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Hiring faculty is a challenge in the field of marketing. One important factor is a shortage of candidates. The problem is exacerbated, however, by an imperfect match between jobs and candidates. This study examines the homogeneity of academic jobs and candidates. Surveys were conducted with both parties. The results show that institutions and candidates are not homogenous. For example, hiring institutions differ in whether they are primarily seeking teaching or research ability and this is predictable depending on whether the institution is PhD granting or not. In addition, three types of job candidates are identified, each looking for something different—work environment, lifestyle, or research support. The lack of homogeneity can complicate the placement of candidates in jobs, but this depends on the distribution of these needs and the flexibility of both parties. Strategies to increase hiring success for hiring institutions are suggested, including assessing needs and competitive advantages.
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Universities are growing increasingly concerned about their ability to hire marketing faculty. The first warnings about the shortage of marketing PhDs were sounded as far back as the early 1970s (Shawver, 1973). The condition drew more attention in the 1980s (Brophy, 1983; Cebrzyski, 1985; Fisher & Garrett, 1984; Fuller, 1983; Whalen, 1983a, 1984) and during this period some estimates were that there were six jobs for every qualified candidate (Fisher & Garrett, 1984). Despite continued concern, the shortage of faculty has continued (Mangan, 2001). The problem occurs not only in marketing but in a variety of business disciplines (Paustian, 2001). Fewer PhDs are graduating in business while demand has grown even higher (The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business [AACSB], 2002; Davis & McCarthy, 2005). The issue is so serious that an AACSB study (2002) found that deans see the shortage of faculty to be the most important issue facing them today (p. 15).

Researchers addressing the difficulty of hiring faculty have usually approached it in terms of supply and demand (e.g., AACSB, 2002; Brophy, 1983; Cebrzyski, 1985; Fuller, 1983). For example, since the initial concern came to light, speculation has centered on how to increase the number of PhDs produced. Increasing salaries does not seem to have increased the supply of PhDs (Cebrzyski, 1985), and therefore it appears that other factors such as the costs of training PhDs may be limiting production (Policano, 2002). As a result, the shortage shows no sign of abating (Davis & McCarthy, 2005).

Interestingly, some research has demonstrated that the shortage of marketing faculty may also be attributable to inefficient matching of candidates to jobs (Basil & Basil, 2006). An imperfect match between slots and applicants means that some jobs do not fit with available candidates. This previous research (Basil & Basil, 2006) examined academic specialty as an indicator of match; however, it did not address many other potential factors such as how well the person fits with the job, organizational focus, or geography. These other dimensions can be used to examine how well the offerings of universities match what is being sought by candidates.

Research assessing the issue of matching has usually been studied under the assumption of market equilibrium. Market equilibrium, stemming from the Nash equilibrium model, occurs in situations where two or more players in competition have achieved a balance or equilibrium (e.g., Roth, 1984). In this situation, there are a roughly equal number of players on both sides where none of the players can gain an advantage over any of the other players (van den Bergh & Gowdy, 2003). This is a “zero-sum” solution. Such an assumption may not apply in situations of disequilibrium simply because the limited supply of candidates means that only some players will be able to hire. In the current situation, we are facing a seller’s market with an
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undersupply of PhDs. Because many jobs go unfilled (Basil & Basil, 2006), individual schools that can find ways to hire advantage themselves over other schools. This is fundamentally different from economic studies, where every player receives a placement and every organization receives a candidate. In our situation, some institutions are able to hire whereas others do not. Therefore, the assumption of a zero-sum solution would not apply.

There is evidence that players have tried to gain advantages over other players. For example, in one study conducted in the 1980s, when the PhD shortage was being felt, some schools tried to gain an advantage over the competition by providing earlier offers to candidates (Roth & Xing, 1994). The earlier offer date was an attempt to gain an advantage for these first-mover schools by taking candidates off the market and away from the competition. Because other institutions wanted to avoid this disadvantage, most other schools eventually moved their interviews and hiring earlier (Roth & Xing, 1994). Eventually the whole field shifted to the earlier recruitment schedule (conducting their “on campus” interviews in September and October). This attempt to gain an advantage by “jumping the gun” resulted in a negative outcome for the entire field because earlier hiring means that hiring institutions have less information on the candidates and thus assume more risk. This example illustrates how it is possible to gain an advantage and why it is important to study what strategies are used in this environment.

