

**SELECTING FACULTY FOR CHRISTIAN BUSINESS COLLEGES:
BASIC POLICIES AND THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT**

Gundars Kaupins
313 Department of Management
Boise State University
Boise, Idaho 83725
(208)-426-4014
fax (208)-426-1857
gkaupins@boisestate.edu

and

Malcolm Coco
College of Business Administration
Mabee Business Building
Abilene Christian University
Abilene, Texas 79699
(915)-674-2560
fax (915)-674-2507
Malcolm.coco@coba.acu.edu

Suggested Running Head: Selecting Christian Business College Faculty

SELECTING FACULTY FOR CHRISTIAN BUSINESS COLLEGES: BASIC POLICIES AND THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT

Abstract

A survey of 146 faculty and administrators from the Christian Business Faculty Association revealed respondent experiences and attitudes associated with faculty selection at their schools. Results show that most respondents received initial contacts with each school through direct referrals from colleagues. On-site, one-on-one interviews are common. Department chairs are the most active and influential selection participants. Resumes are the most important initial information resources. Church membership and involvement are considered among the most important criteria for selecting Christian business school faculty. Religious commitment, however, appears to be dimension separate from other aspects of selection such as teaching ability, research, and service. Future research opportunities are highlighted.

Keywords

Christian, Selection, Faculty, Business, Religion

SELECTING FACULTY FOR CHRISTIAN BUSINESS COLLEGES: BASIC POLICIES AND THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT

The selection of business faculty in higher education is important because faculty can affect business programs for many years. Business faculty can influence cultural, religious, and educational life, research, curriculum, and technological innovations, and government, business, and church connections. Furthermore, college and university administrators often report investments of \$500,000 to \$1 million in new faculty members by the time they reach tenure and promotion (Thomas, 1997). Most research literature on selection practices has focused on secular associate, baccalaureate and graduate programs. The research has provided basic information about selection practices such as interviewing experiences, information sources used in selection, factors attracting faculty to their current positions, and factors considered important in the employment of faculty such as teaching, research, and service.

Research on Christian business faculty selection has not been as extensive. Accordingly, this article focuses on surveying basic information about selection practices in Christian business colleges. Due to the religious mission of Christian business colleges, this article also covers the role of religious commitment in faculty selection.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review provides some highlights of research on selection practices with an emphasis on business schools in community colleges, four-year, and graduate schools. Recent literature is primarily used due to significant technological changes in computer use in communications and presentation software.

Recruiting and Interviewing Experiences

Initial recruiting in business schools has been done through direct referrals from friends or colleagues, ads in newspapers/professional publications, unsolicited applications, postings or announcements in academic conferences, networking within accrediting bodies, and the Internet and many other ways. Among the most common methods of contact include direct referrals and ads in professional publications (Sparr, 1992).

Once the faculty candidate is invited to campus, the interview process is typically filled with one-on-one interviews with faculty and administrators. Group interviews may also take place presumably covering teaching, research, service, and fit in the department or college (Murray, 1999, 1998; Dyrli, 2001; Lawhon, and Ennis, 1995; Perlman and McCann, 1996).

A teaching or research presentation is usually included in the one or two-day period. The presentation is increasingly requiring the use of PowerPoint, the Internet, Blackboard, WebCT, or other computer-based tools. Schools are

discovering that new faculty members must be more technically skilled than their predecessors and hence these new tools would be most appropriate in job interviews (Goddard, 2002; Bryan, Ariza, and Knee, 2001; Chapman, 1999).

Department chairs have historically been the most dominant influences in interviewing new faculty. Eisen (1997), Thomas (1997), and Mooney (1990) found that department chairs not only spend the most time in interviewing, but also have the most impact on the final decision. Deans, associate deans and faculty also have significant impacts.

Outside Information Sources Used in Selection

Information sources on candidates can include resumes, curriculum vita, letters of reference, application forms, portfolios, candidate Web pages, newspaper and magazine reports, criminal records, citations and many others. Young (2002) and Perlman and McCann (1996) indicated the prime importance of curriculum vitae in job applications for chemical and engineering educators. Sheehan, McDevitt, and Ross (1998) found that letters of recommendation have more impact on final decisions especially if the letters are followed up with telephone or personal interviews with the references.

Benefits Attracting Faculty To Schools

The search for business faculty has become more important because the dearth of business doctoral graduates has pushed faculty pay and benefits up. To meet candidate demands, there are greater varieties of health benefits available to

faculty ranging from Health Maintenance Organizations, flexible benefits accounts, dental and eye insurance packages, and wellness centers. Such health-related benefits have become one of the leading factors encouraging faculty to come to an institution (Merritt, 2002).

With dual careers on the rise, the spouse is often important in the hiring decision (Mannix, 2001; Schneider, 1998, Mangan, 1989). Schools often have to at least refer spouses to local companies or analyze the local job market in fields appropriate for the spouse.

