

**LEADERSHIP ASPIRATIONS AND CHALLENGES
OF CHRISTIAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY
BUSINESS DEANS AND CHAIRS**

by

Robert H. Roller, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Dean
School of Business
LeTourneau University
P.O. Box 7001
Longview, TX 75607
Phone: 903-233-3328
FAX: 903-233-3221
BobRoller@letu.edu

Steven L. Bovee, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Division Chair
Division of Business & Management
Roberts Wesleyan College
2301 Westside Drive
Rochester, NY 14624
Phone: 716-594-6763
FAX: 716-594-6316
Bovees@Roberts.Edu

Brett K. Andrews, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Management
School of Business
LeTourneau University
P.O. Box 7001
Longview, TX
Phone: 903-233-3326
FAX: 903-233-3221
BrettAndrews@letu.edu

As presented to the
Christian Business Faculty Association
Buffalo, NY
October, 2000

**LEADERSHIP ASPIRATIONS AND CHALLENGES
OF CHRISTIAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY
BUSINESS DEANS AND CHAIRS**

This paper provides a preliminary report on the results of a survey of business deans and chairs at member institutions of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. An organizational alignment model was used to study the leadership aspirations and challenges of business school deans and chairs, under the premise that stakeholder satisfaction is higher when the individual goals and aspirations of the dean, the design of the school of business' strategy, and the organizational architecture are in alignment. Key results show that important challenges center around financial and resource-related issues, especially the ability to attract, retain, and compensate business faculty. Resource issues were related to the organizational commitment of deans and chairs. In addition, deans were more likely to be challenged by internal issues than were chairs.

LEADERSHIP ASPIRATIONS AND CHALLENGES OF CHRISTIAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY BUSINESS DEANS AND CHAIRS

Introduction to the Study

Those responsible for providing leadership to Christian college/university business programs—business deans and chairs¹—have a variety of aspirations and face many challenges, both external and internal. Little has been done to study the leadership aspirations of Christian college/university business deans, or to understand the challenges faced by those in this area of leadership. Given the strategic and financial importance of most business programs to their educational institutions, we believe that a study of the individuals in these positions of leadership has value to CBFA members and to the leadership of Christian universities.

Business deans operate in a complex environment with numerous stakeholders, including current and potential students, alumni, higher-level administrators, other deans throughout the institution, faculty, boards of regents/trustees, employers, and the communities affected by the institution and its programs. Many factors contribute to the satisfaction of these stakeholders. The school of business must create a strategy consistent with the external factors and internal factors it faces. The nature of this strategy is shaped by the dean's individual goals and aspirations. Because the school of business does not operate in isolation from the rest of the institution (as tempting as that may sound), the organizational architecture of the institution seriously affects the implementation of the school of business' strategy. Such items as assignment of decision rights, performance evaluation systems, and reward systems (including compensation and benefits), may assist or impede strategy implementation. We

¹ The authors recognize that a variety of titles exists for the position of leader of the business program, and that the scope of responsibility and authority of business school deans varies

propose that for stakeholder satisfaction to be high, there must be a good alignment between the strategy design and organizational architecture of the institution. We have created a model of this process of organizational alignment as seen from the perspective of a business school dean (Figure 1). We are using this model as the framework for understanding the leadership aspirations and challenges of Christian college/university business deans and chairs. In the following sections, we briefly review each component of the model and its application to this research.

External Factors

The nature of business education is changing rapidly as the market for business education becomes increasingly competitive. Competition comes not only from other Christian colleges and universities, but also from private for-profit educational providers, online providers, state universities, and corporate universities. Led by technological advances, accelerated programs, distance education, and online education are challenging traditional classroom methods; these forces pose strategic challenges for business deans as they seek appropriate competitive strategies (Roller & Bovee, 1998)

Competitive forces have brought about increased interest in professional accreditation of Christian college/university business programs (Bovee, Roller, & Andrews, 2000). This, coupled with increasing expectations of regional accrediting associations, has increased the drive to demonstrate quality in business programs. While the definition of quality varies from institution to institution, quality usually requires additional resources, including additional terminally-qualified faculty, better facilities and equipment, and increased funding for travel and professional development.