The second major assumption behind matching models that may limit their application is that there is homogeneity among all involved parties. That is, they assume “that groups or sectors act analogously to a single rational individual” (van den Bergh & Gowdy, 2003, p. 66). This is probably not the case in hiring. For example, one university may be focused on a candidate’s research potential whereas another is more interested in teaching skills; meanwhile one candidate may be seeking a high salary whereas another is more interested in good colleagues. There are several reasons to believe that the assumption of homogeneity does not apply to the academic market, at least in marketing. First off, the distinction between teaching and research is probably important. Teaching and research are the two main functions of most universities and of most faculty members (Berry, 1989). Historically, these two tasks were seen as a complementary skill set (Humbolt, 1809/1970). More recently, however, we have begun to think of teaching and research as competing skills (Davenport, 1970; Hammond, Meyer, & Miller, 1969; Schachter, 1991). Most relevant to the issue of hiring in academe is determining which universities will emphasize research over teaching, and vice versa. Overall it seems likely that different universities will put different importance weightings on teaching and research. Generally, we expect PhD-granting institutions to carry a greater burden of research training, and to put more value on research compared to non-PhD-granting institutions. This distinction seems to be amplified by the AACSB (Udell, Parker, & Pettijohn, 1995).

To the extent that we have a matching problem, qualified candidates may not be hired at the schools that would make the best use of them, resulting in a failure to make use of the limited resource of job candidates. Therefore, we expect this to be the simplest test of the homogeneity assumption. This leads to the following research question:

**Research Question 1:** Is there a different emphasis placed on teaching and research skills between PhD-granting institutions and non-PhD-granting institutions?

Another potentially important issue that may apply in this supply-limited situation is the nature of the exchange. According to exchange theory, some consumers or businesses are seeking certain things and other businesses or consumers are offering certain things (Hunt, 1976). Those that are offering things more attractive to candidates should be able to hire. So another focus here is to examine how else candidates may or may not match available jobs and what is being done to attract faculty in this supply-limited situation. Before we can understand how best to match candidates, we must understand what hiring institutions and job candidates are seeking, and compare them. This leads us to three research questions:

**Research Question 2:** What are hiring schools seeking (and offering)?

**Research Question 3:** What makes a school successful in hiring?

**Research Question 4:** What are job candidates seeking (and offering)?

**Method**

**Hiring Institutions**

The first part of this study was a survey of institutions that advertised a marketing job in the 12-month period. The sample was drawn from about 330 hiring institutions, both U.S. and international. An e-mail was sent to each institution, requesting they fill out a Web survey (link supplied in the e-mail). An incentive of a drawing to receive a 1-year subscription to a marketing journal of their choice was offered. The initial e-mail and a follow-up e-mail resulted in 50 responses (a 15% response rate). To improve the response rate, a hard copy of the survey was mailed to the nonresponding institutions with the same incentive offer. To the hard copy we received 49 responses (a 15% response rate). Ultimately both methods resulted in 99 responses, a 30% response rate. (The full survey is shown in Appendix A.)

After the responses were collected, schools were coded as to whether or not they offered a doctoral program in marketing. The American Marketing Association Web site was used...
as the source for this information and this was validated with other information on PhD programs.

Job Candidates

The second part of this study was a survey of recent academic marketing job candidates. An e-mail was sent to several listservers requesting that candidates who had been on the job market within a 2-year period fill out a Web survey (the link was supplied in the e-mail). An incentive of a drawing to receive a 1-year subscription to a marketing journal was offered. This resulted in 93 respondents from both U.S. and international degree-granting institutions. (The full survey is shown in Appendix B.)

Analysis

Our analyses considered the 1 to 14 ranking scales to be interval-level data. We believe reporting the results in these ways is considerably easier and briefer than reporting 14 discreet choices. There is some concern about the application of means to represent noninterval data (e.g., Stacey, 2006). However, this concern is typically raised for rank orderings of very limited range, such as a rank order of 1 to 5. Because our 1-to-14 ratings reflect a wider range than 1-to-5 scales, this means that we have a wider range and larger variance, much closer to interval-level measures for which parametric statistics were developed. Thus we have elected to treat these data as continuous in an effort to enhance the clarity of the data analysis process.