Institutional Factors Attracting Faculty to Schools

Eaton and Nofsinger (2000) examined various reasons why finance faculty decide to accept an academic position and the most common strategies they used to obtain an offer. Teaching load, compatibility with other faculty, and support available for research, research assistants, release time for research and secretarial assistance were considered the most important considerations associated with finding a new job for faculty. Similar results appear with accounting professors (Iyer and Clark, 1998). Other institutional perks may include new research facilities, more powerful computers, better office décor, and lighter teaching loads (Schneider, 1998; Alexander, 2000).

Often the atmosphere and collegiality of the institution are important considerations for the candidate (Budd, 1989). Candidates discuss if there is any

infighting within the school concerning power politics and the appropriation of resources.

Factors Considered In the Employment of Faculty

Faculty in most business schools are typically recruited for their ability to teach, research, and provide service in their specialized area. In larger research-oriented business programs, candidates often need a portfolio of significant top-tier journal publications. Their interview presentations need to reflect a depth of research potential in relatively narrow research areas. In more teaching-oriented institutions, a candidate's potential to teach a wide variety of business subjects may be more valuable. A research record in lower-tier journals or no research might be acceptable (Thomas, 1997).

However, according to Henninger (1998), Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) guidelines continue to support the notion that faculty are selected by their academic credentials and for their ability to conduct empirical research regardless of institutional type. Selection of faculty with doctorates outside traditional business disciplines will continue to be discouraged. Other business accrediting bodies such as the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs and Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools Accreditation Commission might not have as strong of a research emphasis.

Prestige of the school that the faculty person comes from often determines whether the faculty member is selected at some of the more prestigious schools according to Baldi's (1995) study of sociology Ph.D.s, and Bedeian and Field's (1980) study of management professors. The Easton and Nofsinger (2000) study also found significant differences between doctoral granting schools and non-doctoral granting schools. Prestige of the school or department, support available for research, and the quality and motivation of the students appeared to be much more important to faculty in doctoral granting schools.

Increasingly, faculty are being required to know more about technology in research and teaching (White and Myers, 2001; Goddard, 2002; Bryan, Arize, and Knee, 2001; Chapman, 1999). Often research requires expert use in search engines, spreadsheets, statistical packages, and databases. Teaching requires course management programs, PowerPoint application, interactive and cable television, and instant messaging.

The cultural impact faculty have on the institutions cannot be ignored (Curran and Hyman, 2000). Selection committees will often analyze whether the faculty candidate fits the culture of the department, college or institution. This fit may run counter to diversity pressures coming from the institution's mission, community, or government regulations.

By far the largest segment of faculty selection literature is associated with faculty diversity. There is great demand for minority faculty in higher education

and therefore it is difficult, especially for small colleges to compete for minority faculty. About 90 percent of the total faculty in the nation's two and four-year public and private colleges are white, including black colleges (Guest, 1999).

To obtain more minority faculty, many colleges and universities have placed diversity in the workplace in their strategic objectives. Diversity involves more than just slogans within the strategic objectives and affirmative action statements in every placement ad. Diversity involves advertising where minorities can be found, clear record-keeping on staffing progress, establish curriculum vitae banks, develop cultural awareness programs for existing faculty, and maintain commitment from administration and faculty of diversity (Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990; Hayes, 1995; Phillips, 2002; Light, 1994; Plata, 1996; Smith, 2000; Zamboanga and Bingman, 2001; Knowles and Harleston, 1997).

Lack of Religious Focus

The literature on faculty selection practices has focused on secular higher education institutions. Religion is rarely discussed probably because a candidate's religion must not be considered in recruiting or selection due to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Accordingly, much faculty selection literature might not serve some of the needs of Christian higher education because of the lack of religious focus.

Some researchers have argued that religious emphasis is declining in Christian schools. For example, Feeney (1994) complains that there is a greater

emphasis in educational specialization rather than religious commitment concerning faculty hiring at Jesuit higher education institutions. According to Quintanilla (1994), growth in Christian colleges has led to the watering-down of Christian principles in Christian schools—not only in students, but also faculty. In other words, he attributes “evangelical education’s success to a subtle shift toward attracting the mainstream student” (p. 1).

On the other hand, other researchers suggest that religion may be holding its ground in Christian schools with mission-driven and accredited Christian schools. Van Der Dorm (2001), Ryan and Martinson (1996), Wilcox and King (2000), and Stein (1993) strongly recommend that schools focus on their mission statement and apply its charge to help determine appropriate new faculty. Such charge is one of the keys to be successfully reaccredited in business schools according to the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (2003). To be accredited, schools must establish the mission, vision and strategic objectives after analyzing environmental threats and opportunities and internal strengths and weaknesses. All school programs and activities must be tied to strategic planning.