The academic labor market is another area posing challenges for business deans. Given the robustness of the national economy, with unemployment at a 20-year low and salary acceleration throughout the economy, the academic labor market is

greatly among institutions. For the sake of simplicity, we will use the term “dean” throughout the

suffering from a supply/demand imbalance, with many business disciplines chasing few applicants. This is in marked contrast to other, non-business subject areas within the university, which frequently enjoy an oversupply of qualified applicants. As will be noted later, this fact alone may cause friction among deans as they compete for the university's scarce resources to attract candidates. For various reasons, then, few Christian colleges/universities appear willing and/or able to respond to the tight academic labor market with the appropriate incentives to attract and retain appropriately credentialed and experienced faculty.

Internal Factors

In seeking to shape the school of business' strategy, the dean must consider numerous internal factors. The mission, vision, and culture of the institution help determine which strategies are possible without requiring frame-breaking change. The reputation of the institution affects the potential for current and new programs, as does the size of current programs. The structure of the institution may be consistent or inconsistent with the strategy; either way, structural change usually happens slowly in Christian colleges and universities. The technological capabilities may or may not support the strategy. The human resources available to the dean, especially the quality and capabilities of the current faculty, influence the strategic possibilities. Finally, the financial resources of the institution and the allocation of those resources affect the strategic potential of the school of business.

Goals and Aspirations of the Business Dean

A significant input into the design of the school of business' strategy is the personal goals and aspirations of the business dean. Crafting and implementing strategy is an arduous task, and may be one for which the rewards are not commensurate with the costs. So why do deans take on this difficult task? What are the

rest of this paper. Similarly, we will also refer to the business unit as a "school of business."

motivations of Christian college/university business deans and chairs? This research seeks to learn some of the answers to these questions.

Strategy Design

The design of the school of business' strategy takes into account external factors, internal factors, and the individual goals and aspirations of the dean.² Perhaps the most important strategic decision is determining the market position of the school of business. What programs will it offer? Will these programs be traditional or nontraditional, and will they be designed to appeal to traditional, post-traditional, or nontraditional students? What degrees and majors will be available? What role will professional accreditation play in market positioning? Will strategic alliances with other institutions or organizations be desirable?

The strategy must also consider ways to increase the competitiveness of the business program. What is the school of business' competitive advantage? How can it operate in relationship to competitive forces, such as reducing threats of entry and imitation? What will determine its relationships with suppliers (such as curriculum providers, textbook providers, and technology providers) and buyers (students and employers)?

Organizational Architecture³

The strategy is formulated and implemented within the context of the organization's architecture. Often the business dean has little influence, at least in the short term, over the organizational architecture, yet it plays a significant role in the

² This is not to say that the individual goals and aspirations of the business faculty are unimportant. Given the collegial nature of educational institutions, we assume that the business faculty, as a team under the leadership of the dean, develop the strategy. In this paper, however, we are focusing on the leadership aspirations and challenges of business deans, not faculty.

³ The conceptual framework for organizational architecture, as used in this study, is outlined in Brickley, Smith, and Zimmerman (1997). They emphasize the importance of organizational architecture to the execution of effective strategy, given its incentive-effects on individual actions/decisions.

strategy process. The organizational architecture includes such factors as the assignment of decision rights, performance evaluation systems, and reward systems.

In terms of the assignment of decision rights, numerous factors come into play. For example, who is the key decision-maker for such items as hiring, promotion, and evaluation of faculty? Who determines faculty compensation? What influence does the dean have in the budget process? If the institution has graduate or nontraditional programs, what decision rights does the dean have in relation to those programs?

In examining decision rights, another key question is whether the extent of decision rights is consistent with the strategy of the business unit. For example, while business education is increasingly competitive, other areas within the institution may be facing differential rates of change and intensities of competition. This imbalance in the competitive landscape of educational institutions brings challenges because other areas may not feel the same sense of urgency felt by business deans, and may not similarly appreciate the need for additional decision rights for the leadership of the business program. This problem may be exacerbated in Christian institutions, which by their conservative nature may feel somewhat insulated from changes in the broader educational marketplace. The resulting potential for being misunderstood by faculty members in other areas of the institution, by fellow deans, and by superiors in the administration may be a serious challenge to Christian college business deans.

