level of confidence in selecting the right position was similar for those going to doctoral vs. non-doctoral schools. It was significantly higher for those going to doctoral schools in Eaton and Hunt (2002).

Differences were found among studies in terms of gender. Females in this study found more items to be important than in previous studies. Unlike previous studies, females did not demonstrate lower satisfaction with their job selection.

A major contribution of this research is to examine applicants' level of knowledge about various factors they use to make job choice decisions. The respondents generally showed a high level of knowledge about important factors. However, in certain key areas they rated highly important in selecting a position, the knowledge was relatively low.

Tenure was one area of relatively low applicant knowledge. Several complained that they were misled about tenure requirements. The complexity of tenure considerations may make it difficult for applicants to obtain an accurate understanding during a brief visit. This has implications for applicants on one hand and universities and departments on the other. Job applicants must do considerable research in this area. Discussing the issues with various faculty and administrators and then attempting to resolve discrepancies through later follow-up discussions might be helpful. While it is understandable that departments might prefer to be vague about tenure requirements to increase their flexibility in granting or denying tenure, such vagueness may be highly disturbing to applicants. Departmental faculty who candidly discuss tenure requirements, including how many faculty have been awarded tenure or denied it, projected changes in tenure requirements, and other areas of importance to applicants, may go a long way toward maintaining applicants' interest, as well as reducing turnover of those who accept positions.

Research support was another area in which high rankings of importance did not correspond to high levels of knowledge (for those going to doctoral schools). Several applicants complained of being misled. Departments need to be clear on the amount and nature of support and whether it is guaranteed to avoid later dissatisfaction by those who accept positions. Tenure concerns and concerns about research support are related in that research productivity is an important contributor to a new faculty member's likelihood of receiving tenure.

Compatibility with the department head and other faculty was a third highly important area in which new faculty had fairly low levels of accurate information. Compatibility with administrators and other faculty may be difficult to determine during short interviews, particularly if university personnel are on their best behavior. Universities and departments must be willing to allow enough time for meetings with faculty, both individually and in groups.

The finding that females had higher importance ratings for eleven factors but higher levels of knowledge for only three may indicate problems with obtaining accurate information for

items such as quality and motivation of students. Relatively low knowledge of tenure requirements by females, despite high stated importance, could lead to higher turnover by new female faculty.

Universities and management departments need to be seen as providing considerable amounts of accurate information relating to areas of particular applicant interest. Faculty in management departments should find it beneficial to discuss how to present this information and reply to common questions. This may identify areas of misunderstanding or disagreement that may help in better setting department standards and procedures.

Discussion of areas of dissatisfaction with the process in this paper may help both departments and job candidates. Departments that are perceived as addressing areas of concern to applicants will likely be viewed as more attractive By alerting potential jobseekers to such common pitfalls, this research may better prepare them for the job seeking experience and thus reduce applicant disappointment and dissatisfaction.

Several examples of extreme unprofessionalism were noted. Improper interviewer behavior (such as sexual overtures or drunkenness) can create loss of respect for the department and university, as well as possible legal action. However, departments may commit less vivid acts of unprofessional behavior on a regular basis. They may feel they bear little risk in treating badly those applicants for whom they have little interest. However, failure to promptly (or at all!) acknowledge applications and interviews may hurt a department's future recruiting success, if disgruntled applicants tell friends in the PhD program about their negative experiences involving the university. Dissatisfaction with recruiting practices may lead to applicant frustration with the system and acceptance of sub-optimal positions, resulting in increased future turnover. Thus a university's poor recruiting actions may ultimately affect other universities.

Even departments' treatment of successful applicants is in need of improvement. Long waits between campus interviews and offers and insistence on immediate replies when offers are made are likely to cause applicant resentment. This may lead to qualified applicants refusing offers or accepting with lowered morale, which may lead to turnover.

Limitations

There are some limitations to the study. The self-reported nature of the level of knowledge might lead it to be inflated by respondents who did not wish to admit low knowledge. Some new faculty had left employment at their first university and were not located. It is possible that they would have responded differently than others had they been located and sent questionnaires. However, assuming that most such individuals left voluntarily and many of those were dissatisfied with their previous school (Eaton & Hunt, 2002), this indicates that the concerns about lack of accurate knowledge and other complaints described in the paper may have been understated, making the recommendations even more important. The research did not examine why certain job search techniques were used or the applicant's level of satisfaction with them. Psychological factors, such as self-esteem, which might affect job search, were not examined. These limitations somewhat reduce the ability of the research to guide job search behavior by new PhDs. On the other hand, the fact that respondents were

successful in attaining positions with which they were generally well pleased should provide some indication that their job search behavior may be instructive.