A formal religious mission statement is part of accreditation for Christian accreditation organizations such as the Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools Accreditation Commission (TRACS) (2003). TRACS encourages each affiliated institution to develop its own distinctive mission while

providing quality postsecondary education within the context of spiritual development. TRACS institutions must place emphasis on high academic standards as well as Christian values.

The role of religious attitudes has been investigated in the selection of faculty in Christian higher education. Gaffney and Moots (1982) found that in their survey of 210 church-related institutions, about 80 percent of the respondents considered religious affiliation and practice as important criteria in hiring faculty. However, only about 10 percent made religious affiliation a decisive criterion in hiring all faculty members. Mixon (2001) found that faculty selection policies are highly associated with faculty attitudes toward their school's religious tradition. Stricter selection rules, as provided in Brigham Young University, may link faculty to the school's religious tradition more than schools with more lenient selection policies such as Notre Dame, Boston College, and Baylor. Religious schools were not handicapped by their religious-affiliation in achieving academic excellence.

PURPOSE

Due to the limited research on Christian college faculty selection processes, this study will investigate basic information about Christian business faculty selection such as recruiting and interviewing experiences, information sources used in selection, factors attracting faculty to their current positions, and factors considered important in the employment of faculty. With the role of

religion being important in Christian colleges, this study also will place an emphasis on religion within the context of factors attracting faculty to their current positions and factors considered important in the employment of faculty.

CONTRIBUTIONS

The findings should be of interest to doctoral candidates seeking their first positions in Christian higher education, faculty considering changing positions and institutions, and faculty and administrators who are interested in discovering baseline data concerning candidate needs. This can also help faculty and administrators identify what areas to emphasize in their job announcements and interviews in their continuing efforts to attract new faculty.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample

To collect information about Christian Business faculty selection practices, we sent a questionnaire to 400 faculty who are members of the Christian Business Faculty Association (CBFA). Membership rosters and lists of Christian schools are shown at <http://www.cbfa.org/html/member.asp>.

According to the CBFA (2003) Website, this is an “association of faculty members dedicated to integrating our thinking and teaching and writing in business with Biblical truth. Our mission is to progress in our understanding, application and teaching of Biblical truth as it applies to the various disciplines in business” (cover page). Membership is open to college and university faculty

members who agree that “Jesus Christ is the Son of God and through His atonement is the mediator between God and man, that the word of God expressed in the Bible is inspired by God and is authoritative in the development of Christian faith and practice, that the Christian faith has significant implications for the structure and practice of business, [and] that developing Christian education for business practice should be undertaken as a cooperative venture of this organization.” (application page)

The CBFA represents schools associated with Christian higher education in the United States. One hundred and forty-six surveys of faculty and administrators who are members of the CBFA were returned for a return rate of about thirty percent. To ensure anonymity and encourage more honest responses, the respondents’ specific school information was not obtained.

The average size of the schools was about 4,400 full-time students. Schools ranged from 200 to 16,000 students. Business schools averaged about 900 students and the average full-time faculty in each business schools was about 14.

As shown in Table 1, most respondents are faculty members without administrative experience though about 40 percent are administrators. About two-thirds have doctorates and 40 percent are full professors.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed from a review of the literature, personal experience with faculty selection, and concern for religious and diversity issues. The questionnaire sought to measure interviewing experiences, information sources used in selection, factors attracting faculty to their current positions, and factors considered important in the employment of faculty such as teaching, research, and service.

Each respondent received a five-page questionnaire covering major recruiting practices such as advertising and interviewing methods. The questionnaire took about ten minutes to complete. The universities of the respondents remain anonymous.

For some of the questions, respondents rated the importance of various selection considerations on a scale of one to four (1 = essential, 2 = very important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = not important). Corresponding with these questions, respondents also were asked to name their most essential selection consideration.

Data Analysis

Beyond descriptive data, factor analysis with Varimax rotation was used to understand the dimensionality of the different considerations in employment. There are so many questionnaire items that we found in necessary to reduce the

data for interpretation and see what factors seemed unrelated to each other. Factor analysis is useful for combining questions and seeing which questions measure true different dimensions. Varimax rotations select as a "best" solution the set of loadings (correlations) that maximize loadings on one factor. It is the most popular rotation technique.

RESULTS

Table 2 shows respondent recruiting and interview experiences. Direct referrals from friends or colleagues were the most popular recruiting technique. On-site, one-on-one discussions were the most popular interview method. Group discussions ranked a distant second. Chairpersons were most frequently mentioned as participants in the interview process. Ministers and chaplains were a distant ninth place on the list. Most respondents regarded department chairs as having the most weight in the selection process. Overhead projectors were the most common technology used in presentations during the interview process.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Table 3 shows respondent ratings of information used in selection of the respondent. "Other" information sources were rated most important by 29 of the respondents. Other sources include a statement of faith and previous knowledge of the institution. The resume or curriculum vita had the second highest among

the items formally listed in the survey. When asked what is the most essential outside information consideration from the items on the table, 39 percent of respondents marked the resume or curriculum vita. About 19 percent marked personal contacts with references.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Factors attracting faculty to their current position are in Table 4. The top benefit or perk desired is medical benefits or on-site medical services. When asked what is the most essential benefit or per from the items on the table, about 35 percent marked medical benefits or on-site medical services. About 20 percent marked dependent student discounts.