Results

Hiring Institutions

Of the 99 responses from hiring institutions, 8 reported that they did not have a position (most of these are likely to have occurred because the position was cut). The remaining 91 respondents reported interviews at AMA, inviting candidates to campus, and making offers.

Overall, what did hiring institutions identify as the most important factor in selecting a candidate? Research ability was identified by 34 schools with an average ranking (1 to 10, with 1 being most important) of 2.7, followed closely by teaching ability (\(n = 36; M = 2.8\)). Also important was fit with job (\(n = 31; M = 3.4\)) and fit with colleagues (\(n = 35; M = 4.3\)). Only the last two—faculty diversity and likelihood of accepting an offer—differ statistically from the first two. These are shown in Table 1.

Research Question 1 examined the homogeneity assumption. Examining what schools were primarily interested in, it found that there was a difference in how much importance various universities put on teaching and research. Universities without PhD programs put more emphasis on teaching skills than those with PhD programs (\(M = 2.4 \text{ vs. } 3.5; F = 7.72; p = .01\)). Meanwhile, PhD-granting institutions put more emphasis on research skills than those without PhD programs (\(M = 1.9 \text{ vs. } 3.3; F = 5.5; p = .03\)). This partially addresses Research Question 1.

Next, Research Question 2 asked what incentives hiring institutions offered to new hires. A list of likely incentives was provided as well as the option of an “other” category. The results show that the most common incentives were conference travel and summer support. About a quarter reported a research or teaching assistant and reduced teaching loads. Overall, only 5% reported no incentives whatsoever. These results are shown in Table 2.

At the intersection of Research Questions 1 and 2, we compared incentives offered by PhD-granting institutions and non–PhD-granting institutions. PhD-granting schools were more likely to offer summer support than non–PhD-granting schools (49% vs. 24%, \(\chi^2 = 5.9; p = .014\)) and

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Factors in Choosing a Candidate</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Non-PhD</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research ability</td>
<td>2.7a</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching ability</td>
<td>2.8a</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with job</td>
<td>3.4ab</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic training</td>
<td>3.8ab</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with colleagues</td>
<td>4.3ab</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>5.8ab</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>6.1ab</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase faculty diversity</td>
<td>7.4b</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to accept offer</td>
<td>7.6b</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rank orders (average of 1 to 14); those with different subscripts are significantly different at \(p < .05\). **\(p < .01\).
more likely to offer startup research funds, too (32% vs. 11%, χ² = 6.3; p = .013). This is more evidence for the lack of homogeneity in positions.

To examine Research Question 3 on hiring success, we compared the 28 universities that had been able to hire to the 63 that had not (or were still in process). The results showed that 82% of those attempting to hire an assistant professor were successful whereas only 18% of those trying to hire at a different level were successful. Those hiring in the areas of e-commerce, hospitality and tourism, or marketing research were more likely to have hired. Schools offering a reduced teaching load in the 1st year were more likely to have hired. Those schools that placed greater importance on the fit with the job were more likely to hire. Finally, schools who had invited more candidates to campus, and those having made more offers were more likely to have hired (perhaps because they were more satisfied with their pool of candidates).

As a better test of this question, a logistic regression compared the 28 universities that had been able to hire with the 63 that had not (or were still in process). This allowed a comparison that controlled for the other factors. The results demonstrated that schools attempting to hire assistant professors and those more concerned with the fit with the job were more likely to be successful. Interestingly, offering a reduced teaching load or being a PhD-granting institution made no difference in hiring success when controlling for the other factors. These findings suggest schools were more likely to be successful in hiring new assistant professors, and this was the important explanatory variable. The results are presented in Table 3.