For many Christian colleges, an area that highlights the changes in the competitive landscape are nontraditional programs in business and management, which many Christian colleges have begun to offer. Because such programs operate under different assumptions than more traditional programs, there may be conflict between the traditional business unit and whatever unit is responsible for the nontraditional program. Alternatively, if the business unit is responsible for the nontraditional program, there may be conflict between the business school and the traditional academic areas. This conflict may be structural or financial in nature (among other things). A similar dynamic

often exists in traditional liberal arts-oriented colleges that have created or expanded professional and graduate programs. The need for decision rights that are consistent with the nature of the programs offered by the institution may often go unrecognized by those in higher-level administration.

Reward systems are the second key component of the organizational architecture. Faculty compensation may be a challenge to business deans. Many Christian colleges have traditionally had a commitment to comparability in salaries across academic areas. As business (and other professional and graduate) programs have grown, this commitment has often been stretched, broken, or discarded, due to market realities. As a result, the business school becomes a target for jealousy. Yet many deans still find themselves poorly equipped to recruit and retain qualified faculty, especially those with terminal degrees. These problems have been exacerbated in some cases by changes in tenure and promotion standards and accreditation pressures. The related frustration faced by the dean may be even greater if, as is frequently the case, the business school turns a substantial profit and thus supports unprofitable areas of the university. The dean may admonish others not to starve the cash cow, but the institution has become addicted to the milk.

The third key aspect of the organization's architecture is performance evaluation systems. This can refer to either or both the evaluation system for business faculty and the evaluation system for the business dean. The ability of the dean to provide proper leadership is dependent on the ability to influence performance evaluation of business faculty. The authors are aware of several institutional inadequacies in this regard, and this research highlights others. Some examples include: the dean playing no meaningful role in performance evaluation, no meaningful relationship between performance and rewards, institutional mandates requiring the use of poorly designed classroom evaluations, negative information being weighted too heavily, and tenure and

promotion standards that do not reinforce quality standards of professional development in business faculty.

Performance evaluation and reward systems also affect deans personally. Many deans are plagued by an enormous workload. Most teach a substantial course load while performing numerous administrative details. In some cases, deans feel like they have, in essence, two jobs: that of a full-time business professor, and that of a full-time college administrator. Sometimes the opportunity to teach overload sections for additional compensation (in an effort to mitigate inadequate compensation structures) exacerbates the workload. In some cases, especially where nontraditional or graduate programs have been added, the institution has grown more quickly than its policies, leaving business deans with obsolete methods of performance evaluation that are institutionally sanctioned.

Research Methodology

We have developed a questionnaire, a copy of which is included with this paper. The questionnaire is designed to solicit responses from business deans concerning their leadership goals and aspirations, the challenges they face in attempting to lead their business schools, and their levels of job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) and organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Ninety-five institutions within the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) that offer business programs were contacted and asked to participate in this study. Of those 95, six declined to participate. Eighty-nine questionnaires were distributed, and at the time of this writing, 30 respondents had returned a useable questionnaire, which results in a preliminary return rate of 33.7%. A limitation that must be noted in this study is the low overall sample size (n=30) for the study. It is our hope that future efforts to obtain the other questionnaires will increase the sample size, and thus the generalizability of the results. The process was slowed by the timing of the questionnaire distribution. We

encountered difficulty contacting business deans during the traditional summer break. The questionnaire was distributed via FAX/e-mail to each business dean/chair of these institutions. The business dean of each participating institution was contacted before the FAX/e-mail was sent, and was asked to complete and return the questionnaire immediately. Responses were tabulated and analyzed. Substantial demographic data was also gathered so that appropriate analyses could be completed.

Results

Respondent Demographics

To describe the respondents, it is helpful to begin with their professional title. Nearly two-thirds (62.5%) defined themselves as chairs of their respective departments. Another 33.4% were deans, with the remainder of the respondents reporting themselves among a variety of titles such as Academic Director, Director of the MBA program, and Interim Director. The respondents reported being in their present position for a mean of 6.26 years. As to their career path, the most popular position previously held was that of professor (62.5%), followed by chair (12.5%), and various administrative posts from other academic or administrative areas of the university (21%). Only one respondent reported himself as having held an industry position immediately previous to his current position. The respondents spent an average of 7.9 years in their previous position and have an average of 16.6 years of full-time teaching experience. The vast majority of respondents (91.6%) reported having some type of teaching load associated with their position. The median load was reported to be 9 semester hours. This figure varied widely from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 18. The future career aspirations of respondents was fragmented. The most popular career move was to return to the role of a teaching faculty member (25.0%), which was followed closely by retirement (20.8%), and (tie) either leaving the institution for a promotion to dean at another institution, or accepting a promotion to Provost at their current institution (12.5%).