Insert Table 4 About Here

The top rated institutional aspect desired was organizational culture. Emphasis of integrating faith and learning was rated second. When asked what is the most essential institutional consideration from the items on the table, about 20 percent marked teaching experience, 17 percent marked church membership and involvement, and 17 percent marked business, industry, or government experience.

Table 5 shows the results of a factor analysis of the ratings from Table 4. The items shown on the table are ones that loaded heavily on one factor only and had at least a .5 or -.5 correlation. The item is also not correlated highly with any other factors (maximum of .4 or -.4 allowed). Using the scree test using eigenvalues of at least one as a standard for factor inclusion, six factors appear. The factor that accounted for the most explained variance (31%) was research funding. Second was quality and prestige of the school. Emphasis of integrating faith and learning did not load heavily on any of these six factors.

Insert Table 5 About Here

Table 6 summarizes factors considered important in selecting faculty. It covers personal characteristics of candidates and considerations for hiring new faculty. Outside of the “other characteristics” category, the highest rated personal characteristic of a candidate is the potential to connect with students. Church membership and involvement was second. When asked what is the most essential personal characteristic of faculty candidates from the items on the table, about 21 percent of respondents marked teaching experience, and 18 percent marked church membership and involvement and business experience.

The leading reason to hire new faculty is to improve teaching and instructional effectiveness. Maintaining or promoting a religious or spiritual

perspective was second. When asked what is the most essential consideration to select new faculty from the items on the table, about 37 percent marked maintaining or promoting a religious/spiritual perspective and about 16 percent marked improving teaching and instructional effectiveness.

Insert Table 6 About Here

Using the same factor analysis (Principal Components with Varimax rotation), Table 7 reveals eight factors coming from the ratings in Table 6. Teaching effectiveness and research effectiveness were the leading two factors. Religious issues were a separate factor.

Insert Table 7 About Here

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Basic Considerations

Many of the basic considerations in recruiting and selecting faculty from CBFA institutions appear to correspond to recent research in more secular institutions. Similar results appear to occur with the use of direct referrals from friends or colleagues (Sparr, 1992), the use of one-on-one interviews with faculty

and administrators (Murray, 1999), the importance of department chairs (Eisen, 1997) and the prime importance of the resume (Young, 2002).

The low level of computer use by candidates does not correspond to Goddard's (2002) research showing significant growth of the Internet in recruiting. This may be partially explained by the large number of full professors in the sample who may have been hired at their school before the Internet became popular. Future research can compare cohort groups who were hired in the 21st century versus the 1990's, 1980's and so on.

Future research also should make comparisons between Christian schools and more secular institutions in terms of basic recruiting and selection behaviors. Given some similarity of basic behaviors between this study and what was shown in the literature review, there might not be much difference between the institutions. More direct comparisons using the same survey questions would provide a clearer comparison between Christian and other institutions.

Future research also should do a school-by-school comparison of typical recruiting and selection behaviors. Such information would help faculty candidates provide pertinent information in their portfolio (resumes, cover letters, teaching evaluations, etc.) and in their interviews for particular Christian colleges.

Importance of Religious Factors in Selection

Results in Tables 4 and 6 show that respondents believe that religion has great importance in the selection process for Christian business schools.

Religious categories were generally ranked in the top three in each of the tables. The results correspond to the Gaffney and Moots (1982) research that found religious affiliation and practice as important criteria in hiring faculty according to 80 percent of their respondents from church-affiliated schools.

Though religion seems important to both job candidates and the universities involved, it may not be the determining factor whether the candidate gets hired. This may be a minimum qualification. Church membership may be essential to be considered for the job but not necessarily the most important qualification.

As Mixon (2001) had done with Brigham Young, Baylor, Notre Dame, and Boston College, future research can compare specific school missions and strictness in their selection policies. Does a particular denomination or religiosity in general affect the type of faculty member hired and ultimately affect teaching, research, and service at the school? Having membership in the right denomination and being active in that denomination may be the requirement just to be considered for an interview. For example, to be a member of the Abilene Christian University faculty, staff must be an active member of the Church of Christ.

Future research also can analyze different disciplines not only within business schools but also outside of business schools. Mixon's (2002) research also found that religious values were not as associated with faculty in the arts and

sciences as with business. We do not know whether this is a feature of the four schools analyzed or universities in general.

The factor analyses revealed that religion appeared to be a separate dimension from other selection considerations for the job candidates and for the schools. This separate dimension could be a part of the minimum religious requirements just to get an interview on some campuses. Once the religious requirement is completed, teaching, research, and other factors might take hold.