Future Research

There is a need for considerable future research in the area of management faculty job search and selection. Research could examine the nature of differences, such as personalities and values, among those receiving PhDs in various business disciplines. Further research could look at earlier steps in the process, such as how job applicants determine what schools to interview with at a national conference and how experiences at conference interviews increase or decrease applicant interest in pursuing a school further. Future research might attempt to tie the perceptions of the position, the school, and the process together to determine how each affects the decision to accept a particular position. Finally, further research could examine the amount of effort new faculty expended to obtain information about factors of importance to them.

Examining all faculty who accept positions during a given time period would permit comparison of the job search and selection of both new management PhDs and relocating faculty. Determining the sources of information for various factors of importance could be valuable. Further research could look at the factors involved in selecting non tenure-track positions, such as visiting professorships. Finally, those accepting positions internationally could be surveyed to determine whether the factors in this study have international applicability.

REFERENCES

Bain, T., & Fottler, M. D. (1980). Male-female professionals: A model of career choice. *Industrial Relations, 19*, 366-370.

Boudreau, J. W., & Rynes, S. L. (1985). Role of recruitment in staffing utility analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 354-366.

Breaugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and practice*. Boston: PWS-Kent.

Breaugh, J. A., & Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management, 26*, 405-434.

Dyer, L. D. (1973). Job search success of middle-aged managers and engineers. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 26*, 969-979.

Eaton, T. V., & Hunt, S. C. (2002). Job search and selection by academic accountants: New and relocating faculty. *Journal of Accounting Education, 85*(2), 67-84.

Eaton, T., & Nofsinger, J. R. (2000). The new and relocating finance faculty market: Factors affecting job selection. *Financial Practice and Education, 10*, 99-110.

Holland, R.G., & Arrington, C.E. (1987). Issues influencing the decision of accounting faculty to relocate. *Issues in Accounting Education, 2*, 491-500.

Howell, F. M., & Reese, W. A. (1986). Sex and mobility in the dual economy. *Work and Occupations, 13*, 77-96.

Huffman, M. L., & Torres, L. (2001). Job search methods: Consequences for gender-based earnings inequality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 128-141.

Hunt, S. C., & Eaton, T. V. (1999). *Job search and selection of academic accountants: New and relocating faculty.* Paper presented at Applied Business Research Conference, Denver, CO.

Hunt, S. C., & Sawhney. R. (2003). Management PhD candidates' job search: The initial interview. *Journal of Education for Business, 78*, 249-254.

Kida, T. E., & Mannino, R. C. (1980). Job selection criteria of accounting Ph.D. students and faculty members. *The Accounting Review, 55*, 491-500.

Ornstein, S., & Isabella, L. A. (1993). Making sense of careers: A review 1989-1992. *Journal of Management 19*, 243-267.

Ostrowski, B. (1986). First-time accounting faculty: The job search, acceptance and support process. *Issues in Accounting Education, 1*, 48-55.

Rousseau, D. R. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. (2000). Applicants' perceptions of selection procedures and decisions: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Management, 26*, 565-606.

Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette & I. M. Hough (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed., vol. 2, pp. 399-444), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists' Press.

Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review 15*, 286-310.

Rynes, S. L., Bretz, R. D., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology, 39*, 729-757.

Rynes, S. L., Heneman, H. G. III, & Schwab, D. P. (1980). Individual reactions to organizational recruiting: A review. *Personnel Psychology, 33*, 529-542.

Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1983). A comparison of male and female reactions to career advancement opportunities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22*, 105-116.

Schwab, D. P., Rynes, S. L., & Aldag, R. J. (1987). Theories and research on job search and choice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 5*, 129-166.

Steffy, B.C, Shaw, K. N., & Noe, A. W. (1989). Antecedents and consequences of job search behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35*, 254-269

Stumpf, S. A., Austin, E. J., & Hartman, K. (1984). The impact of career exploration and interview readiness on interview performance and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 24*, 221-235.

Thomas, K. M., & Wise, P. G. (1999). Organizational attractiveness and individual differences: Are diverse applicants attracted by different factors? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13*, 375-390.

Turban, D. B., Forret, M. L., & Hendrickson, C. L. (1998). Applicant attraction to firms: influences of organization reputation, job and organizational attributes, and recruiter behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 52*, 24-44.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Wanous, J. P. (1992). *Organizational entry*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wanous, J. P., Keon, T. L., & Latack, J. C. (1983). Expectancy theory and occupational/ organizational choices: a review and test. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32*, 66-86.