The respondents were predominantly white (100%) and male (83.3%), who are currently married (79.1%). Their average age was 50.4 years.

Frustrations

Respondents were asked to list their top five frustrations with their current position. Since this was an open-ended question, the results were post-coded and then analyzed in categories. The most important issue, as noted by 70.8% of respondents, was the insufficiency in their resources and funding. This category included such items as lack of money, lack of resources, low budget levels, inadequate budget systems, and viewing the business program as a cash cow to support other programs. This issue was followed closely by the difficulty in attracting and retaining faculty (62.5%). This issue unanimously stemmed from the problem of low faculty salaries making it difficult to attract and retain faculty. The third most important frustration was that of time commitments and bureaucratic minutia (58.3%). This issue dealt with busywork and various commitments the respondents viewed as non-productive, such as committee meetings, paperwork, red tape, and overall time commitment. One respondent referred to this frustration as “pesky administrative work.” The fourth most important issue was the respondents’ frustration with the strategic direction of their institution and/or the strategic direction imposed upon their business program. Respondents felt that top administration did not have a clear direction or was fragmented in its focus. This resulted in unclear strategic directions being dictated to the school/division.

The final three issues resulted in ties among many smaller issues. The fifth most important frustration (25.0%) was a tie between student enrollment and retention issues and interpersonal conflict issues with faculty and staff members. The sixth most important issue was a three-way tie (16.6%) among poor communication issues with the institutional leadership, organizational structure and authority issues, and the issue of a

heavy teaching load. The final frustration was a tie (8.3%) between institutional politics and change management problems.

Challenges

The challenges facing business deans were categorized into two categories—internal and external. Respondents rated each challenge on a 5-point scale (1 = No challenge at all; 5 = A great challenge). In analyzing the means of the external factors (Table 1), we found that shortages of potential faculty represented the greatest challenge by a wide margin. The next most challenging factor was competition from public four-year universities.

Table 1 – External Challenges Ranked by Descending Mean

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Shortages of potential faculty	4.52	.66
Competition from public 4-year universities	3.43	.99
Increasing importance of professional accreditation	3.04	.92
Demographic trends for college-age students	2.91	.79
Expectations of accrediting bodies	2.86	1.05
Competition from other Christian colleges	2.82	1.07
Competition from private secular colleges	2.73	1.05
Competition from distance education programs	2.52	1.08
Competition from public 2-year colleges	2.52	1.12
Competition from online degree programs	2.39	1.03
Competition from corporate universities	2.26	1.38

In analyzing the internal challenges facing business deans (Table 2), we did not find the great disparity as we did in the external challenges category. However, it seems that the major challenge facing business deans has to do with an external shortage of labor (qualified professors). This challenge is made more difficult by the institution which

either does not possess or is not willing to relinquish either/both the financial resources and other resources necessary to attract qualified faculty members.

Table 2 – Internal Challenges Ranked by Descending Mean

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Securing adequate staffing for the business unit	4.37	.71
Inadequate levels of faculty compensation in the business school	4.25	.89
Inadequate levels of faculty compensation throughout the institution	4.00	1.10
Securing adequate funding for the business unit	3.95	.85
Securing adequate funding and scheduling flexibility to support research and professional development opportunities for business faculty	3.83	.81
Securing a reasonable percentage of revenue generated by the business programs to fund the business programs/initiatives	3.62	1.17
The business dean's teaching load is too high, and thus constrains his/her ability to provide strategic leadership	3.50	1.25
Inability to keep pace with technology requirements of the business program	3.50	1.17
The business dean has too little input in the budget process	3.29	1.33
The teaching load of business faculty is too high, and thus impacts the quality/extent of faculty research	3.21	1.16
Too little influence on reward systems for business faculty	3.20	1.31
Convincing other chairs/deans of the need for change	3.12	.99
Inadequate decision-making rights	3.08	1.13
The business dean has too little input in faculty compensation decisions	3.08	1.41
Securing adequate support for leadership development opportunities for the Dean and others with business program leadership responsibilities	3.04	.85
The teaching load of business faculty is too high, and thus impacts the quality of classroom teaching	2.95	.99
Inadequate structure to allow for growth of the business program	2.95	1.48
Inadequate structure for the size of the institution	2.87	1.36
Convincing the Provost/VPAA of the need for change	2.87	1.19
Convincing the business faculty of the need for change	2.83	1.00
Inadequate faculty evaluation process	2.75	1.15
Convincing the university President of the need for change	2.70	1.23
Differing cultures of the institution and the business unit	2.58	1.13
The business Dean has too little input in the faculty evaluation process	2.58	1.13
Reputation of the institution	2.52	1.20
The business dean has too little influence in decisions regarding nontraditional business programs	2.34	1.26
Competition with other non-business programs	2.25	.98
Competition with leadership of the adult business program	2.20	1.41
Changes in institutional mission or vision	1.82	.83

