



CDI
16,4

“Life could be a dream”

What US-based management PhD students desire in an initial academic appointment

316

C. Brian Flynn and Hubert S. Feild

Department of Management, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, USA, and

Arthur G. Bedeian

*Department of Management, Louisiana State University,
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA*

Received 15 February 2011
Revised 18 March 2011
Accepted 23 March 2011

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to first identify the work- and non-work-related criteria US-based management doctoral students consider important in selecting an initial academic appointment, and second, to explore whether gender and race/ethnicity are associated with the importance attached to these criteria.

Design/methodology/approach – To address these objectives, the authors developed a 125-item survey of work- and non-work-related criteria that management PhD students about to enter the academic labor market for the first time may wish to consider in weighing prospective job opportunities.

Findings – Job and professional considerations were dominant in assessing an initial employment opportunity. Female doctoral students differed from their male counterparts in attaching greater importance to four major themes: family friendliness, research support, clarity of performance and reward criteria, and university and community diversity. Race/ethnicity differences were also found, with Asian doctoral students valuing considerations related to academic prestige and research support more than their White counterparts.

Research limitations/implications – Respondents indicated their race/ethnicity, but not their nationality, or whether they were immigrants or US citizens and, thus, may have confounded the results to some degree.

Practical implications – The authors' results carry important implications for departmental administrators seeking to fill open positions with first-time faculty candidates, as well as management PhD students interested in whether a department can meet their expectations regarding academic and financial resources necessary for academic success.

Originality/value – In that detailed information about what PhD students in general and management doctoral students in particular want in an initial academic appointment is limited, the paper fills a longstanding gap in the research literature.

Keywords Doctoral student recruitment, Initial academic appointments, Academic job preferences, Academic careers, Faculty recruitment, United States of America, Universities

Paper type Research paper



I. Introduction

Research suggests that most university faculties are generally satisfied with their intellectual lives, teaching loads, relationships with colleagues, and the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of their students (COACHE, 2008; Johnsrud and Heck, 1998, p. 540; Rosser, 2004). Universities, however, are not immune to many of the same

The authors thank Min Z. Carter, Shannon G. Taylor, and Alan G. Walker for helpful comments on earlier draft manuscripts.

human-resource challenges that confront non-academic organizations. One such challenge is attracting and retaining qualified employees in a highly competitive and resource-restrained environment (Baruch and Hall, 2004). Business schools, in particular, must confront this challenge as a global shortage of doctoral-trained faculty appears imminent given declining PhD enrollments, anticipated rising demand for business education, and expected faculty retirements (AACSB International, 2003). Although current economic conditions may have temporarily slowed the rate at which senior business school faculty retire, competition for new faculty who hold a PhD or equivalent degree will inevitably increase as demand outstrips supply. The resulting imbalance will occur across business disciplines, including management (AACSB International, 2008a).

Given this inevitability, an emphasis on fulfilling the job expectations of PhD students about to enter the academic labor market for the first time will be essential to successfully recruiting and retaining top talent. Earlier studies have investigated the job-selection criteria current and relocating faculty in accounting (Eaton and Hunt, 2002; Holland and Arrington, 1987), finance (Eaton and Nofsinger, 2000), and management (Hunt, 2004) consider important in an academic position. Only one previous study, however, has investigated the criteria doctoral students use in selecting an initial academic appointment (Kida and Mannino, 1980) and it included only accounting students. Moreover, previous studies have relied on the same 30-item survey measure developed by Kida and Mannino (1980) over 30 years ago, rendering what is known from prior studies using this instrument dated and limited in scope. Because of a shift in generational values (Smola and Sutton, 2002), the technology boom, and other cultural changes (e.g. number of female faculty and dual-career families in academe (Creamer and Amelink, 2007)) that have occurred over the last three decades, a fresh perspective seems warranted.

In that detailed information about what PhD students in general and management doctoral students in particular want in an initial academic appointment is both limited and dated, we designed the present study with two objectives in mind. First, we sought to identify the work- and non-work-related criteria management doctoral students in general consider important in selecting a first-time faculty appointment. Second, recognizing that the demographics of higher education have changed since the earlier Kida and Mannino (1980) study that included accounting doctoral students, we wanted to explore whether gender and race/ethnicity are associated with the importance attached to these criteria.

II. Study contributions

Our findings should be of importance to both management departments seeking to fill open positions with first-time faculty candidates and management PhD students initially entering the academic marketplace. If, as noted, management departments are to successfully attract and retain first-time faculty candidates, they must be aware of the candidates' preferences relative to both work- and non-work-related criteria. We designed our study to collect information relative to these preferences. In turn, the results we report should be of value in designing effective job announcements, emphasizing relevant information in job interviews, orchestrating successful campus visits, and, ultimately, formulating attractive job offers (Hunt *et al.*, 2009). Furthermore, this knowledge should assist in assessing whether the expectations of prospective faculty candidates can be reasonably met and will fit with a recruiting department's

mores regarding teaching, research, and service. Prior research has provided strong support for a link between person-organization (P-O) fit and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intended turnover (Verquer *et al.*, 2003). P-O fit is particularly important in the early stages of a career, as it has been shown to be associated with later career success in the form of pay increases, promotions, and job tenure (Bretz and Judge, 1994). Finally, consistent with our second study objective, drawing on our results, an appreciation of gender and race/ethnicity differences in the value attached to work- and non-work-related criteria should be of value to departments seeking to increase faculty diversity along these lines.

Conversely, from the vantage of prospective faculty candidates seeking their first positions, our results should likewise be of value for several reasons. First, beyond the benefits associated with P-O fit, research has shown that academic success in an initial faculty appointment yields later career stage job-placement benefits relative to obtaining a more prestigious academic appointment (Bedeian *et al.*, 2010). Thus, with an eye to their long-range future, those seeking their first position should be no less interested in whether a department can meet their expectations regarding academic and financial resources necessary for academic success than recruiting departments should be in whether a prospective faculty candidate can reasonably be expected to fulfill a department's performance norms.

Second, the survey we have developed for collecting our results should provide new entrants into the academic marketplace a means for systematically comparing differences across job opportunities in teaching, research, and service expectations, as well as in terms of academic and financial resource availability (Tompkins *et al.*, 1996). Assessing these differences should help doctoral candidates determine the attractiveness of alternative employment opportunities. Even when considering a single job opportunity, there may be some leeway in how a job is ultimately configured. Whereas, it is rare for first-time faculty to land a position that meets all their expectations, by charting their preferences in advance they will be able to emphasize those work- and non-work-related criteria that they value the most. Thus, our findings could serve as a basis for negotiating "must have" (e.g. a competitive salary) and "nice to have" (e.g. reduced teaching load during the first year of employment) aspects of a job offer.

III. The present study: theory and hypotheses

Overall differences

Given the virtual absence of non-anecdotal information pertaining specifically to what management PhDs expect in an initial academic appointment, we turned to research in neighboring disciplines to gain insights into what graduate students and new faculty in general view as important in an academic career. We assumed that in a manner similar to other aspiring academics, management doctoral students seek a beginning position that will reward them for the substantial investment they have made in acquiring a PhD and provide the resources and support necessary for realizing their career and personal goals. Therefore, we suspected that management doctoral students would also judge considerations associated with teaching and research support as very important in their position decisions. Building on recent survey data (COACHE, 2007), we also reasoned that other considerations, such as a university's financial stability (particularly salient given the current economic conditions), university and department leadership, and family-friendly university policies would also be important.

Gender differences

Although we were unable to make specific predictions regarding what management PhD students as a group desire in an initial academic appointment, we did expect gender differences given documented differences in career trajectories of female and male faculty in other academic settings (Carter, 2010). We were prompted in this regard by studies suggesting that female university faculty have lower research productivity (Sax *et al.*, 2002), lower job satisfaction (COACHE, 2008), and lower retention rates than their male colleagues (Johnsrud and Heck, 1994). Although prior research has focused on faculty at varying career stages and not on PhD students *per se*, these findings suggest (as described below) that gender is likely associated with differences in the work- and non-work-related criteria that management doctoral students consider important in choosing an academic position.