Given the selection dimensions, future research can use regression analysis to help model the impact religious attitudes and requirements have on selection decisions. Future research can investigate religious impact on faculty demographics, faculty attitudes toward teaching and research, and the school's mission.

Ultimately, we feel that researching Christian school selection practices can help Christian colleges identify existing practices, benchmark the best practices, provide comparisons with secular colleges, note trends, identify strengths and weaknesses, and discover the impact of various recruiting practices on productivity and employee turnover. A focus on special topics such as understanding role of diversity and religiosity in selection decisions can lead to an understanding of possible secularization of Christian schools.

Table 1. Respondent Demographic Information^a

| | N | % |
|---|----|------|
| Administrative Responsibilities | | |
| Without | 80 | 54.7 |
| With | 62 | 42.4 |
| No Response | 4 | 2.7 |
| Type of Administrative Responsibilities | | |
| Business Program Director | 29 | 19.8 |
| Department Chair | 18 | 12.3 |
| Dean | 9 | 6.1 |
| Associate Dean | 3 | 2.1 |
| Vice President | 3 | 2.1 |
| President | 1 | 0.7 |
| Percent with Various Degrees | | |
| Doctorate | 98 | 67.1 |
| Masters | 44 | 30.1 |
| Bachelors | 1 | 0.7 |
| No Response | 3 | 2.1 |
| Academic Rank | | |
| Full Professor | 63 | 43.2 |
| Associate Professor | 45 | 30.1 |
| Assistant Professor | 33 | 22.6 |
| No Response | 5 | 3.4 |
| Instructional Credit Hours Each Semester | | |
| None | 1 | 0.7 |
| 1-3 | 7 | 4.8 |
| 4-6 | 14 | 9.6 |
| 7-9 | 30 | 20.5 |
| 10-12 | 67 | 45.9 |
| 13-15 | 15 | 10.3 |
| More than 15 | 7 | 4.8 |
| No response | 5 | 3.4 |

^aN = 146

Table 2. Recruiting and Interviewing Experiences

| A. Primary Initial Contact Methods | N | % |
|---|-----|------|
| Direct referrals from friends or colleagues | 82 | 56.2 |
| Ads in newspapers/professional publications | 27 | 18.5 |
| Unsolicited applications | 12 | 8.2 |
| Postings or announcements in academic conferences | 5 | 3.4 |
| Networking within accrediting bodies | 2 | 1.3 |
| Internet | 2 | 1.3 |
| Other undefined | 10 | 6.8 |
| No response | 6 | 4.1 |
| B. Primary Interviewing Method | N | % |
| On-site, one-on-one discussions | 93 | 63.7 |
| On-site, panel question-and-answer sessions | 25 | 17.1 |
| On-site, group discussions | 20 | 13.7 |
| Other ^a | 3 | 2.0 |
| No Response | 5 | 3.4 |
| C. Participants In the Interview Process | N | % |
| Chairperson of the prospective department | 129 | 88.4 |
| Associate dean of the business school | 105 | 71.9 |
| Provost or academic vice-president of the university | 82 | 56.1 |
| Faculty members from the prospective department | 62 | 42.4 |
| Dean of the business school | 48 | 32.9 |
| Chairpersons of departments outside the business school | 46 | 31.5 |
| Receptionists, secretaries or administrative staff | 37 | 25.3 |
| Faculty members from outside the business school | 34 | 23.3 |
| Ministers or chaplains | 31 | 21.2 |
| Students | 10 | 6.8 |
| Others ^b | 23 | 15.7 |

^a“Other” includes off-site, one-on-one discussions

^bOthers include board of trustees, president, computer support, dean of students, human resources, outside business leaders, board of directors, business school advisory board

Table 2 Continued

| D. Most Important Members of the Selection Team | N | % ^c |
|---|----|----------------|
| Department chair | 50 | 53.7 |
| Provost or academic dean | 18 | 19.3 |
| Dean | 18 | 19.3 |
| President | 15 | 16.1 |
| Search committee chair | 3 | 3.2 |

^cOut of 93 respondents

Table 2 Continued

| Technology Used in the Interview Process | N | % |
|--|----|------|
| Overhead projector for transparencies | 56 | 38.3 |
| Computer | 25 | 17.1 |
| PowerPoint presentation software | 6 | 4.1 |
| Other equipment ^d | 5 | 3.4 |
| Internet connections | 4 | 2.7 |
| Other software ^d | 4 | 2.7 |
| Not applicable | 23 | 15.8 |

^dOther equipment and software include Blackboard, chalk blackboard, flip chart, and white board