As dynamic as these challenges may be, an entirely different set of factors is responsible for high stress in business deans (Table 3). These factors can be grouped into two categories: personally-imposed stress and organizationally-imposed stress.

Personally-imposed stress appears to result from personal work habits, while organizationally-imposed stress results from job design in the way the institution mandates the dean's use of time.

Table 3 – Factors That Cause Stress Listed by Descending Mean

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Excessively high self expectations	4.08	.82
Too heavy of a workload	3.95	.95
Insufficient academic time	3.91	.92
Too many meetings	3.75	.89
Maintaining professional and personal balance	3.50	1.14

When looked at in the context of satisfaction, deans who had high levels of job satisfaction reported having significantly less stress from high self expectations ($t=-2.839, p=.010$)⁴ and significantly less stress from a high workload. However, these same deans did not have a significantly different teaching load than deans who were not satisfied in their job.

Structure and Title

A t-test revealed that the organizational structure of the business dean's institution⁵ does not play a significant role in the dean's perception of the internal or external challenges, key frustrations of the job, organizational commitment, or overall job satisfaction. However, the existence of a non-traditional program is a significant difference ($t= -2.325, p=.030$) in that deans who must operate where a non-traditional business program is present report having greater difficulty in convincing business

⁴ All tests were 2-tailed t-tests for equality of means. Significance was determined at the .05 level

⁵ The authors recognize that various structural models exist. For the purposes of this study, we are concerned with an institution's status as either a college or university and whether the business programs have single or multiple programs/majors.

faculty of the need for change. These same deans also report more often that their non-traditional programs are administered outside of the school of business.

Greater differences are seen among business program heads who are titled as “chairs” and business program heads who are titled as “deans.” Deans were significantly more challenged by internal factors. Deans reported having more difficulties in convincing both business faculty members ($t = -3.260$, $p = .004$) and the university president ($t = -2.488$, $p = .021$) of the need for change. Funding was also an issue where deans reported having more of a challenge. Deans felt that their institution, as a whole, had low levels of faculty compensation ($t = -2.621$, $p = .016$), and that the business dean had far too little input in the budgetary decisions and budgeting process ($t = -2.776$, $p = .011$).

Discussion and Implications

We must emphasize that this paper reports only preliminary findings; that due to timing issues, the expected sample size has not yet been obtained. The sample size represented in this paper ($n = 30$), while representing an acceptable return rate, is insufficient for sophisticated statistical techniques such as multiple regression or factor analysis, which will be used in a later revision of this paper. Nevertheless, the sample size is sufficient for the statistical techniques used in the results section; and the results are sufficient to allow for some preliminary discussion of the findings.

It appears that the largest challenges facing CCCU business deans can be grouped into three categories: faculty recruitment issues, funding issues, and resource issues. All of the top ten internal challenges fall into these three categories. It is tempting to include the issue of faculty recruitment as a funding issue, since one of the key issues is being able to offer the levels of compensation necessary to attract and retain qualified faculty. But other factors, such as the spiritual requirements for faculty

and external markets for faculty, play major roles in the issues surrounding faculty recruitment.

The significant relationship between funding issues and organizational commitment of business deans ties together many of the issues examined in this paper. The availability of resources is both an internal issue and an organizational architecture issue, in that resource issues affect the assignment of decision rights, the performance evaluation system, and reward systems. Insufficient resources throw the system out of alignment and impact stakeholder satisfaction, manifesting as a lack of commitment to the institution. This is not surprising, in that insufficient resources may lead to the perception by business deans that the organization is not committed to them or the business program, thus lessening the deans' motivations to be committed to the organization.

Both internally and externally, the business deans did not perceive competitive forces to be significant challenges. Given the increased rate of change in the market for business education, the preoccupation of deans with internal funding and resource issues, coupled with a lack of concern about competitive issues, may be a cause for concern. Simply put, the daily crush of internal issues may detract from the ability to strategically align the business unit with external realities.