Owing to differences in research productivity, it is not surprising that earning tenure may be more difficult for women than their male colleagues. Indeed, in the USA, only 47 percent of female faculty holds tenure compared to 65 percent of males, and only 18 percent of full professors at doctoral granting universities are female (AAUP, 2004). Various reasons for what some might call a “significant discrepancy” in female representation at upper academic ranks have been given. Park (1996) argued that obtaining tenure is difficult for women because of the structural position women typically occupy in universities, which tends to mimic the social perception of women as nurturers and caregivers. This status results in heavier teaching loads, greater responsibility for undergraduate teaching, more service commitments, and less access to graduate assistants, research monies, and time for research. These differences, in turn, directly impacts research productivity in terms of fewer publications, on which tenure is primarily based (de Rond and Miller, 2005). To a degree, studies bear out Park’s assertion that women publish less than men, resulting in greater difficulties in obtaining tenure, promotion, and research funding (Hemmings *et al.*, 2007). Some theorize that such outcomes are a result of family responsibilities (Asmar, 1999), whereas others, as suggested, believe a more structural issue is involved, in that, women gain less recognition and support than men for comparable output because of a power imbalance in universities (Hemmings *et al.*, 2007). We expected that female PhD management students would attribute more importance than their male counterparts to three aspects of an initial academic appointment: family responsibilities, structural issues (such as clarity of reward criteria and research support), and interpersonal interactions and relationships (particularly with colleagues). We discuss each of these aspects next.

Work-family conflict. A large measure of the discussion related to family responsibilities stems from the work-family conflict literature and is grounded in role theory. Role theory predicts that as a person takes on additional life roles, conflict will occur because of difficulties in balancing the demands of each of these roles (Allen, 2001). The potential for conflict is compounded as the composition of families in today’s society contains more dual-career couples and working mothers with young children than in the past (Allen, 2001). Whereas, men typically benefit from the stability of having a family, women may be negatively affected due to increased levels of family responsibilities, and thus are hindered in their career progression (Kirchmeyer, 2002).

To assist individuals in coping with the inevitable conflicts between career and home, many organizations have adopted family-friendly work policies, such as flexible work schedules, job sharing, on-site childcare, and leaves of absence.

Whereas, there is an increased likelihood that both men and women will have additional household duties added to their career-related responsibilities (Allen, 2001), and thus gain from family-friendly work policies, women may benefit more from such policies because they are likely more affected by inter-role conflict (de Wet and de Wet, 1997). Thus, we expected that female management doctoral students seeking an initial academic appointment would place a greater emphasis on family-friendly policies than their male colleagues:

- H1.* Female doctoral students will consider family-friendly work policies as more important in taking an initial academic appointment than their male counterparts.

Structural issues. Assuming that having invested at least equal amounts of time and energy in obtaining a PhD as their male colleagues, it seems logical that women will desire equal access to research support and opportunities in their quest to earn tenure. Indeed, human-capital theory predicts that if there is perfect competition in a labor market, then personal investments, such as education and experience, will be rewarded equally (Morrison and von Glinow, 1990). Research suggests, however, that access and opportunity differ for men and women, with men tending to benefit more from education and experience, both in gaining appointments and assignments that tend to provide more research support and opportunities (Kulis, 1998) and in earning tenure and the rank of full professor (Perna, 2001). In addition, females in the social sciences generally report less clarity regarding the tenure process and the standards and expectations required for tenure than males (Jaschik, 2010). Given the uneven distribution of access and opportunity between men and women, we reasoned that for female doctoral students to maximize their career progression they would place a greater emphasis on research support in the form of having expert colleagues and funding, as well as explicit performance standards, than their male colleagues:

- H2.* Female doctoral students will consider having explicit reward criteria and research support (e.g. expert colleagues and funding) as more important when selecting their first academic appointment than their male counterparts.

Interpersonal interactions and relationships. Findings in developmental psychology as well as career development suggest that personal relationships are of paramount importance for women (O'Neil and Bilimoria, 2005). For example, Hemmings *et al.* (2007) concluded that women feel that working with a strong and supportive mentor is critical to publishing success, suggesting that professional relationships play a crucial role in their career development. Additional research suggests that men tend to focus on challenges, ambitions, and skill development early in their careers, with a focus on relationships coming later after their career is well established, whereas, women focus on relationships throughout their career, creating a less sequential/linear career path (Mainiero and Sullivan, 2005). The emphasis that women seem to place on relationships suggests that they will also consider relationships important in selecting a first job and, in comparison to men, place a greater emphasis on a collegial environment that fosters such relationships:

- H3.* Female doctoral students will consider collegiality and relationships among faculty colleagues as more important in their first academic position than their male counterparts.

Racial/ethnic differences

Racial/ethnic diversity has become a major consideration in academics, fueled by legislation, increased immigration, globalization, the changing composition of the academic workforce, and so forth (Avery and Thomas, 2004). Nonetheless, relatively little is known about the extent to which management PhD students of various races/ethnicities demonstrate differences in the criteria they consider important in selecting an initial academic appointment. Even with an increase in minority applicants for faculty positions (PhD Project, 2008), minority faculty representation continues to be a very small part of the professoriate (Trower and Chait, 2002). For example, at AACSB-member US business schools, for full-time faculty whom race/ethnicity is known, only 4.0 percent are Black, non-Hispanic, and only 14.6 percent are Asian/Pacific Islander. The like percentage of minority doctoral students during this same time period is somewhat better, with 4.6 percent Black, non-Hispanic, and 7.4 percent Asian/Pacific Islander (personal communication, Jessica Brown, Manager – Knowledge Services, AACSB International, March 21, 2011).

Despite modest increases in the number of minorities earning doctorates, many choose not to follow an academic path, or exit academe prior to tenure because of a climate perceived as isolating, biased, and hostile (Trower and Chait, 2002). Because of such climate perceptions, minorities are likely to experience less satisfaction with their academic positions and a greater propensity to turn over (COACHE, 2008). Assuming that attracting racial/ethnic minority members to an academic career in management and enhancing their likelihood of staying is important to management departments, we believed it would be helpful to know what differences, if any, PhD management students of various races/ethnicities attached to various work- and non-worked-related criteria in evaluating an initial academic appointment. Whereas, there is an abundance of research on why and how minorities chose to enter academics (Cole and Barber, 2003), and more broadly based research on earning tenure once in an academic position (Williamson and Cable, 2003), there appear to be no studies that specifically address racial/ethnic differences in what management doctoral students desire in their first academic position. Owing to the absence of data to guide specific predictions related to racial/ethnic differences in desired job-choice criteria, we proposed a general research question:

RQ1. Are there racial/ethnic differences in what management doctoral students view as desirable in an initial academic job opportunity?

IV. Method

Sample and procedures

To reach our target population, we accessed the web sites of academic departments or institutes affiliated with US universities that offer doctoral programs in management or a cognate field (e.g. industrial relations; see Long *et al.*, 1998). Based on concentrations identified by AACSB International (2008b), we contacted doctoral students in the following management concentrations:

- behavioral science/organizational behavior;
- business ethics;
- computer information systems/management information systems;
- human resource management (including industrial relations);

- international business;
- management;
- production/operations management; and
- strategic management.

Whereas, Long *et al.* (1998) identified 105 US doctoral programs, nine have since been discontinued, and we added one program that was created after the compilation of their list, for a total of 97 programs. Of these programs, 58 listed their students by name on their departmental web sites, with their corresponding e-mail addresses. We selected potential study participants if they were:

- in one of the aforementioned academic concentrations; and
- a doctoral student.

In this way, we identified 898 potential survey respondents. We subsequently sent a personalized e-mail invitation to these potential respondents seeking their cooperation. The invitation contained a link to a web-based survey (described below) with assurances that all responses would be completely anonymous. We sent a follow-up e-mail encouraging cooperation approximately four weeks after the initial invitation to participate. For the 39 programs whose web sites did not list their students, we contacted either the program coordinator or program office and requested that they distribute a general invitation to participate in our study to all doctoral students enrolled in the designated academic concentrations.

In total, we received 365 survey responses. Of this total, we dropped 51 responses from our analyses. We eliminated ten surveys because 25 percent or more of the item responses were missing, 18 because the respondents were in PhD programs other than management (i.e. economics, finance, and marketing), and 23 responses because the respondents had recently obtained their doctoral degree and had accepted a job offer. Thus, the final sample used for our data analyses consisted of 314 respondents. Based on information obtained from AACSB International (2008b), we estimated that the population of students enrolled in management doctoral programs at the time of our data collection to be 1,167. We conservatively estimate that our usable sample represented roughly 27 percent (314/1,167) of this population.