In sum, the results of the hiring institution survey demonstrate that there is some heterogeneity between the preferences of PhD-granting and non-PhD-granting institutions. Not surprisingly, PhD-granting institutions are more focused on the quality of research training than non-PhD-granting institutions. In exchange, they are more likely to provide seed funds and summer support for those skills. Non-PhD-granting institutions, meanwhile, are more focused on preparation for teaching and are seeking candidates with those skills. These results suggest that the heterogeneity of preferences of hiring institutions may work to constrain the hiring process. This is not insurmountable, but it does mean that because schools are seeking different things, every candidate may not fit their needs equally, as previous economic theory and research in matching has assumed. The difficulty depends on the proportion of candidates with those skills and the flexibility of each party. The question of homogeneity is important because it speaks to a need for differentiation on the part of institutions and candidates. For example, if all job candidates are looking for positions in big cities, then universities in smaller college towns may be limited in whom they can hire. Alternatively, if candidates are primarily concerned about a specific issue such as teaching load, then schools with higher teaching loads may need to make adjustments.

### Job Candidates

There were 93 job candidates who responded to our survey. The candidates reported receiving their degree from 71 different PhD programs, including 14 from outside the United States. Research Question 4 asked what candidates were looking for in a job. In a rank ordering (from 1 to 14, with 1 being most important), most factors turned out to be moderately important. Overall, colleagues, research support, teaching load, research expectations, and salary were the most important factors (from 5.4 to 6.0 out of 14). These were followed by location of the school, atmosphere, number of different course preparations required, and school reputation (from 6.2 to 7.8). Least important were spousal considerations, conference/travel support, cost of living, and benefits (8.3 to 9.7). These results are shown in Table 4.

The means across these items were somewhat similar, but in accord with the homogeneity question, there may be different types of candidates that are seeking different things. Because the sample was restricted to recent PhD candidates, they generally did not vary across rank. Instead, homogeneity was examined using a k-means cluster analysis. The analysis found three clusters of similar size (n = 34, 22, and 20) which is counter to the notion of homogeneity. A comparison of these three clusters demonstrates that there is one cluster most focused on the working environment (colleagues and atmosphere; n = 34, Cluster 1), a second focused on lifestyle issues (spousal consideration and research expectations; n = 22, Cluster 2), and a third focused on support for research (research support, number of classes per year, number of preparations; n = 20, Cluster 3). A comparison of
these three clusters was performed to assess differences in the importance weightings assigned for the job choice factors. Several significant differences were found, and these are shown in Table 4. Overall, it appears that preferences are not homogeneous and there are distinct types of candidates.

The validity of these clusters was verified through an analysis of open-ended responses to the question “What factor was the MOST important to you in selecting a position? (This may or may not be one of the factors listed above.)” For those candidates in Cluster 1, for whom colleagues and atmosphere were the top priorities (n = 34, 43% of sample), open-ended responses reflected a focus on colleagues and atmosphere through comments such as “colleagues” or “collegiality” (mentioned by 6) and “atmosphere” (2). For those candidates in Cluster 2 for whom spouse and quality of life were the top priorities (n = 22, 28% of sample), open-ended responses reflected a focus on location through comments such as “location” (6), “being close to my wife and daughter” (1), and “finding a position close to my family” (1). For those candidates in Cluster 3 for whom research support was the top priority (n = 20, 25% of sample), open-ended responses reflected a focus on research through comments such as “research support” (4), “research environment” (3), “opportunity to successfully do research” (1), and “the fact I could work with doctoral students” (1). Therefore, there appears to be clusters of candidates who share some attributes among themselves but are different from other types of candidates.

Taking a broader view of the process, with an eye to the general equilibrium question, there were two additional open-ended questions that asked candidates about the hiring process in general. The third open-ended question was, “Please describe anything that you felt one or more of the schools you interviewed with did very well with regard to the interviewing process.” The most common response was making the candidate feel welcome (23); this included a variety of examples such as “excited to have me visit” and “I knew I was not the only candidate, but in some ways they made me feel like I was.” Also mentioned was professionalism and communication (7 each). Professionalism examples included “demonstrated, nicely, the high standards of professionalism and research that were expected” and having prepared timetables in advance. Examples of communication included “schools did an exceptional job of keeping me informed as to my status” and “providing frequent updates and status of the hiring process.” The atmosphere or colleagues were mentioned by 4 respondents, and being responsive to research presentation by 3 others.

Finally, candidates were asked, “Please describe anything that you felt one or more of the schools you interviewed with did very poorly with regard to the interviewing process.” The majority of responses had to do with the lack of feeling welcome or other aspects of the atmosphere in the AMA screening interviews or campus visits. In addition, a number of candidates were bothered by unprofessional conduct by the interviewers, such as appearing drunk.