Table 3. Outside Information Sources Used in Selection

| Information Considerations | Importance Rating ^a | % Rated Most Essential ^b |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Other sources of information ^c | 1.38 | 8.1 |
| Resume/curriculum vita/biographical sketch | 1.59 | 46.7 |
| Personal contacts with references | 1.97 | 22.9 |
| College or university transcripts | 2.14 | 1.6 |
| Course/instructor evaluations | 2.17 | 6.5 |
| Reference letters | 2.21 | 9.8 |
| Performance evaluations of previous employers | 2.52 | 3.2 |

^a(1 = essential, 2 = very important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = not important), N = 110 to 139 except for other sources of information

^bN = 122

^cOther sources include: statement of faith and previous knowledge of the institution, N = 29

Table 4. Factors Attracting Faculty To their Current Position

| A. Benefits or Perks | Importance Rating ^a | % Rated Most Essential ^b |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Medical benefits or on-site medical services | 1.89 | 35.1 |
| Other benefits or perks ^c | 1.93 | 9.0 |
| Dependent student discount | 2.32 | 19.8 |
| Travel funds | 2.50 | 4.5 |
| Fast-track promotion or tenure consideration | 2.56 | 9.0 |
| Reduced teaching loads | 2.62 | 9.9 |
| Enhanced office/lab space/computing resources | 2.83 | 0.9 |
| Research stipends | 2.87 | 3.6 |
| Sabbaticals or faculty renewal leaves | 2.94 | 4.5 |
| Start-up research funds | 3.21 | 2.7 |
| Employment referrals for spouse | 3.34 | 0.9 |
| B. Institutional Factors | Importance Rating ^d | % Rated Most Essential ^e |
| Organizational culture | 1.77 | 21.3 |
| Emphasis of integrating faith and learning | 1.87 | 31.6 |
| Other institutional factors ^f | 1.89 | 5.1 |
| Collegiality of faculty | 1.96 | 10.3 |
| Quality of life in the community | 2.19 | 10.3 |
| Compensation | 2.41 | 11.8 |
| Teaching load | 2.51 | 8.1 |
| Quality of faculties | 2.96 | 0.0 |
| Prestige of the business school | 3.05 | 0.0 |
| Opportunities for research | 3.34 | 1.5 |
| Job opportunities for spouse | 3.74 | 0.0 |

^aN = 126 to 135 except for other benefits or perks (30)

^bN = 136

^cOther benefits or perks include a housing incentive, facilitation of getting a Ph.D., God's guidance, and the opportunity to teach at the graduate level

^d(1 = essential, 2 = very important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = not important), N = 130 to 141 except for other institutional factors (9)

^eN = 136

^fOther institutional factors include location of the college, mission of the school

Table 5. Factor Analysis of Faculty Attractions^a

| | Factor Loadings |
|---|-----------------|
| Factor 1: Research Funding | |
| Variance Explained 37.17% | |
| Reduced teaching loads | .907 |
| Travel funds | .881 |
| Research stipends | .851 |
| Start-up research funds | .840 |
| Enhanced office/lab space/computing resources | .834 |
| Fast-track promotion or tenure consideration | .770 |
| Sabbaticals or faculty renewal leaves | .665 |
| | |
| Factor 2: Quality and Prestige | |
| Variance Explained 15.29% | |
| Prestige of the business school | .833 |
| Quality of facilities | .774 |
| Quality of life in the community | .605 |
| | |
| Factor 3: Spouse Employment | |
| Variance Explained 10.51% | |
| Job opportunities for spouse | .867 |
| Employment referrals for spouse | .852 |
| | |
| Factor 4: Collegiality | |
| Variance Explained 8.04% | |
| Collegiality of faculty | .764 |
| Teaching load | .692 |
| | |
| Factor 5: Medical Benefits | |
| Variance Explained 5.91% | |
| Medical benefits or on-site medical services | .906 |
| Dependent tuition discount | .608 |
| | |
| Factor 6: Culture | |
| Variance Explained 5.51% | |
| Organization Culture | .850 |

^aExtraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax

Table 6. Factors Considered In the Employment of Faculty

| A. Personal Characteristics | Importance Rating ^a | % Rated Most Essential ^b |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Other personal or background characteristics ^c | 1.45 | 5.9 |
| Potential to connect with students | 1.70 | 10.3 |
| Church membership and involvement | 1.72 | 18.4 |
| Teaching experience | 1.93 | 21.3 |
| Business, industry, or government exper. | 2.13 | 18.4 |
| Leadership potential | 2.38 | 2.9 |
| Involvement in professional activities | 2.49 | 2.2 |
| Publication record or prospects for research | 2.65 | 7.4 |
| International exposure | 2.89 | 0.7 |
| Potential to attract external funding | 3.50 | 0.7 |
| B. Reasons for Hiring New Faculty | Importance Rating ^d | % Rated Most Essential ^e |
| Improve teaching and instructional effectiveness | 1.70 | 16.1 |
| Maintain or promote a religious/spiritual Perspective | 1.75 | 36.5 |
| Fulfill long-term strategy or mission | 1.96 | 6.6 |
| Satisfy accreditation requirements | 2.01 | 15.3 |
| Expand or enhance programs and course offerings | 2.10 | 6.6 |
| Other reasons or motivations ^e | 2.25 | 0.0 |
| Increase the prestige of the business school | 2.41 | 5.1 |
| Expand ethnic and gender diversity | 2.78 | 0.0 |
| Improve research output | 2.98 | 2.2 |
| Just “cover the bases” so that all courses get taught | 3.01 | 6.6 |