Measures

As noted, almost all previous studies of job-selection criteria used by individuals seeking academic positions have relied on a 30-year old survey measure developed by Kida and Mannino (1980). Recognizing the definition of constructs evolves over time (Haynes *et al.*, 1995), we believed it was necessary to develop a more comprehensive and contemporary measure that would more fully capture the targeted content domain. In that, as Lindell and Brandt (2000) note, that “content validity can be established through pretests, focus groups, or interviews with expert informants” (p. 336), we undertook several steps in developing a new measure. First, we reviewed the relevant academic career-academic job-search literature (Austin, 2002; Mason *et al.*, 2009) to identify potential survey items. Second, we conducted open-ended interviews with 40 doctoral students and 11 faculty colleagues affiliated with four PhD programs in management. These interviews involved questions such as “When choosing an academic position in a management department,

what factors do you think new PhD graduates should consider?" Next, we reviewed 73 postings submitted as responses to a query we placed on the Job Seeking Experiences forum of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* web site. Like our interview questions, our query centered on what individuals would consider in selecting an initial academic appointment. These steps produced a pool of roughly 150 survey items. After eliminating redundant items, we retained 136 items (125 items tapping work- and non-work-related criteria, ten demographic items, and one open-ended item) were retained.

We asked respondents included in our final study sample to access an URL embedded in their invitation to participate and rate each survey item with respect to its importance in considering an initial academic appointment. With the exception of demographic items and the single open-ended item, all remaining survey items were anchored with a six-point rating scale (1 – not at all important to me, 2 – of little importance to me, 3 – somewhat important to me, 4 – important to me, 5 – very important to me, 6 – extremely important to me, and X – does not apply to me or I do not know).

V. Results

Of the 314 respondents to our survey, 190 (60.5 percent) were men and 124 (39.5 percent) were women. This breakdown mirrors the proportion of doctoral degrees awarded in the USA for men (60.5 percent) and women (39.5 percent) in the broad field of business for the period 2008-2009 (Bell, 2010, p. 47). Average respondent age was 33.6 years (SD = 6.5). A majority of respondents were White (63.7 percent), with Asians being the next largest racial/ethnic group (24.8 percent). Approximately, half indicated they planned to enter the job market in the next 18 months or less, and about half stated they intend to search for an academic position that emphasized research rather than an equal balance between research and teaching. Table I provides additional details pertaining to respondent characteristics.

Overall criteria deemed important

Our first objective was to identify what work- and non-work-related criteria management doctoral students in general consider important in selecting a first-time faculty appointment. We calculated the mean respondent ratings of all 125 items. Table II shows these items and their mean ratings rank-ordered from most important to least important.

Respondents rated approximately half (63 items) of the 125 items as important, very important, or extremely important when considering an initial academic appointment. Of these items, over 80 percent concerned job and professional criteria. For example, the item judged most important and on which there was the most consensus was "Freedom to conduct research in areas that interest you" ($M = 5.55$; $SD = 0.66$). Indeed, of the roughly top 10 percent of all items (see Table II, Items 1-12), three dealt directly and three indirectly (e.g. "Number of different course preparations in an academic year") with research activities. Given that some 92 percent of our respondents indicated a preference for an initial academic appointment with a stronger emphasis on research than on teaching, or an equal emphasis on research and teaching (Table I), the importance assigned to items concerned with research is not surprising. Although items 3 and 6 (Table II) are concerned with teaching, one might make the argument that these items actually reflect how much less time respondents would have available for research, as teaching is often viewed as a distraction from research-oriented activities (Bergeron and Liang, 2007).

Characteristic	n	%	Characteristic	n	%
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Time frame to seek a full-time academic position</i>		
Male	190	60.5	Within 12 months	117	37.3
Female	124	39.5	Within 13-18 months	34	10.8
			Within 19-24 months	48	15.3
			25 months or beyond	96	30.6
<i>Age (in years; M = 33.6, SD = 6.5)</i>			Not planning on seeking an academic position	0	0.0
20-25	21	6.7	Currently employed and not seeking other employment	18	5.7
26-30	91	29.0	No response	1	0.3
31-35	100	31.8	<i>Teaching/research balance</i>		
36-40	50	15.9	Stronger emphasis on teaching than on research	28	8.9
41-45	22	7.0	Stronger emphasis on research than on teaching	154	49.0
46-50	14	4.5	Roughly equal emphasis on teaching and research	131	41.7
>50	8	2.5	Not applicable	1	0.3
No response	8	2.5	No response	0	0.0
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>			<i>Preferred college/university type</i>		
White	200	63.7	Public	47	15.0
Asian (including those from India)	78	24.8	Private	36	11.5
Black or African-American	13	4.1	No preference	196	62.4
Hispanic or Latino	12	3.8	Not sure	34	10.8
American-Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0.3	No response	1	0.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1	0.3	<i>Preferred college/University size</i>		
Two or more races	6	1.9	Fewer than 5,000	5	1.6
No response	3	1.0	5,000 to 15,000	34	10.8
<i>Highest degree achieved (at time of survey)</i>			15,000 to 25,000	53	16.9
Bachelor's	49	15.6	More than 25,000	38	12.1
Master's	248	79.0	No preference	146	46.5
Doctorate	17	5.4	Not sure	37	11.8
No response	0	0.0	No response	1	0.3
<i>Current academic status</i>			<i>Preferred college/university setting</i>		
Doctoral student	307	97.8	Rural	23	7.3
Instructor or lecturer	3	1.0	Suburban	88	28.0
Assistant professor	0	0.0	Metropolitan	94	29.9
Associate professor	0	0.0	No preference	76	24.2
Full professor	0	0.0	Not sure	33	10.5
Not applicable	3	1.0	No response	0	0.0
No response	1	0.3			

Note: n = 314

Table I.
Respondent characteristics

Items ranked 10 and 11 (Table II) in importance concerned the stability of a hiring department and its programs and the financial stability of its school/college or university. Tenure and promotion were also important (Item 2), particularly in terms of the transparency of criteria used in making tenure/promotion decisions ($M = 5.34$; $SD = 0.83$). Thus, our findings suggest that respondents' primary criteria in assessing

Rank	Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ^a	SD
1	Freedom to conduct research in areas that interest you	314	5.55	0.66
2	Transparent criteria used in tenure/promotion decisions	310	5.34	0.83
3	Number of different course preparations in an academic year	314	5.19	0.91
4	Professional collegiality among faculty (e.g. discussing research ideas, obtaining guidance in resolving research problems)	312	5.18	0.91
5	Expected number and quality of publications required for promotion/tenure	313	5.15	0.88
6	Number of classes you would teach in an academic year	314	5.14	0.93
7	Freedom to publish in outlets that fit your research interests	310	4.99	0.96
8	Quality of library holdings (e.g. books, journals, indexes, databases)	313	4.88	1.13
9	Your compatibility with the department chair/head	309	4.83	1.04
10	Stability of the department and its programs (e.g. prospect of program mergers or elimination)	311	4.82	0.97
11	Financial stability of the school/college or university (e.g. no history or prospects of budget cuts)	313	4.78	1.01
12	Success of departmental faculty most recently evaluated for tenure	310	4.78	1.11
13	AACSB accreditation of the business school/college	310	4.76	1.34
14	Quality of available medical care	312	4.75	1.05
15	Availability of up-to-date computer equipment and software in your office	312	4.75	1.07
16	At least one colleague in your department with whom you might collaborate on research	313	4.74	1.03
17	Prospects for future salary increases	312	4.73	0.94
18	Local opportunities for a spouse/life partner to do things important to her/him	304	4.70	1.32
19	Freedom to teach courses as desired (e.g. choosing your textbook, determining course/test content, assigning grades)	313	4.70	1.14
20	Use of a specific list of journals by administrators as the basis for determining annual raises, promotion, and tenure	313	4.68	1.14
21	Extent that multi- versus sole-authored publications are rewarded	312	4.67	1.13
22	Guaranteed financial support for research (with no other responsibilities) during the first few summers of your appointment	313	4.64	1.07
23	Opportunity for financial support to present your research at international conferences	313	4.62	1.19
24	Academic reputation of departmental faculty	314	4.61	1.10
25	Senior faculty in your department willing to work with junior faculty (e.g. review papers, coauthor papers, discuss academic issues)	313	4.61	1.05
26	Funding to attend professional meetings (even if you are not on the program)	311	4.59	1.11
27	Quality of leadership at the departmental chair/head's level	312	4.57	1.17
28	Size (in dollars) of your starting salary	314	4.54	0.86
29	A reduced teaching load during the first year of your appointment	312	4.54	1.22
30	Statistical/software consulting support for your research activities	312	4.52	1.22
31	Extent departmental faculty publish in top journals	314	4.48	1.20
32	Long-term plans of the department/school/college (e.g. future funding, academic programs to be offered, admission requirements)	311	4.46	1.00
33	Extent university is "family friendly" <i>vis-à-vis</i> raising children, balancing family and work demands, etc.	305	4.45	1.43
34	Local crime rate	313	4.42	1.25
35	Ease with which you could obtain a faculty position with another university if you choose to do so (i.e. Would your professional peers see this job as a "stepping stone" or as a "barrier" to a better academic appointment?)	310	4.40	1.23
36	Departmental faculty turnover rate	313	4.39	1.13