**Discussion**

This study examined what universities were seeking in candidates and what job candidates were seeking in universities. The results of the survey of hiring institutions suggest that teaching and research ability are the most important factors sought by hiring institutions, as expected. Though intuitive, these results are also reassuringly consistent with hiring studies which show that one important aspect of fit with a job is that the candidate possesses the skills required to perform the job (Carless, 2005).
With regard to the theoretical question of homogeneity, schools with PhD programs were more interested in pursuing candidates on the basis of their research training than schools without PhD programs. Again, although not surprising, this difference suggests that any candidate cannot match any job. In addition, an analysis of job candidate responses revealed three distinct clusters. Some candidates were most concerned about work environment, some were most concerned about lifestyle issues, and some were most concerned about research potential. The fact that some schools put significantly more emphasis on research skills than others, as well as the distinct clusters of job candidates, suggests that the assumption of homogenous matching preferences does not appear to be the case in the academic marketing market. The assumption of homogeneity may limit the validity of matching models.

Both hiring institutions and job candidates reported assessing their fit with one another. These findings suggest that institutions and candidates are aware of these differences, and this is reflected in these distinct preferences. The distinction between fit with job and fit with colleagues is in line with organizational studies which demonstrate that job fit has two dimensions—skills required and fit with the organizational culture (Carless, 2005). Because both groups reported trying to assess how well the candidate fit in the organizational culture, this suggests that these fit factors may also complicate the match or may limit “matches” between institutions and candidates, further complicating the placement of job candidates into academic positions (e.g., Roth & Xing, 1994).

How much the lack of homogeneity complicates the hiring process depends on both the relative distribution of these needs among hiring institutions versus job candidates as well as the flexibility of each party. If the mix of skills, training, and other wants of hiring institutions matches with what is provided in the job candidate pool, then despite a lack of homogeneity, this does not limit the match between the two parties. To the extent that the desires of the two pools do not match, however, this decreases the likelihood that institutions will find candidates that fit with their position and, more relevant in this supply-limited context, decreases the likelihood that candidates will find positions that are attractive to them. The latter may mean that more candidates may forgo academic jobs and perhaps take positions in industry. Meanwhile, the loss of PhDs to industry is part of the equilibrium problem that is partly responsible for the shortage of candidates. To the extent that either party is flexible, however, this lessens the constraints imposed by the heterogeneity of both parties. Given the shortage of job candidates and the fact that less than half of universities are able to hire (Basil & Basil, 2006), it seems especially important for hiring institutions to be as flexible as possible in their search.

What can hiring institutions offer to candidates that they are seeking? The overall univariate results from job candidates suggest that candidates valued colleagues, research support, and teaching load as the most important factors they were seeking. This would seem to favor PhD-granting institutions; however, this was not found—PhD-granting institutions had no greater success in hiring than non–PhD-granting institutions. This may be because the pool of acceptable PhD candidates is small for each institution. Specifically, institutions generally hire graduates from schools ranked at least as high as their own institution. The more highly the school is ranked, the fewer acceptable candidates they have to consider. As such, if schools are inflexible in this regard, they will face serious hiring limitations.

Institutions may wish to consider the results of the cluster analysis when appealing to candidates. The cluster analysis suggests that three distinct preference patterns are evident. One grouping emphasizes quality-of-life issues. This group is seeking good colleagues and atmosphere. Salary is more important to this group than to the other groups. Astute institutions may wish to offer higher salaries to candidates in this category. The second group seems to be concerned with spousal issues and school location, while also showing concern for the demands that the new institutions will place on them. This group might respond well to a reduced teaching load and to reassurance that the research expectations will be manageable for them. Finally, the third group appears to be research driven, and they are looking for support to excel in their research. This includes research funding as well as minimal teaching. For someone in this group, offering additional research funds, a course release, or fewer preparations may be much more motivating than offering additional salary compensation.

Examining the wishes of hiring institutions, most respondents suggested that doctoral training include more training on pedagogy. Both PhD-granting institutions and non–PhD-granting institutions expressed the importance of teaching skills. This may reflect the environmental trend of greater demand for quality teaching on the part of students, or the fact that teaching is a critical part of the job in both types of universities. PhD-granting institutions were also more likely to suggest that doctoral programs prepare students better for research. These results suggest that research still receives much greater emphasis in PhD-granting institutions. But taken together with the desire for more pedagogical training, this suggests that the PhD-granting institutions were not seeking only research skills but teaching plus research.