^aN = 126 to 141 except for other personal or background characteristics (17)

^bN = 136 ^cOther characteristics include community service, innovations

^d(1 = essential, 2 = very important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = not important), N ranges from 132 to 142 except for other reasons or motivations (4)

^eN = 137 ^fOther reasons include particular program improvement, advising

Table 7. Factor Analysis of Faculty Employment Consideration^a

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Factor 1: Teaching Effectiveness | Factor Loadings |
| Variance Explained 19.92% | |
| Potential to connect with students | .803 |
| Teaching experience | .786 |
| Expand/enhance programs | .670 |
| | |
| Factor 2: Research and Experience | |
| Variance Explained 14.00% | |
| Involvement in professional activities | .783 |
| Business, industry or government experience | .730 |
| Improve research output | .654 |
| Fulfill long-term strategy or mission | .626 |
| | |
| Factor 3: Outreach | |
| Variance Explained 11.75% | |
| Leadership potential | .537 |
| International exposure | .531 |
| | |
| Factor 4: Teaching Basics | |
| Variance Explained 8.49% | |
| Just cover the bases to get all the courses taught | .843 |
| Improve teaching and instructional effectiveness | .732 |
| | |
| Factor 5: Religious Issues | |
| Variance Explained 7.85% | |
| Church membership and involvement | .919 |
| Maintain or promote a religious perspective | .830 |
| | |
| Factor 6: Accreditation | |
| Variance Explained 6.62% | |
| Satisfy accreditation requirements | -.857 |

^aExtraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax

Table 7 Continued^a

| | |
|--|------|
| Factor 7: Prestige | |
| Variance Explained 5.65% | |
| Increase the prestige of the business school | .832 |
| Factor 8: Diversity | |
| Variance Explained 5.41% | |
| Expand ethnic or gender diversity | .860 |

^aExtraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Varimax Rotation Method

REFERENCES

- Alexander, F. K. (2000). The silent crisis: the relative fiscal capacity of public universities to compete for faculty. *The Review of Higher Education* 24: 113-129.
- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. (2003). Home Page [cited 25 February, 2003], Available from <http://www.aacsb.edu>.
- Baldi, S. (1995). Prestige determinants of first academic job for new sociology Ph.D.s 1985-1992. *The Sociological Quarterly* 36:777-789.
- Bedeian, A. G. & Field, H. S. (1980). Academic stratification in graduate management programs: departmental prestige and faculty hiring patterns. *Journal of Management* 6: 99-116.
- Bryan, V. C., E. N. Arize, & Knee, R. H. (2001). The dilemma of recruiting, rewarding, and retaining technically competent faculty in higher education. ERIC Database Accession Number ED455728.
- Budd, R. W. (1989). Recruiting, retaining, and rewarding research faculty: art or atmosphere? *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 30: 83-89.
- Castle, S. & Arends, R. I. (2000). Vacancies and applicant pools: results of the AACTE faculty supply and demand survey. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. New Orleans: Louisiana.
- Chapman, D. S. (1999). Expanding the search for talent: adopting technology-based strategies for campus recruiting and selection. *The Journal of Cooperative Education* 34: 35-41.
- Christian Business Faculty Association. (2003). CBFA Organization, [cited 25 February, 2003] Available from <http://www.cbfa.org>.
- Clark, D. and Iyer, V. M. (1998). Criteria for recruitment as assistant professor of accounting in colleges and universities. *Journal of Education for Business* 74: 6-10.

- Curran, C. M. & Hyman, M. R. (2000). Ensuring best-fitting faculty hires. *Marketing Education Review* 10: 69-82.
- Dyrli, O. E. (2001). Web-powered headhunting: using the Internet can put a college's faculty openings in front of thousands of qualified applicants immediately. *Matrix: The Magazine for Leaders in Higher Education*, 2: 17-19.
- Eaton, T. & Nofsinger, J. R. (2000). The new and relocating finance faculty market: factors affecting job selection. *Financial Practice and Education* 10: 99-111.
- Eisen, J. G. (1997). *The Role of Department Chairs in Department Decision Making*. Doctoral Dissertation. Boston: Harvard University.
- Feeney, J. J. (1994). Can Jesuit college education survive in a new century? A historic perspective. *America*, 170, 14-19.
- Gaffney, E.G. & Moots, P. R.. (1982). *Government and Campus: Federal Regulation of Religiously Affiliated Higher Education*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Goddard, M. (2002). What do we do with these computers: reflection on technology in the classroom. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* 12: 19-26.
- Greenfield, S. (2003). Greenfield Online. [cited 25 February, 2003]. Available from <http://www.greenfieldonline.com>.
- Guest, C. (1999). Academic brass scrambles to beef up faculty diversity. *Kansas City Business Journal*, 32: 16-17.
- Hayes, D. W. (1995). Recruitment and retention of non-white faculty and administrators. *Black Issues in Higher Education* 12: 35.
- Henninger, E. A. (1998). Perceptions of the impact of the new AACSB standards on faculty qualifications. *Journal of Organization Change Management* 11: 407-424.