Interestingly, deans reported internal issues to be more of a challenge than chairs did. This may be because deans have a more external and strategic perspective than chairs have. Thus, because of their desire to focus on external issues, the crush of internal issues becomes more problematic.

This paper is organized around an organizational alignment model. Given the results of our research, it appears that organizational alignment may be difficult to come by for many business deans and chairs. Internal factors appear to play a larger role than external factors in influencing perceptions of the strategic situation, and thus may play a larger role in strategic design. The resulting strategy design may have a tendency to

underemphasize important external factors, thus negatively impacting the long-run efficacy of the business unit's strategy.

In contrast, organizational alignment issues received medium scores as challenges, implying that these issues, while not unimportant, are not perceived as critical challenges for the respondents. As mentioned above, however, funding issues, which affect organizational architecture, are significantly related to organizational commitment. In essence, it appears that many deans focus on the funding issues without perceiving the impact of these issues on organizational architecture. In other words, rather than perceiving the organization's systems to be out of alignment, they merely perceive funding inadequacies, and thus focus their attention on funding issues.

Conclusion

The results of this study, while preliminary, have begun to illuminate the aspirations and goals of business school deans, along with the leadership challenges they face. The study is framed by the concept of organizational alignment—that stakeholder satisfaction will be higher when the individual goals and aspirations of the dean, the design of the school of business' strategy, and the organizational architecture are in alignment. As additional responses are obtained, the analysis will be expanded. Later, our plan is to expand the sample in phase two of this research, and include both private and public secular institutions, thereby allowing comparisons to be made of the challenges faced by deans in different types of institutions.

**LEADERSHIP ASPIRATIONS AND CHALLENGES
OF CHRISTIAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY
BUSINESS DEANS AND CHAIRS**

*Introduction: We are conducting a study of deans and chairs of Christian college business programs. In doing so, we hope to better understand the aspirations of those who serve in these capacities, and also to better understand both the external and internal challenge these individuals face. Our goal is to promote better leadership in Christian colleges and universities, and to promote the sharing of "best practices" among those called to serve as Christian college business deans and chairs. **The confidentiality of responses will be protected; in no case will individual responses be tied to an institution.***

Your Name _____ Institution _____

Part One: Program Goals. Please list your top five goals for your business unit, in order of importance.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Part Two: Individual Goals. Please list your top five individual goals as a college professor/administrator, in order of importance.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Part Three: Career Aspirations. Please answer the following questions to help us better understand your professional background, career goals and aspirations.

What is your present position/job title? _____

How many years have you served in your present position? _____

What position did you have immediately prior to your present position? _____

How many years did you serve in that capacity? _____

How many years of full-time teaching experience do you have? _____

Do you carry a teaching load in your current position?

- No
- Yes (please indicate load): _____ credit hours per semester

Briefly describe your professional experience in business. _____

For how many years in the future do you expect to serve in your present capacity? _____

When you are finished serving in your present position, in what position would you like to serve next? (choose one)

- Teaching position as a business professor
- Provost or VP for Academic Affairs
- University President
- Dean at the same institution
- Dean at a different institution
- Position in industry
- Retirement
- Other (please specify): _____

Part Four: Frustrations. Please list your top five frustrations with your current position or institution, in order of importance.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Part Five: External Factors. Please indicate to what extent you consider each of the following external factors to be a challenge to your leadership of your business unit.

Factor	A Great Challenge			No Challenge at all	
	5	4	3	2	1
Competition from other Christian colleges	5	4	3	2	1
Competition from private secular colleges	5	4	3	2	1
Competition from public two-year colleges	5	4	3	2	1
Competition from public four-year colleges	5	4	3	2	1
Competition from distance education programs	5	4	3	2	1
Competition from online degree programs	5	4	3	2	1
Competition from corporate universities and training programs	5	4	3	2	1
Shortages of potential faculty	5	4	3	2	1
Increasing importance of professional accreditation	5	4	3	2	1
Expectations of accrediting bodies	5	4	3	2	1
Demographic trends for college-age students	5	4	3	2	1
Other (please specify)	5	4	3	2	1
Other (please specify)	5	4	3	2	1

Part Six: Internal Factors. Please indicate to what extent you consider each of the following internal factors to be a challenge to your leadership of your business unit.