Limitations

This research was conducted with a single academic discipline at a single point in time. Because almost all models of matching are dynamic, this is a major limitation of the research. Further research may wish to examine a more dynamic view of the job search process, from initial entry into the job market with application letters, through the screening interviews and on-campus visits, to the acceptance of an offer (or perhaps even a year or two after starting the position). In addition, although the sample was gathered as broadly as possible, it is still possible that some nonresponse may have biased these results. For these reasons, we await replication.
Practical Applications

How should the field approach the challenges found here? There are several suggestions. The most basic question is when is the PhD really essential? A PhD certainly makes sense for graduate education and research to increase our body of knowledge. But is it a necessity for teaching lower division and softer skills classes? In some cases, professionally qualified instructors may be quite capable. Perhaps the AACSB should find ways to ensure that classes are taught by qualified instructors with appropriate skills for each class, and not the hard-and-fast 50% rule.

Because a PhD is essential for many roles, increasing the supply is warranted. Moreover, because rising salaries themselves do not seem to be increasing the number of people obtaining PhDs in marketing and business (Basil & Basil, 2006; Davis & McCarthy, 2005), we should try other means of increasing enrollment in these programs. One approach would be to educate undergraduate and MBA students about the shortage as well as the job benefits and quality of life associated with a PhD in business (Davis & McCarthy, 2005). We should also consider ways of increasing the number of PhD “slots” and perhaps reduce the financial burden of obtaining a full-time PhD. Also, because an increasing percentage of PhDs in business are being lost to industry (AACSB, 2002), we should find ways to make the academic world more attractive, and perhaps even recruiting people back from the corporate world (Mangan, 2006). Although there is a shortage of business PhDs, there is still an oversupply of PhDs in many fields, so we may also want to consider “importing” PhDs from other fields (Whalen, 1983b). Limiting a search to those with PhDs in “Marketing,” as many positions are advertised, means that schools are limiting their pool to one that has been undersupplied for 20 years now. Consideration of PhDs with a relevant background can increase the potential pool. One example of effort in this area can be seen in the AACSB’s recently instituted training program for people with PhDs in other fields who are interested in moving into marketing (Mangan, 2007). Retraining academically qualified PhDs from other fields offers the potential of a larger pool of qualified PhDs.

We may also be able to relax some of the matching constraints for PhD hires by being more flexible in what we are seeking. There are some areas with a greater supply of candidates than others. Schools with teaching needs in a low-supply area or those who are disappointed with their pool at AMA might consider shifting existing faculty or instructors to these lower supply areas and instead trying to hire from the areas of higher supply (such as CB). Other ways of increasing flexibility also relax possible matching constraints. Schools might want to consider following the model of seeking the best possible candidate in any relevant area. Furthermore, given the shortage of candidates, we should consider the possibility that hiring is not always a matter of selecting a perfect candidate, but that mentoring faculty in pedagogy, research, or topic areas may allow us to find ways to do more with the candidates that are available. If one candidate is somewhat weak in a desired area, mentoring may make that candidate viable.

Because there are different types of candidates on the market, it is important to assess your competitive advantage relative to the range of candidates. Are you offering a stimulating research environment with great colleagues and support? Or are you offering a desirable geographic location? In addition to listening to candidates’ doctoral research, screening candidates on the basis of their employment priorities is likely to be helpful. This may explain why hiring institutions more concerned about the fit with the job were more likely to hire—because they tried to assess a number of fit factors, and sought out the appropriate candidates. We believe that the cluster analysis here may provide a first look at possible segmentation strategies. Although the same can be done for candidates, the sellers’ market suggests that the onus may fall on hiring institutions to ferret out the match potential and then explain it to the candidate.