(continued)

Table II.
Means and standard deviations for items rated by doctoral management students as important in choosing an initial academic position

Rank	Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ^a	SD
37	Local cost of living (e.g. for food, utilities, housing, transportation, property/state income taxes)	313	4.38	1.16
38	Social relationships among faculty members (e.g. going to lunch; having informal, non-work-related discussions)	313	4.38	1.22
39	Quality of the university's healthcare plan	312	4.35	1.09
40	A "startup package" to facilitate your research program (e.g. additional computers, software, and databases, work or lab space, such as a behavioral lab for conducting experiments) other than your faculty office	313	4.33	1.10
41	Specific courses you would teach	314	4.29	1.05
42	A PhD program in your department that supports and emphasizes graduate student research (e.g. conference presentations, journal article submissions)	314	4.27	1.38
43	Overall university prestige	314	4.25	1.19
44	For those seeking an appointment with a college in the USA, the region of the USA where the university is located (e.g. northeast, southwest)	309	4.23	1.45
45	Quality of students enrolled in your classes	314	4.23	1.09
46	One or more course releases for research every few years or so	310	4.22	1.09
47	Availability of local social or leisure activities	310	4.22	1.22
48	Having graduate research assistant(s)	313	4.21	1.13
49	Quality of the university's retirement plan	312	4.20	1.12
50	Competitive summer research grants	311	4.18	1.05
51	Departmental faculty who have research interests similar to your own	313	4.18	1.07
52	Opportunities for exposure to leading researchers in your area through formal departmental colloquia	313	4.17	1.17
53	Potential for adding new faculty in your academic specialty	312	4.17	1.13
54	Extent departmental faculty in your area are around and available	313	4.16	1.07
55	Quality of leadership at the dean's level	309	4.14	1.19
56	Access to local organizations (e.g. within 25-50 miles) for research purposes	312	4.13	1.24
57	Having a limited number of departmental/college committee assignments during your first few years of employment	313	4.10	1.24
58	Your proximity to a regional or larger airport	310	4.08	1.27
59	A formalized program that extends one's tenure clock for care giving (new baby; aging/ill immediate family members)	304	4.07	1.48
60	Opportunity to teach a full course load in one semester with the other semester available for research (on- or off-campus)	307	4.06	1.24
61	Classroom technology (e.g. computer with web access, projection equipment)	312	4.04	1.20
62	A formalized mentoring system for junior faculty in the department (i.e. a designated senior faculty member mentors a new faculty member)	313	4.04	1.32
63	Quality of preschool/schools for children	291	4.02	1.68
64	Local climate/weather	313	3.99	1.33
65	Emphasis on teaching performance for promotion and tenure	311	3.96	1.28
66	Number of students enrolled in your classes	310	3.95	1.14
67	Colleagues in departments other than your own with whom you might collaborate on research	312	3.89	1.16
68	Number of full-time, tenure-track faculty in the department	313	3.88	1.06
69	Amount of time expected to be spent in office or on campus	310	3.88	1.38
70	Amount of traffic and congestion in the town where the university is located	312	3.86	1.28
71	Small (<\$1,000) grants (department or school/college-sponsored) to underwrite research expenses	311	3.84	1.16
72	Opportunity to teach graduate-level courses	310	3.82	1.24
73	A moving allowance to cover relocation expenses	312	3.81	1.19

(continued)

Table II.

Rank	Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ^a	SD
74	A Master's program in your department	308	3.80	1.43
75	Receiving a formal, written performance review each year	311	3.79	1.29
76	Percentage of departmental faculty with tenure	313	3.75	1.15
77	Departmental faculty in your area who are journal editors or serving on editorial boards	313	3.72	1.31
78	Opportunity to teach upper-level (junior-senior) undergraduate courses versus lower level courses (sophomore)	311	3.70	1.37
79	A formalized sabbatical program	313	3.69	1.22
80	Physical condition of classrooms	313	3.68	1.16
81	Extent student evaluations are used for assessing teaching performance	310	3.65	1.22
82	Extent departmental faculty participate in professional associations	310	3.64	1.27
83	Extent that amount of dollars generated in overhead through externally funded research contracts/grants is used to assess faculty performance	295	3.61	1.45
84	Quality/location of your office	314	3.60	1.17
85	Geographic proximity of your family (e.g. parents, siblings, in-laws)	306	3.58	1.64
86	Access to professional assistance (e.g. proposal preparation, identifying funding sources) in obtaining external research contracts/grants	313	3.57	1.32
87	Opportunity to live in a place where you can bike or walk to work	312	3.57	1.46
88	Having graduate teaching assistant(s)	313	3.56	1.23
89	Availability of acceptable local-area childcare	286	3.55	1.73
90	Quality of leadership at the provost/president's level	305	3.54	1.19
91	Opportunity to chair/serve on Master's theses and PhD dissertations	308	3.51	1.35
92	Clerical/secretarial support	314	3.49	1.18
93	Availability of a university-sponsored athletic fitness center	312	3.47	1.45
94	Cultural diversity of the community where the university is located	310	3.45	1.47
95	A formalized program that reduces departmental responsibilities during the term one has or adopts a child	302	3.44	1.69
96	Active public relations office that promotes faculty members' research and other professional accomplishments	311	3.41	1.37
97	Supplemental pay to teach in outreach programs (e.g. executive development or distance education programs)	311	3.37	1.24
98	Availability of public transportation	309	3.35	1.42
99	If you were to accept an appointment, an expense-paid, return trip to find housing	311	3.35	1.22
100	Quality of local restaurants	308	3.34	1.37
101	University assistance in finding acceptable employment for a spouse/life partner	303	3.33	1.64
102	Access to professional assistance for improving your teaching	311	3.30	1.37
103	Availability of convenient parking	308	3.27	1.41
104	Editorial/graphic assistance for preparing journal submissions	309	3.17	1.34
105	A guaranteed opportunity (if you choose) to teach during the first few summers of your appointment	309	3.17	1.40
106	Reduced tuition rate for immediate family members to attend the university	302	3.16	1.51
107	Extent you are required to advise undergraduates	311	3.15	1.23
108	Availability of local shopping opportunities	313	3.14	1.25
109	Availability of a writing center to help students with writing assignments	308	3.13	1.37
110	Opportunities for involvement in international programs (e.g. summer study abroad for students)	313	3.11	1.47
111	Availability of consulting opportunities	309	3.08	1.35
112	Diversity (e.g. cultural, race, ethnicity) of the student body	314	3.08	1.41

(continued)

Table II.

Rank	Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ^a	SD
113	Departmental colleagues who primarily value teaching	314	3.06	1.28
114	Children's daycare facilities at the university	284	3.05	1.61
115	Extent departmental faculty (including families) regularly socialize together away from work	313	3.03	1.18
116	Age/gender/racial composition of departmental faculty	311	2.94	1.38
117	Size of the university (e.g. number of students, faculty)	312	2.91	1.25
118	Being put on the university payroll in advance of your required reporting date	297	2.79	1.18
119	Proximity of teaching classrooms to your office	311	2.69	1.26
120	Type of university (i.e. public versus private)	311	2.61	1.32
121	Availability of university-owned housing or a mortgage-assistance program	308	2.54	1.19
122	University's academic calendar (quarter versus semester)	311	2.43	1.23
123	For those seeking an appointment with a college in the USA, politics of the state where the university is located (Republican versus Democrat)	307	2.42	1.48
124	Formal departmental/college dress code	308	2.29	1.22
125	University's emphasis on NCAA athletics (e.g. football, basketball)	309	2.10	1.14

Notes: ^a1 – not at all important; 2 – of little importance; 3 – somewhat important; 4 – important; 5 – very important; 6 – extremely important

Table II.

an initial appointment were related to job and professional issues associated with research and tenure/promotion concerns. Upon further review, 12 of the top 63 survey items rated as important involved quality of life and personal/family issues. These items stressed criteria such as quality of available medical care (Item 14; $M = 4.75$; $SD = 1.05$); local opportunities for a spouse/life partner to do things of interest (Item 19; $M = 4.70$; $SD = 1.32$); and extent to which a university is “family friendly” with regard to raising children and balancing family-work demands (Item 33; $M = 4.45$; $SD = 1.43$). Although respondents rated a number of personal items as important, job and professional issues were dominant considerations in assessing an initial employment opportunity.

Gender and racial/ethnicity differences in importance of academic appointment criteria

Our second objective was to determine if there were gender or racial/ethnicity differences in how management doctoral students perceived the importance of various work- and non-work criteria when considering an initial academic appointment. Given the large number of survey items, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis on the items into factors for more meaningful comparisons. Our intent at this point was to discover simple patterns of relationships among the items rather than to establish how well theory-driven hypothesized factors explained our observed data.