Factor	A Great Challenge			No Challenge at all	
	5	4	3	2	1
Securing adequate funding for the business unit	5	4	3	2	1
Securing adequate staffing for the business unit	5	4	3	2	1
Securing adequate support for leadership development opportunities for the Dean and others with business program leadership responsibilities	5	4	3	2	1
Securing adequate funding and scheduling flexibility to support research and professional development opportunities for business faculty	5	4	3	2	1
Securing a reasonable percentage of revenue generated by the business programs to fund the business programs/initiatives	5	4	3	2	1
Convincing business faculty of the need for change	5	4	3	2	1
Convincing other chairs/deans of the need for change	5	4	3	2	1
Convincing the VPAA/Provost of the need for change	5	4	3	2	1
Convincing the university president of the need for change	5	4	3	2	1
Competition with leadership of the adult business program	5	4	3	2	1
Competition with other non-business programs	5	4	3	2	1
Inadequate structure for the size of the institution	5	4	3	2	1
Inadequate structure to allow for growth of the business program	5	4	3	2	1
The business dean's teaching load is too high, and thus constrains his/her ability to provide strategic leadership	5	4	3	2	1
The teaching load of business faculty is too high, and thus impacts the quality of classroom teaching	5	4	3	2	1
The teaching load of business faculty is too high, and thus impacts the quality/extent of faculty research	5	4	3	2	1
Inadequate levels of faculty compensation throughout the institution	5	4	3	2	1
Inadequate levels of faculty compensation in the business school	5	4	3	2	1
Inadequate faculty evaluation process	5	4	3	2	1
The business dean has too little input in the budget process	5	4	3	2	1
The business dean has too little input in the faculty evaluation process	5	4	3	2	1
The business dean has too little input in faculty compensation decisions	5	4	3	2	1

Factor	A Great Challenge			No Challenge at all	
	5	4	3	2	1
The business dean has too little influence in decisions regarding nontraditional business programs	5	4	3	2	1
Differing cultures of the institution and the business unit	5	4	3	2	1
Changes in institutional mission or vision	5	4	3	2	1
Reputation of the institution	5	4	3	2	1
Inability to keep pace with technology requirements of the business program	5	4	3	2	1
Inadequate decision-making rights	5	4	3	2	1
Too little influence on reward systems for business faculty	5	4	3	2	1

To what extent do the following items cause you stress?

Factor	High Stress			Low Stress	
	5	4	3	2	1
Excessively high self expectations	5	4	3	2	1
Insufficient academic time	5	4	3	2	1
Too many meetings	5	4	3	2	1
Too heavy of a workload	5	4	3	2	1
Maintaining professional and personal balance	5	4	3	2	1
Financial program support	5	4	3	2	1
Making decisions affecting others	5	4	3	2	1
Report and paperwork deadlines	5	4	3	2	1
Conflict with faculty	5	4	3	2	1
Activities outside regular hours	5	4	3	2	1

Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements:

Factor	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
	5	4	3	2	1
I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently	5	4	3	2	1
I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others	5	4	3	2	1
I receive an assignment without the proper resources and materials to execute it	5	4	3	2	1
I receive an assignment without the proper staffing to complete it	5	4	3	2	1
I have to do things that should be done differently	5	4	3	2	1
I have to work on unnecessary things	5	4	3	2	1
I receive incompatible requests from two or more people	5	4	3	2	1
I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment	5	4	3	2	1
I know what my responsibilities are	5	4	3	2	1
I feel certain about how much authority I have	5	4	3	2	1
I know exactly what is expected of me	5	4	3	2	1
Explanation is clear regarding what has to be done	5	4	3	2	1
Clear planned goals exist for my job	5	4	3	2	1
I know that I have divided my time properly	5	4	3	2	1

Part Seven: Demographic Information.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

What is your university's total enrollment?	
What is the total enrollment in your business programs?	
What is your traditional business program enrollment?	
What is your nontraditional business program enrollment?	
What is your total undergraduate business enrollment?	
What is your total graduate business enrollment?	
How many full-time faculty teach in your business program?	
How many part-time (adjunct) faculty teach in your business program?	
What percentage of your full-time business faculty hold a terminal degree?	
What is your age?	
What is the average annual compensation of your full-time business faculty (based on a nine-month equivalent)?	
How many credit hours do the business faculty teach in an academic year as part of their standard load?	
What is the limit for the number of overload hours business faculty can teach in an academic year ?	
How many department chairs report to you?	
How many clerical staff report to you?	