How should we train this limited supply of PhDs? Many hiring institutions (42%) expressed a desire for better training in pedagogy. This finding confirms that teaching is a critical aspect of the professorate. However, the next largest desire (29%) was for better research training. Because the shortage of PhDs has resulted in an increasing percentage of teaching being done by part-time and non–tenure-track faculty (Gravois, 2005), more of the research role falls to PhDs. Preparing students for both tasks in the academic environment provides the potential for a wider variety of roles (e.g., Armstrong & Sperry, 2004; Berry, 1989; Udell et al., 1995) and may loosen some of the constraints imposed by heterogeneity.

Finally, there are several strategies that hiring institutions could follow to benefit their own situation in this tight market. With regard to the general issue of competitive advantage, can the process be made more positive? Although most of the job candidates surveyed reported that the welcome they received was done very well by schools in the hiring process, many expressed a wish for more communication and professionalism in the job search process. Because many candidates expressed interest in colleagues and atmosphere, enabling candidates to interact with potentially attractive collaborators throughout the job search process may help candidates to view a school more favorably. In this case taking a bit more effort in the recruitment phase might pay dividends in matching and ultimately hiring.

Overall, the PhD shortage boils down to the fact that we need to apply the skills we teach. With regard to the shortage of candidates, we should find ways to grow the market. In addition, hiring institutions should find ways to segment the market, realize their own strengths and weaknesses, communicate their competitive advantage, provide a positive job search experience, and deliver a valuable proposition to each viable prospect.
### Appendix A

**Hiring Institution Survey**

We are conducting a study of the academic job market. One part of that research involves understanding the perspective of hiring institutions. (We also plan to interview job candidates about which institution they chose and why). We hope you will complete the following questionnaire for this research. This should take less than 10 minutes.

Your responses will remain confidential. They will only be disclosed in aggregated form (i.e., category averages).

Our intention is to present these results (in aggregate form) at a marketing conference and to publish them in a marketing journal. We can also provide you with a preliminary report if you would like, as a thank-you for your participation (there is a place for your name and address below). Since the publication process can take time, this will allow you to receive the results significantly faster.

We are also offering an incentive for your participation. We will randomly draw respondents’ names, and five lucky winners will receive a one-year subscription to the academic marketing journal of their choice.

Michael and Debra Basil  
Faculty of Management  
University of Lethbridge

#### Hiring Institution Survey

1. What is the name of your institution?
2. Did you have one or more positions open?  
   _ yes  
   _ no [Skip to Q. 13]
3. At what rank? [fill in the number of positions at each level for which you had an opening]  
   _ visiting _ assistant  
   _ lecturer _ associate  
   _ senior lecturer _ full  
   _ open
4. In what area was/were the position(s) [check as many as apply]?  
   _ Advertising _ E-Commerce  
   _ Brand/Product Management/Development _ Global Marketing  
   _ Channel Management, Logistics _ High Technology/IS/ IT/Dbase Mkt  
   _ Consumer Behavior _ Hospitality and Tourism  
   _ International Marketing _ Promotion  
   _ Marketing Communication _ Retailing  
   _ Marketing Management and Strategy _ Sales Management  
   _ Marketing Research _ Services Marketing  
   _ Marketing Theory, and Principles of Marketing
5. With how many people did you conduct initial screening interviews (e.g., at AMA) for each position? ______  
6. How many people came to campus for interviews? ______  
7. How many offers did you make? ______  
8. Did you hire someone? ___ yes ___ no [SKIP TO Q9]  
9. If yes, how many? ______  
10. For any position for which you failed to hire, please specify the reason(s).  
11. Please RANK ORDER the following in terms of how important they were to the search committee in selecting a candidate(s). Place a “1” next to the item that was most important, a “2” next to the second most important item, etc. Please do not give “ties.”

#### Rank of Average Importance Across All New Hires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fit with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Job Candidate Survey

Dear Doctor xxx:

We saw in an ELMAR announcement that you recently accepted an academic position. We are interested in researching the academic hiring process for marketing professors. We believe that the academic market is changing. We hope to identify key trends in the hiring process, and to identify factors that best predict the match-up between a candidate and an institution. We believe this information will be useful to you by shedding insight into the effectiveness of your own efforts, and that it will be useful to all institutions that seek to hire new faculty.

Could you please take just a few minutes to respond to the enclosed survey for us? Your responses are particularly important since we must limit our sample to individuals who have recently been recruited. We would greatly appreciate your help.