Iyer, V. M & Clark, D. (1998). Criteria for recruitment as assistant professor of accounting in colleges and universities. *Journal of Education for Business* 74: 6-10.

Knowles, M. F. & Harleston, B. W. (1997). *Achieving Diversity in the Professoriate: Challenges and Opportunities*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Lawhon, T & Ennis, D. L. (1995). Recruiting and selecting community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 19: 349-359.

Light, P. (1994). "Not like us": removing the barriers to recruiting minority faculty. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 13: 164-179.

Mangan, K. (1989, September 20). Colleges discover that winning a tip faculty recruit sometimes depends on finding work for a spouse. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36: 13-14.

Mannix, M. (2001, November). Take me take my spouse. *Aeee Prism* 11: 26-28.

Merritt, J. (2002, June 3). The profit squeeze is pinching business schools. *Business Week*, Issue 3785, 80.

Mooney, C. J. (1990, February 7). 3 in 4 department heads are found to stress teaching in faculty hiring. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 36: A15, A19.

Murray, J. P. (1998). Hiring the faculty for the next millennium. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development* 16: 5-14.

Murray, J. P. (1999). Interviewing to hire competent community college faculty. *Community College Review* 27: 41-56.

Perlman, B. & McCann, L. I. (1996). *Recruiting Good College Faculty: Practical Advice For a Successful Search*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Phillips, R. (2002). Recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. *Planning for Higher Education* 30: 32-39.

Plata, M. (1996). Retaining ethnic minority faculty at institutions of higher education. *Journal of Instructional Psychology* 23: 221-227.

- Quintanilla, R. (1994, December 10). More are finding Christian colleges right for times. *Chicago Tribune*, p. 1.
- Ryan, M. & Martinson, D. L. (1996). An analysis of faculty recruiting in schools and departments. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 50: 4-13.
- Schneider, A. (1998, May 29). Recruiting academic stars: new tactics in an old game. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 38: A14-A16.
- Sheehan, E. P., McDevitt, T. M. & Ross, H. C. (1998). Looking for a job as a psychology professor? Factors affecting applicant success. *Teaching of Psychology* 25, 8-11.
- Smith, D. G. (2000). How to diversify the faculty. *Academe* 86: 48-52.
- Sparr, L. F. (1992). Recruitment of academic psychiatrists: applicant's decision factors. *Academic Psychiatry* 16: 141-146.
- Stein, R. H. (1993). *The Art of Hiring in America's Colleges and Universities*. Amherst, N. Y.: Prometheus Books.
- Sullivan, G. M. & Nowlin, W. A. (1990). Recruiting and hiring minority faculty: old story, same myths, new opportunities. *CUPA Journal* 41: 43-50.
- Thomas, J. R. (1997). Vision and leadership for selecting and mentoring new faculty in higher education. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance* 68: 41-47.
- Thompson, S. C. (1995, February 14). Small colleges lead in gains in enrollment but other small campuses show year's biggest losses. *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, p. 1B.
- Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools Accreditation Commission (2003). TRACS Organization, [cited 11 March, 2003], Available from <http://www.tracs.org>.
- Van Der Dorm, P. (2001). The well-tempered search: hiring faculty and administrators for mission. *Academe* 87: 34-36.

White, J. T. & Myers, S. D. (2001). You can teach an old dog new tricks: the faculty's role in technology implementation. *Business Communication Quarterly* 64: 95-101.

Wilcox, J. and King, I. eds. (2000). *Enhancing Religious Identity: Best Practices from Catholic Campuses*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Winter, P. (1996) Recruiting experienced educators: a model and a test. *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 29: 163-171.

Winter, P. & Kjollien, C. (2001). Business faculty recruitment: the effects of full-time versus part-time employment. *Community College Review* 29: 18-32.

Winter, P. & Munoz, M. (2001). Community college business faculty recruitment: association between personal characteristics and applicants' rating of the job. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 25: 539-552.

Young, V. L. (2002). Seeking a faculty position. *Chemical and Engineering News* 80: 60-62.

Zamboanga, B. and Bingman, L. G. (2001). The diversity challenge: recruiting prospective faculty of color. *Black Issues in Higher Education* 18: 160.