To determine the number of factors to retain, we used parallel analysis, which is considered superior to the eigenvalue-greater-than-1 and scree-plot methods of factor selection (Henson and Roberts, 2006). Results of this analysis suggested a 13-factor solution. Based on these results, we explored several different factor solutions using principal-axis factoring with varimax rotation. Using a factor loading of 0.45 or higher as an item cutoff criterion (Ford *et al.*, 1986), as well as considering factor interpretability, we settled on an 11-factor solution having no cross-loading items (>0.40) as the most meaningful and parsimonious structure. (Table III shows the items

Item	Loading
<i>Factor 1: quality of institutional leadership and support ($\alpha = 0.86$)</i>	
Long-term plans of the department/school/college (e.g. future funding, academic programs to be offered, admission requirements)	0.66
Stability of the department and its programs (e.g. prospect of program mergers or elimination)	0.64
Quality of leadership at the dean's level	0.64
Quality of leadership at the departmental chair/head's level	0.60
Your compatibility with the department chair/head	0.60
Financial stability of the school/college or university (e.g. no history or prospects of budget cuts)	0.55
Quality of leadership at the provost/president's level	0.54
Quality of library holdings (e.g. books, journals, indexes, databases)	0.49
Classroom technology (e.g. computer with web access, projection equipment)	0.48
<i>Factor 2: academic prestige ($\alpha = 0.86$)</i>	
Extent departmental faculty publish in top journals	0.78
Academic reputation of departmental faculty	0.75
Departmental faculty in your area who are journal editors or serving on editorial boards	0.65
A PhD program in your department that supports and emphasizes graduate student research (e.g. conference presentations, journal article submissions)	0.65
Overall university prestige	0.63
Number of full-time, tenure-track faculty in the department	0.63
Opportunity to chair/serve on Master's theses and PhD dissertations	0.49
Percentage of departmental faculty with tenure	0.45
<i>Factor 3: temporal/physical contextual considerations ($\alpha = 0.77$)</i>	
University's academic calendar (quarter versus semester)	0.65
Size of the university (e.g. number of students, faculty)	0.55
Quality/location of your office	0.54
Local climate/weather	0.50
Proximity of teaching classrooms to your office	0.48
Type of university (i.e. public versus private)	0.48
Physical condition of classrooms	0.46
<i>Factor 4: faculty collegiality and relationships ($\alpha = 0.87$)</i>	
At least one colleague in your department with whom you might collaborate on research	0.68
Extent departmental faculty in your area are around and available	0.65
Departmental faculty who have research interests similar to your own	0.63
Extent departmental faculty (including families) regularly socialize together away from work	0.63
Colleagues in departments other than your own with whom you might collaborate on research	0.62
Senior faculty in your department willing to work with junior faculty (e.g. review papers, coauthor papers, discuss academic issues)	0.59
Social relationships among faculty members (e.g. going to lunch; having informal, non-work-related discussions)	0.58
Professional collegiality among faculty (e.g. discussing research ideas, obtaining guidance in resolving research problems)	0.49
<i>Factor 5: research support ($\alpha = 0.83$)</i>	
Competitive summer research grants	0.57
Access to professional assistance (e.g. proposal preparation, identifying funding sources) in obtaining external research contracts/grants	0.55

(continued)

Table III.
Factor loadings for items rated by doctoral management students as important in choosing an initial academic position

CDI 16,4	Item	Loading
	Guaranteed financial support for research (with no other responsibilities) during the first few summers of your appointment	0.52
	Opportunities for exposure to leading researchers in your area through formal departmental colloquia	0.51
	Opportunity for financial support to present your research at international conferences	0.49
	Small (<\$1,000) grants (department or school/college-sponsored) to underwrite research expenses	0.47
	One or more course releases for research every few years or so	0.46
	Access to local organizations (e.g. within 25-50 miles) for research purposes	0.45
	<i>Factor 6: performance and reward criteria ($\alpha = 0.79$)</i>	
	Emphasis on teaching performance for promotion and tenure	0.64
	Expected number and quality of publications required for promotion/tenure	0.60
	Extent student evaluations are used for assessing teaching performance	0.58
	Extent that multi-authored versus sole-authored publications are rewarded	0.56
	Receiving a formal, written performance review each year	0.54
	Use of a specific list of journals by administrators as the basis for determining annual raises, promotion, and tenure	0.52
	Success of departmental faculty most recently evaluated for tenure	0.49
	<i>Factor 7: family friendliness ($\alpha = 0.89$)</i>	
	Availability of acceptable local-area childcare	0.77
	A formalized program that reduces departmental responsibilities during the term one has or adopts a child	0.75
	A formalized program that extends one's tenure clock for care giving (new baby; aging/ill immediate family members)	0.75
	Quality of preschool/schools for children	0.73
	Children's daycare facilities at the university	0.69
	Extent university is "family-friendly" <i>vis-à-vis</i> raising children, balancing family and work demands, etc.	0.66
	University assistance in finding acceptable employment for a spouse/life partner	0.46
	<i>Factor 8: teaching load ($\alpha = 0.73$)</i>	
	Number of classes you would teach in an academic year	0.68
	Number of different course preparations in an academic year	0.58
	Specific courses you would teach	0.49
	A reduced teaching load during the first year of your appointment	0.47
	<i>Factor 9: community amenities ($\alpha = 0.80$)</i>	
	Quality of local restaurants	0.69
	Availability of local social or leisure activities	0.63
	Availability of local shopping opportunities	0.60
	Availability of public transportation	0.51
	Your proximity to a regional or larger airport	0.48
	<i>Factor 10: university and community diversity ($\alpha = 0.78$)</i>	
	Diversity (e.g. cultural, race, ethnicity) of the student body	0.64
	Cultural diversity of the community where the university is located	0.61
	Age/gender/racial composition of departmental faculty	0.50
	<i>Factor 11: opportunity for advanced undergraduate/graduate teaching ($\alpha = 0.73$)</i>	
	Opportunity to teach graduate-level courses	0.57
	Opportunity to teach upper-level (junior-senior) undergraduate courses versus lower level courses (sophomore)	0.46
	A Master's program in your department	0.45
	Having graduate research assistant(s)	0.45
	Note: $n = 308-314$	

Table III.

and factor loadings for the 11-factor solution.) Table IV presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the factors. Simple correlations among the 11 factors ranged from 0.14 to 0.54 ($M = 0.33$; $SD = 0.10$), indicating that the factors were not completely orthogonal.

Because of correlations among the factors, we first computed a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with gender and race as the independent variables and the 11 derived factors as the dependent variables. We found differences for gender, Wilks' $\lambda = 0.89$, $F(11,257) = 2.82$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_m^2 = 0.11$, where η_m^2 represents the multivariate effect size (Steyn and Ellis, 2009), and differences for race/ethnicity, Wilks' $\lambda = 0.82$, $F(11,257) = 5.07$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_m^2 = 0.18$. The interaction effect between gender and race/ethnicity, however, was not significant (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.93$, $F(11,257) = 1.65$, $p > 0.05$, $\eta_m^2 = 0.07$). Based on these results, we explored the nature of the underlying main effects' differences for gender and race/ethnicity through a series of univariate ANOVA (Hasse and Ellis, 1987). Table V shows the results of the ANOVAs for both independent variables, along with means and standard deviations.

Gender differences. Turning first to *H1*, we predicted that female doctoral students would rate family-friendly policies as more important in taking an initial academic position than their male counterparts. As indicated in Table V, female doctoral students judged family friendliness to be more important than did their male colleagues, $F(1,307) = 15.10$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$, thus supporting *H1*. *H2* posited that female doctoral students would also attach greater importance to explicit reward criteria and research support than their male counterparts. As shown in Table V, this hypothesis was also supported. Female doctoral students attributed greater importance to the research support, $F(1,312) = 9.70$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.03$, and performance and reward criteria, $F(1,311) = 4.44$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$, factors than did male respondents. Our *H3* predicted that female doctoral students would consider faculty collegiality and relationships among faculty colleagues as more important in their first academic positions than their male counterparts. This hypothesis was not supported. Male and female doctoral students considered faculty collegiality and relationships to be equally important. Although not hypothesized, we found one other gender difference for the factor, diversity of the university and community, $F(1,312) = 23.15$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.07$. Female doctoral students attributed greater importance to university and community diversity than did male doctoral students.

Racial/ethnic differences. Owing to the absence of data to guide specific predictions related to racial/ethnic differences in desired job-choice criteria, we posed the following research question:

RQ1. Are there racial/ethnic differences in what management doctoral students view as desirable in an initial academic job opportunity?