In exchange for your participation, we will provide you with advance results of our research. You will have the opportunity to see the results far before they ever make it into a journal. Also, we will hold a drawing for three one-year subscriptions to the academic marketing journal of your choice. Finally, you will be helping some fellow academics with their research (and we will be very grateful for this!).

All responses will remain confidential. The final survey results will report overall averages—individuals and institutions will not be identifiable.

Please take a moment right now to respond. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Michael and Debra Basil
Faculty of Management
University of Lethbridge
Job Candidate Survey

We are conducting a study of the academic job market. One part of that research involves understanding the perspective of job candidates. (We have already surveyed hiring institutions). We hope you will fill out the following questionnaire for this research. This should take about 10 minutes.

Your responses will remain confidential. They will only be disclosed in aggregated form (i.e., category averages).

Our intention is to present these results (in aggregate form) at a marketing conference and to publish them in a marketing journal. We can also provide you with a preliminary report if you would like, as a thank-you for your participation (there is a place for your name and address below). Since the publication process can take time, this will allow you to receive the results significantly faster.

We are also offering an incentive for your participation. We will randomly draw respondents’ names, and three lucky winners will receive a one-year subscription to the academic marketing journal of their choice.

Job Candidate Survey

1. Were you on the job market for a position (if not, please disregard this survey)?
2. From what institution did you or are you getting your degree? _________________
3. Which of these areas is your research specialty [check as many as apply]?
   - Advertising
   - Brand/Product Management/Development
   - Channel Management, Logistics
   - Consumer Behavior
   - E-Commerce
   - Global Marketing
   - High Technology/IS/IT/Dbase Mkt
   - Hospitality and Tourism
   - International Marketing
   - Marketing Communication
   - Marketing Management and Strategy
   - Marketing Research
   - Marketing Theory, and Principles of Marketing
   - Promotion
   - Retailing
   - Sales Management
   - Services Marketing
   - Other (specify: ______________________________)
4. Which of these areas is your teaching specialty [check as many as apply]?
   - Advertising
   - Brand/Product Management/Development
   - Channel Management, Logistics
   - Consumer Behavior
   - E-Commerce
   - Global Marketing
   - High Technology/IS/IT/Dbase Mkt
   - Hospitality and Tourism
   - International Marketing
   - Marketing Communication
   - Marketing Management and Strategy
   - Marketing Research
   - Marketing Theory, and Principles of Market
   - Promotion
   - Retailing
   - Sales Management
   - Services Marketing
   - Other (specify: ______________________________)
5. With how many schools did you conduct an initial interview (e.g., at AMA)? ____
6. How many institutions invited you out for an on-campus interview? ____
7. How many campuses did you actually visit? ____
8. How many institutions made you a job offer? ____
9. Did you accept one of those offers?
   - yes
   - no
10. Rank order (from 1 to 14) how important the following factors were to you in seeking a position (no ties please):
    - number of classes taught per year (teaching load)
    - number of class preparations (number of different classes taught per year)
    - research expectations
    - research support
__ conference/travel support
__ location of the school
__ colleagues
__ atmosphere
__ spousal considerations (e.g., job opportunities for spouse, etc.)
__ school reputation
__ salary
__ benefits
__ cost of living
__ other (specify: _________________________________________________)

11. If you accepted a position, please rate that school on the following, using this scale.

1  2  3  4  5
very bad  bad  average  good  very good
__ number of classes taught per year (teaching load)
__ number of class preparations (number of different classes taught per year)
__ reasonable research expectations
__ research support
__ conference/travel support
__ location of school
__ colleagues
__ atmosphere
__ spousal considerations
__ school reputation
__ salary
__ benefits
__ cost of living
__ other (specify: _________________________________________________)

12. What factor was MOST important to you in selecting a position? (This may or may not be one of the factors listed above)

13. What factor was LEAST important to you in selecting a position? (This may or may not be one of the factors listed above)

14. Please describe anything that you felt one or more of the schools you interviewed with did very well with regard to the interviewing process.

15. Please describe anything that you felt one or more of the schools you interviewed with did very poorly with regard to the interviewing process.

Your name: ______________________________________________
Address: ________________________________________________

(Name and address are needed for the drawing and in order to send you advance results. The information you provide will remain strictly confidential.)

Thank you for your time!
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