Sex:

- Male
- Female

Race:

- Caucasian
- African American
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Other

Family Status (Check all that apply):

- Single, never married
- Single, divorced
- Married
- Children under 6 years of age at home
- Children 7-18 years of age at home

How would you classify your position? (choose one):

- Administrator
- Faculty
- Faculty & Administrator

What was your **primary** motivation to become a dean or chair? (choose one)

- Desire to contribute to and improve the business program
- Personal growth
- Influence the development of faculty
- Advance administrative career
- Financial rewards
- Power and authority of the position
- Other (please specify): _____

To the best of your knowledge, why were you hired for this position? (choose one)

- I was best suited to deal with growth of the college/university
- I was best suited to facilitate change
- I was best suited to deal with crisis (financial, academic, staff, or other) in the school of business
- I understood the school of business' programs and was dedicated to sustaining them
- I was willing to serve as interim dean/chair

Part Eight: Other Information.

Which of the following best describes the structure of your business unit?

- Business department
- Business division with no departments
- Business division with multiple departments
- School of business with no departments
- School of business with multiple departments
- College of business with multiple departments

Does your institution have one or more nontraditional business degree programs?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what is the relationship of the nontraditional business degree programs to the traditional business degree programs?

- The nontraditional business degree programs are kept entirely separate
- The nontraditional degree programs are administered by the business unit
- The nontraditional degree programs are partially administered by the business unit and partly by another unit of the institution (please specify):

What is the state of your business program's professional accreditation? (check all that apply)

- Our program does not have professional accreditation

	AACSB	ACBSP	IACBE
We are members of this body			
We are seeking accreditation with this body			
We are accredited by this body			

Part Nine: Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements:

Question	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
	5	4	3	2	1
Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this position	5	4	3	2	1
I often think about quitting	5	4	3	2	1
I am generally satisfied with the kind of work that I do in this position	5	4	3	2	1
Most people that work here are very satisfied with their positions	5	4	3	2	1
People in this organization often think of quitting	5	4	3	2	1
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful	5	4	3	2	1
I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for	5	4	3	2	1
I feel very little loyalty to this organization	5	4	3	2	1
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	5	4	3	2	1
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	5	4	3	2	1
I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this organization	5	4	3	2	1
I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar	5	4	3	2	1
This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	5	4	3	2	1
It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	5	4	3	2	1
I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over those I was considering at the time I joined	5	4	3	2	1
There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	5	4	3	2	1
Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	5	4	3	2	1
I really care about the fate of this organization	5	4	3	2	1
For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	5	4	3	2	1
Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	5	4	3	2	1

What is your overall level of satisfaction with the following?

Question	Highly Satisfied			Highly Dissatisfied	
	5	4	3	2	1
Clarity of your role	5	4	3	2	1
Pace of your position	5	4	3	2	1
Workload of your position	5	4	3	2	1
Your work environment	5	4	3	2	1
Your compensation	5	4	3	2	1
Overall level of satisfaction	5	4	3	2	1

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return by FAX to 716-594-6316. As a respondent to this survey, you will receive a copy of the completed results within a few months.

REFERENCES

- Bovee, S.L., Roller, R.H., & Andrews, B.K. (2000). The pursuit of excellence: Costs, benefits, and motivations for Christian college business accreditation. Research on Christian Higher Education, 7, in press.
- Brickley, J.A., Smith, C.W., & Zimmerman, J.L. (1997). Managerial Economics and Organizational Architecture. Boston: Irwin.
- Gmelch, W.H., Wolverson, M., & Wolverson, M.L. (1999). The education dean's search for balance. Presented to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington (DC), February.
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 250-279.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.
- Rizzo, J.R., House, R.J., & Lirtzman, S.I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 150-163.
- Roller, R.H. & Bovee, S.L. (1998). Business education and the Christian university: Challenges for the new millennium. Presented to the Christian Business Faculty Association, Vancouver (B.C.) Canada, October.
- Wolverson, W., Wolverson, M.L., & Gmelch, W.H. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. The Journal of Higher Education, 70 (1), 80-106.

Figure 1
Organizational Alignment Model

Individual goals, strategy, and organizational architecture and their influence on stakeholder satisfaction