To address this question, we employed the race and ethnic categories designated by the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 2007) to code respondent race/ethnicity. Approximately, 64 percent of our respondents were White, and roughly 25 percent were Asian (including respondents from India). Given the low proportion of respondents who were African-American, Hispanic or Latino, American-Indian, Native Hawaiian, or multi-racial, we omitted these groups from subsequent analyses, leaving only Whites and Asians for comparison.

Table IV.
Means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and intercorrelations among factors important in choosing an initial academic position

Factor	M	SD	<i>r</i>															
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11					
1. Quality of institutional leadership and support	4.45	0.77	<i>0.86</i>															
2. Academic prestige	4.06	0.87	0.29	<i>0.86</i>														
3. Temporal/physical contextual considerations	3.13	0.81	0.51	0.29	<i>0.77</i>													
4. Faculty collegiality and relationships	4.27	0.78	0.44	0.47	0.32	<i>0.87</i>												
5. Research support	4.17	0.78	0.53	0.54	0.37	0.46	<i>0.83</i>											
6. Performance and reward criteria	4.38	0.77	0.38	0.23	0.29	0.27	0.31	<i>0.79</i>										
7. Family friendliness	3.69	1.25	0.24	0.26	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.22	<i>0.89</i>									
8. Teaching load	4.79	0.78	0.38	0.25	0.32	0.27	0.34	0.34	0.14	<i>0.73</i>								
9. Community amenities	3.63	0.97	0.29	0.21	0.44	0.26	0.27	0.15	0.34	0.23	<i>0.80</i>							
10. Diversity of the university and community	3.47	1.01	0.34	0.45	0.32	0.34	0.39	0.25	0.36	0.21	0.42	<i>0.78</i>						
11. Opportunity for advanced undergraduate/graduate teaching	3.88	0.96	0.42	0.45	0.42	0.24	0.47	0.37	0.18	0.38	0.29	0.33	<i>0.73</i>					

Notes: *n* = 308-314; correlations ≥ 0.14 are significant, *p* ≤ 0.05 (two-tailed test); coefficient alpha estimates are italicized on the diagonal

Factor	α	Gender				Race/ethnicity				η^2		
		Male (<i>n</i> = 190)		Female (<i>n</i> = 124)		White (<i>n</i> = 200)		Asian (<i>n</i> = 78)				
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
1. Quality of institutional leadership and support	0.86	4.42	0.76	4.50	0.77	0.81	4.39	0.75	4.54	0.81	2.09	0.01
2. Academic prestige	0.86	4.01	0.85	4.14	0.89	1.63	3.94	0.88	4.45	0.77	19.93**	0.07
3. Temporal/physical contextual considerations	0.77	3.10	0.81	3.19	0.82	0.96	3.03	0.81	3.40	0.83	11.27**	0.04
4. Faculty collegiality and relationships	0.87	4.24	0.77	4.33	0.81	0.97	4.18	0.77	4.59	0.76	15.84**	0.05
5. Research support	0.83	4.06	0.74	4.34	0.81	9.70**	3.96	0.75	4.60	0.70	41.83**	0.13
6. Performance and reward criteria	0.79	4.31	0.77	4.50	0.77	4.44*	4.36	0.74	4.44	0.84	0.62	0.00
7. Family friendliness	0.89	3.48	1.17	4.03	1.29	15.10**	3.59	1.25	3.95	1.15	4.61*	0.02
8. Teaching load	0.73	4.79	0.76	4.79	0.81	0.00	4.76	0.72	4.83	0.92	0.39	0.00
9. Community amenities	0.80	3.62	0.92	3.64	1.05	0.06	3.59	1.00	3.68	0.90	0.55	0.00
10. Diversity of the university and community	0.78	3.25	1.00	3.79	0.93	23.15**	3.30	0.99	3.81	0.98	15.32**	0.05
11. Opportunity for advanced undergraduate/graduate teaching	0.73	3.89	0.95	3.85	0.99	0.15	3.78	0.97	4.10	0.95	6.15*	0.02

Notes: Significant at: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$; for gender, Wilks' $\lambda = 0.85$, $F(11,295) = 4.92$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_m^2 = 0.16$; for race/ethnicity, Wilks' $\lambda = 0.80$, $F(11,259) = 5.89$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_m^2 = 0.20$; importance ratings were made on the following rating scale: 1 – not at all important; 2 – of little importance; 3 – somewhat important; 4 – important; 5 – very important; 6 – extremely important

Table V.
Gender and race/ethnicity
differences in
management doctoral
students' rated
importance of factors in
choosing an initial
academic appointment

Racial/ethnic differences were evidenced for seven of the 11 factors derived from our factor analysis of the 125 survey items tapping work- and non-work-related criteria related to choosing an initial academic appointment (Table V). Asian management doctoral students rated the following factors as more important than their White colleagues: academic prestige, $F(1,276) = 19.93, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.07$, temporal/physical contextual considerations, $F(1,276) = 11.27, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.04$, faculty collegiality and relationships, $F(1,276) = 15.84, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.05$, research support, $F(1,276) = 41.83, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.13$, family friendliness, $F(1,271) = 4.61, p < 0.05, \eta^2 = 0.02$, diversity of the university and community, $F(1,276) = 15.32, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.05$, and opportunity for advanced undergraduate/graduate teaching, $F(1,276) = 6.15, p < 0.05, \eta^2 = 0.02$. Of these seven factors, two, academic prestige and research support, were most prominent. In general, six of the seven factors for which there were racial/ethnic differences were professional/career oriented. The one remaining factor, family friendliness, though statistically significant, explained only a small portion of between-race/ethnic differences ($\eta^2 = 0.02$).

VI. Discussion and implications

Our primary objectives in undertaking this study were:

- (1) To identify the work- and non-work-related criteria management doctoral students in general consider important in selecting an initial academic appointment.
- (2) To explore whether gender and race/ethnicity are associated with the importance attached to these criteria.

On average, survey respondents considered criteria associated with opportunities to pursue research activities as more important than other considerations. Although there were differences in the criteria male and female doctoral students consider important in assessing an initial employment opportunity, these discrepancies were not generally large. Female doctoral students tended to rate the diversity of a university and its surrounding community, family friendliness of a department/institution, research support, and clarity of performance criteria as being slightly more important than their male colleagues.

For the most part, the factors rated higher by female management doctoral students seem to reflect a balance between professional and personal criteria. Although the aforementioned gender differences were statistically significant, the mean differences between male and female respondents for research support and performance and reward criteria accounted for a small proportion of the differences due to gender ($\eta^2 = 0.03$ and 0.01 , respectively). This would seem to suggest that both male and female doctoral students are likely to desire explicit reward criteria and research support as they begin their academic careers. Family friendliness, on the other hand, exhibited a larger gender difference, accounting for 5 percent of the variance explained and, thereby, lending credibility to the notion that females maintain a larger number of roles and primary care responsibilities and, thus, compared to their male counterparts, consider family friendly policies more important. It is encouraging that recent evidence suggests that substantial progress has been made in introducing “family-friendly” policies (such as family leave following the birth or adoption of a child, extension of the tenure clock for women who bear a child, and on-campus childcare) that have helped female (and male) faculty seeking to combine family and work responsibilities

(MIT, 2011). Additionally, we predicted that female doctoral students would consider collegiality and relationships among colleagues to be more important than their male counterparts, but this prediction was not supported.

Somewhat unexpected was the prominence of diversity as a major area of importance for female as compared to male management doctoral students. The diversity factor, which included student body, community, and departmental faculty, explained 7 percent of gender differences. This was greater than the variance explained by any other factor. These findings suggest that female doctoral students might be seeking a work environment that is more culturally and racially diverse. This explanation seems reasonable when one considers that women tend to exhibit lower performance and experience more stress in male-dominated environments (Ott, 1989). Our results may indicate that female respondents see management departments as more homogenous in gender and race (i.e. White, male) and are concerned that this will place them at a disadvantage in an initial academic position. Thus, women may see the presence of diversity as an indication of a more level playing field and a greater opportunity for career development.

Our analysis of racial/ethnicity differences showed that Asian management doctoral students placed more emphasis than Whites on items associated with the support of research activities. Research considerations were not the only items for which there were racial/ethnicity differences, but were generally perceived as most important in assessing an initial academic appointment. Previous research by Mamiseishvili and Rosser (2010) indicated international faculty (including Asians) are significantly more productive in research, but less engaged in teaching and service than their US citizen colleagues. Thus, our finding that Asian management doctoral students placed a greater emphasis on research criteria than their White colleagues aligns with previous research.

The differences observed between White and Asian management doctoral students suggest that culture may play an important role in what new management PhDs find desirable in their first academic appointment. One of the most popular and useful frameworks for looking at culture is Hofstede's five cultural dimensions (though not without its criticisms (Ailon, 2008; McSweeney, 2002; Taras *et al.*, 2010)), which consists of: individualism versus collectivism, power distance, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term versus short-term orientation (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005). Our results may be indicative of how cultural aspects influence initial job choices. For instance, Asian doctoral students gave greater importance to faculty collegiality and relationships than did their White peers. This result might be an indicator of a collectivistic cultural value held by Asians. Additionally, Asian doctoral students' emphasis on academic prestige may be indicative of a culture of power distance, where the benefits of graduating from a prestigious American university provide the students with high returns in terms of status and job opportunities after returning to their home country (Bound *et al.*, 2009).

The pattern of gender and racial/ethnicity differences we observed when respondents rated the importance of criteria in assessing an initial academic appointment was also confirmed when we asked what type of academic setting management doctoral students preferred (i.e. research oriented, balanced, or teaching oriented). We computed separate $2 \times 3 \chi^2$ tests for both gender and race/ethnicity in terms of preferred academic setting. Male and female doctoral students did not differ in their preferences. Asians, however,

in contrast to their White counterparts, preferred research institutions as an initial place of employment versus balanced or teaching-oriented settings ($\chi^2 = 8.08, p < 0.05$).

These results carry important implications for departmental administrators and faculty alike. A recent survey by the Council of Graduate Schools indicated that applications for graduate school by international students rose by 7 percent overall, and applications for business PhDs have risen 8 percent (Bell and Mahler, 2010). Of those international applicants, India, China, and South Korea (all three national origins were denoted as Asian in our study) constitute the top three countries of origin for international graduate students. In addition, as recently as 2005, 31 percent of doctoral degrees across all disciplines were awarded to international students, and many of these students remain in the USA following graduation (Mamiseishvili and Rosser, 2010), thus increasing the likelihood that management departments will recruit Asian PhDs for faculty appointments.

An additional implication concerns the relative ranking of initial salary in comparison to other work- and non-work-related criteria. As noted, the item, "Size (in dollars) of your starting salary" was ranked 28th in importance. This particular ranking suggests that budget constraints in terms of salary offers should not be seen as precluding departments from successfully competing for top talent. By emphasizing other work- and non-related criteria perceived as equally or more important, departments may be able to effectively bid for desired candidates (Bertin and Zivney, 1991). Money is, thus, only one among many criteria considered by management doctoral student's seeking their first academic position.

Study limitations and strengths

As with all studies, the present investigation is not without limitations. First, because we did not know the exact size, gender composition, and racial/ethnicity distribution of the US-based management doctoral student population, a primary limitation stems from our inability to determine the representativeness of our respondent sample. Though we were able to approximate the participation rate in our study, we believe our estimated participation rate is conservative. Nevertheless, the generalizability of our findings is unknown. A second limitation concerns the analysis of race/ethnicity and its use as an indicator of culture. The respondents in our survey indicated their race/ethnicity, but not their nationality, or whether they were immigrants or US citizens, as the EEOC designation of Asian does not account for these differences. It is possible that respondents from India may differ from Chinese respondents in their preferences for different criteria. Thus, grouping and treating these two respondent groups as Asian may have confounded our results to some degree. It is also possible that respondents who were not US citizens or residents may have likewise differed in their preferences.

With regard to study strengths, our inability to establish the generalizability of our results is balanced to some extent by our study design. We were able to solicit responses from doctoral students enrolled in a comprehensive list of US-based PhD programs in management. Given the voluntary nature and anonymity of study participation, we see no reason to believe that respondents were untruthful, biased in their responses, or unrepresentative of our general target population of PhD students seeking management degrees in US universities. This is not to say that our respondents may not have been influenced by factors associated with their admission

to a PhD program or their socialization as a doctoral student. Indeed, recognizing the demanding tenure requirements and heavy emphasis on research at many universities, if nothing else, our findings suggest that current management PhD students agree about the importance of various work- and non-work-related criteria in assessing an initial academic appointment.

A second study strength is that through careful pretesting we were able to develop survey items appropriate for use with both English and non-native English speakers. The majority of career-related measures were developed solely with English-speaking respondents in mind. Such a survey design is problematic in that a number of newly or soon-to-be management PhDs entering the US academic marketplace are foreign born and, as our results suggest, the work and non-work-related criteria they value may differ from their native-born counterparts. As management departments vie to achieve a competitive edge in recruiting new faculty, fulfilling the expectations of both groups will be necessary for attracting and retaining the very best talent.

Finally, given our relatively large number of female respondents, we were able to explore gender-based differences in response patterns. Although differences in the criteria male and female doctoral students consider important were not generally large, they should caution against adopting a “one-size-fits-all” strategy in attracting new faculty. Given increasing gender diversity within the management discipline, departments need to be vigilant in their efforts to address job-selection criteria that are relevant to both men and women.

Directions for future research

Whereas, we designed our survey to be comprehensive, we received open-ended comments regarding considerations that were not included among its items. These considerations related to community involvement initiatives of a hiring department, availability of placement opportunities within the same university for a spouse, university aesthetics, respect of sexual orientation in university policies and practices, immigration assistance for international students, and university climate regarding health-related issues. Adding items to our survey that address these considerations may prove beneficial and informative in future research.

Other possible areas for further research are more general. One area is the degree to which a match between the expectations of faculty at the time they accept an initial academic appointment and their actual on-the-job experiences leads to greater career success and satisfaction. A second related area concerns how job-criteria preferences change as faculty advance in their careers and encounter different life experiences. Previous cross-sectional research (Holland and Arrington, 1987) indicates that the preferences of faculty shift from professional factors (e.g. research support) to more personal concerns (e.g. spouse’s happiness and quality of life) as their careers unfold. A longitudinal study may help to determine if, why, and when faculty job-criteria preferences change and the relative importance of professional and personal factors across time. Such a study may also provide information that could be helpful in retaining existing faculty or, alternatively, enticing other faculty to relocate.

A final avenue for future research would be to extend our study to PhD candidates internationally. Replication with other samples of management PhD students drawn from varying national and societal contexts possessing alternative educational and normative structures would extend the generalizability of our results.

References

- AACSB International (2003), *Sustaining Scholarship in Business Schools*, Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, Tampa, FL, available at: www.gfme.org/issues/pdfs/SustainingScholarship.pdf (accessed March 21, 2011).
- AACSB International (2008a), *Business School Faculty Trends Report (2008)*, Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, Tampa, FL, available at: www.aacsb.edu/dataandresearch/reports/default.asp (accessed May 3, 2010).
- AACSB International (2008b), *Business School Questionnaire: Part 2 Overview Report 2007-2008*, Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, Tampa, FL.
- AAUP (2004), "Research director reports on gender gap", *Academe Online*, available at: www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/MJ/AW/RptGndrGap.htm (accessed September 6, 2010).
- Ailon, G. (2008), "Mirror, mirror on the wall: culture's consequences in a value test of its own design", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 33, pp. 885-904.
- Allen, T.D. (2001), "Family-supportive work environments: the role of organizational perceptions", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 414-35.
- Asmar, C. (1999), "Is there a gendered agenda in academia? The research experience of female and male PhD graduates in Australian universities", *Higher Education*, Vol. 38, pp. 255-73.
- Austin, A.E. (2002), "Preparing the next generation of faculty: graduate school as socialization to the academic career", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 73, pp. 94-122.
- Avery, D.R. and Thomas, K.M. (2004), "Blending content and contact: the roles of diversity curriculum and campus heterogeneity in fostering diversity management competency", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 3, pp. 380-96.
- Baruch, Y. and Hall, D.T. (2004), "The academic career: a model for future careers in other sectors?", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 64, pp. 241-62.
- Bedeian, A.G., Cavazos, D.E., Hunt, J.G. and Jauch, L.R. (2010), "Doctoral degree prestige and the academic marketplace: a study of career mobility within the management discipline", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 9, pp. 11-25.
- Bell, N.E. (2010), *Graduate Enrollment and Degrees: 1999 to 2009*, Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, DC, available at: www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/R_ED2009.pdf (accessed February 6, 2011).
- Bell, N.E. and Mahler, J.D. (2010), *Findings from the 2010 CGS International Graduate Admissions Survey*, Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, DC, available at: www.cgsnet.org/Default.aspx?tabid=172 (accessed April 13).
- Bergeron, D.M. and Liang, X.F. (2007), "Thriving in the academy: a model of faculty career success", in Solomon, G.T. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2007 Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA*.
- Bertin, W.J. and Zivney, T.L. (1991), "The new hire market for finance: productivity, salaries and other market factors", *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 1, pp. 25-34.
- Bound, J., Turner, S.E. and Walsh, P. (2009), "Internationalization of US doctorate education", Working Paper No. 14792, National Bureau of Economic Research, available at: www.nber.org/papers/w14792 (accessed March 25, 2010).
- Bretz, R.D. and Judge, T.A. (1994), "Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 44, pp. 32-54.
- Carter, S.D. (2010), "Differences in career paths of female and male faculty in the US", eNewline: Management Education News from AACSB International, available at: www.aacsb.edu/publications/enewline/archives/2010/vol9-issue2-gender.pdf (accessed September 6).

-
- COACHE (2007), "The one-two policy punch – be sure to consider importance and effectiveness", available at: <http://gseacademic.harvard.edu/~coache/reports/20070801.html> (accessed February 4, 2009).
- COACHE (2008), *Highlights Report 2008: Selected Results from the COACHE Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey*, available at: http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic436591.files/COACHE_HighlightsReport2008.pdf (accessed February 4, 2009).
- Cole, S. and Barber, E.G. (2003), *Increasing Faculty Diversity: The Occupational Choices of High-Achieving Minority Students*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Creamer, E.G. and Amelink, C.T. (2007), "Work-life spillover and job satisfaction of married/partnered faculty members", *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, Vol. 13, pp. 317-32.
- de Rond, M. and Miller, A.N. (2005), "Publish or perish: bane or boon of academic life?", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 14, pp. 321-9.
- de Wet, C.B. and de Wet, A.P. (1997), "Sharing academic careers: an alternative for pre-tenure and young family dual-career faculty couples", *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, Vol. 3, pp. 203-21.
- Eaton, T.V. and Hunt, S.C. (2002), "Job search and selection by academic accountants: new and relocating faculty", *Journal of Accounting Education*, Vol. 20, pp. 67-84.
- Eaton, T.V. and Nofsinger, J.R. (2000), "The new and relocating finance faculty market: factors affecting job selection", *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 10, pp. 99-110.
- EEOC (2007), *EEO-1 Instruction Booklet*, US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, available at: www.eeoc.gov/employers/eo1survey/2007instructions.cfm (accessed November 11, 2009).
- Ford, J.K., MacCallum, R.C. and Tait, M. (1986), "The application of exploratory factor analysis in applied psychology: a critical review and analysis", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 39, pp. 291-314.
- Hasse, R.F. and Ellis, M.V. (1987), "Multivariate analysis of variance", *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 34, pp. 404-13.
- Haynes, S.N., Richard, D.C.S. and Kubany, E.S. (1995), "Content validity in psychological assessment: a functional approach to concepts and methods", *Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 7, pp. 28-247.
- Hemmings, B.C., Rushbrook, P. and Smith, E. (2007), "Academics' views on publishing refereed works: a content analysis", *Higher Education*, Vol. 54, pp. 307-32.
- Henson, R.K. and Roberts, J.K. (2006), "Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: common errors and some comment on improved practice", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 6, pp. 393-416.
- Hofstede, G.H. and Hofstede, G.J. (2005), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Holland, R.G. and Arrington, C.E. (1987), "Issues influencing the decision of accounting faculty to relocate", *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 2, pp. 57-71.
- Hunt, S.C. (2004), "Business faculty job selection: factors affecting the choice of an initial position", *Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 10, pp. 53-72.
- Hunt, S.C., Eaton, T.V. and Reinstein, A. (2009), "Accounting faculty job search in a seller's market", *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 24, pp. 157-85.
- Jaschik, S. (2010), "Job satisfaction and gender", *Inside Higher Ed*, available at: www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/07/12/coache (accessed July 12).

- Johnsrud, L.K. and Heck, R.H. (1994), "A university's faculty: identifying who will leave and who will stay", *Journal of Higher Education Management*, Vol. 10, pp. 71-84.
- Johnsrud, L.K. and Heck, R.H. (1998), "Faculty work life: establishing benchmarks across groups", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 39, pp. 539-55.
- Kida, T.E. and Mannino, R.C. (1980), "Job selection criteria of accounting PhD students and faculty members", *Accounting Review*, Vol. 55, pp. 491-500.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (2002), "Gender differences in managerial careers: yesterday, today, and tomorrow", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 37, pp. 5-24.
- Kulis, S. (1998), "Organizational variations in women scientists' representation in academia", *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, Vol. 4, pp. 43-67.
- Lindell, M.K. and Brandt, C.J. (2000), "Climate quality and climate consensus as mediators of the relationship between organizational antecedents and outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 331-48.
- Long, R.G., Bowers, W.P., Barnett, T. and White, M.C. (1998), "Research productivity of graduates in management: effects of academic origin and academic affiliation", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41, pp. 704-14.
- McSweeney, B. (2002), "Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: a triumph of faith-a failure of analysis", *Human Relations*, Vol. 55, pp. 89-118.
- Mainiero, L.A. and Sullivan, S.E. (2005), "Kaleidoscope careers: an alternate explanation for the 'opt-out' revolution", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 19, pp. 106-23.
- Mamiseishvili, K. and Rosser, V.J. (2010), "International and citizen faculty in the United States: an examination of their productivity at research universities", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 51, pp. 88-107.
- Mason, M.A., Goulden, M. and Frasch, K. (2009), "AAUP: why graduate students reject the fast track", *Academe Online*, available at: www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2009/JF/Feat/maso.htm (accessed September 6, 2010).
- MIT (2011), *A Report on the Status of Women Faculty in the Schools of Science and Engineering at MIT*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, available at: <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/images/documents/women-report-2011.pdf> (accessed March 21, 2011).
- Morrison, A.M. and von Glinow, M.A. (1990), "Women and minorities in management", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 45, pp. 200-8.
- O'Neil, D.A. and Bilimoria, D. (2005), "Women's career development phases: idealism, endurance, and reinvention", *Career Development International*, Vol. 10, pp. 168-89.
- Ott, E.M. (1989), "Effects of the male-female ratio at work", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 13, pp. 41-57.
- Park, S.M. (1996), "Research, teaching, and service: why shouldn't women's work count?", *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 67, pp. 46-84.
- Perna, L.W. (2001), "Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 42, pp. 541-67.
- PhD Project (2008), *PhD Project Survey of Dean's Report*, available at: www.phdproject.org/inthenews.html (accessed April 28, 2010).
- Rosser, V.J. (2004), "Faculty members' intentions to leave: a national study on their work life and satisfaction", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 45, pp. 285-309.
- Sax, L.J., Hagedorn, L.S., Arredondo, M. and Dicrisi, F.A. (2002), "Faculty research productivity: exploring the role of gender and family-related factors", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 43, pp. 423-46.

-
- Smola, K.W. and Sutton, C.D. (2002), "Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, pp. 363-82.
- Steyn, H.S. Jr and Ellis, S.M. (2009), "Stimating an effect size in one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA)", *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 44, pp. 106-29.
- Taras, V., Kirkman, B.L. and Steel, P. (2010), "Examining the impact of culture's consequences: a three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95, pp. 405-39.
- Tompkins, J.G. IV, Hermanson, H.M. and Hermanson, D.R. (1996), "Expectations and resources associated with new finance faculty positions", *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 6, pp. 54-64.
- Trower, C.A. and Chait, R.P. (2002), "Faculty diversity", *Harvard Magazine*, Vol. 10, March/April, pp. 33-37, 98.
- Verquer, M.L., Beehr, T.A. and Wagner, S.H. (2003), "A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 63, pp. 473-89.
- Williamson, I.O. and Cable, D.M. (2003), "Predicting early career research productivity: the case of management faculty", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24, pp. 25-44.

Further reading

- Hunt, S.C. and Sawhney, R. (2003), "Management PhD candidates' job search: the initial interview", *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 78, pp. 249-54.

About the authors

C. Brian Flynn is currently a Doctoral Student at Auburn University. He completed his BS degree at Brigham Young University and his MBA at Georgia State University. Prior to beginning his PhD studies, he also performed human resource and management roles in the customer service, aerospace, and technology industries. C. Brian Flynn is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: cbflynn@auburn.edu

Hubert S. Feild is currently Torchmark Professor of Management at Auburn University. Prior to his academic career, he worked with Exxon Corporation. His research interests include human resource recruitment and selection.

Arthur G. Bedeian is a Boyd Professor at Louisiana State University and A&M College. A past President of the Academy of Management, a former Dean of the Academy's Fellows Group, and a recipient of the Academy's Distinguished Service Award, he is also a Fellow of both the American Psychological Association and the International Academy of Management.