From Doctoral Student To Faculty Member: PhD. Project Alumni's Evaluation Of Their Preparedness

Bill N. Schwartz, College of Charleston, USA
W. Darrell Walden, University of Richmond, USA

ABSTRACT

In response to the important issues regarding diversity in business schools and corporate America, the KPMG Foundation established the PhD Project. The PhD Project helps business professionals and recent college graduates earn doctoral degrees in business disciplines and join business school faculty. While the PhD Project has helped increase the number of minority faculty members in business schools, it may be helpful to gather insights from the recent PhD alumni who have received support from the PhD Project. Our study examines attitudes about preparedness of PhD Project alums for their first faculty position after completing their PhD program. Results show that PhD Project alumni and majority PhD alumni (alumni not associated with the PhD Project) felt they were prepared for their first faculty position, but they were not significantly different in their evaluation in most respects. However, to our surprise, majority PhD alumni felt they were better prepared for research than PhD Project alumni. This difference was significant and further analyses showed that younger faculty and those in the ethnic majority were better prepared for research. Both groups considered themselves well prepared for research and teaching. Neither group was as optimistic about being prepared for service responsibilities and the academic climate or politics of an academic career. Our findings show that the PhD Project is necessary to help ensure that minority faculty members are adequately prepared for research and their academic careers.

Keywords: Doctoral Education; Diversity; Faculty; PhD. Project

INTRODUCTION

*I*n response to issues of achieving and maintaining diversity goals in business schools and corporate America, the KPMG Foundation established the PhD Project[1], which helps business professionals and recent graduates earn doctoral degrees in business disciplines and, join business school faculty. Using financial support, a network of minority doctoral students associations, and other resources, the PhD Project attracts African American, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans to business programs and supports them through the doctoral process to completion. Since its inception in 1994, the PhD Project has been instrumental in increasing the number of minority business faculty from 294 to more than 1000. In addition, 90% of doctoral students associated with the PhD Project complete their program compared to the national average of 75% (Milano 2008, 78).

PhD Project alumni are an important component of the strategy to place more faculty of color in front of the classroom and to encourage more minority college students to pursue business degrees and careers. Increasing the number of minority business majors can increase the probability that organizations will reach and maintain their goals for diversity.

---

[1] See www.phdproject.org for complete information.

The purpose of our study is to investigate PhD Project alumni's attitudes about preparedness for their first faculty position and compare the results with alumni who are not associated with the PhD Project. The PhD Project's success of increasing diversity in business schools and corporate America depends, in part, upon whether PhD Project alumni feel they are prepared to be successful faculty members.

In the next section, we discuss the preparation of university and college faculty members, the PhD Project's mission and objectives, and offer our hypotheses. The following section presents the study's research methodology. We then present research results followed by a discussion of the results and the conclusion.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

Preparation Of Faculty Members

In its overview of the Preparing Future Faculty program[2], the Council of Graduate Schools, with the Association of American Colleges and Universities, stated the role and responsibilities of faculty members are teaching, research and service. One goal of all business school is to hire new faculty members who are prepared to deal competently with the role and responsibilities of a faculty member (Mitchell 2007, 249). Business schools search for and hope to hire excellent teachers and active researchers who understand how the publication process works. Mitchell (2007, 239) declared that new faculty members need to understand "how universities work, how decisions are made, and the major issues being confronted." Austin (2002, 95) added that new faculty members need to "work effectively in the ever changing world of higher education."

According to Mitchell (2007, 239) well-prepared doctoral students know how to become good teachers (prepare and conduct classes), researchers (write, revise, and review research), and institutional citizens (knowledgeable representatives). However, many doctoral students are trained in colleges and universities that focus on research (Gaff 2002, 9), even though many faculty positions emphasize teaching and service (Adams 2002, Richlin and Essington 2004). Golde and Dore (2001) did not find fault with this focus since the PhD is a research degree, but less than half of the doctoral students they surveyed reported that their program prepared them to actually publish their research.

Referring to Harvard University's Project on Faculty Appointment, Gaff (2002, 11) stated that new faculty members were unaware, and therefore, unprepared for the demands and stresses of faculty life. Although doctoral students and new faculty rated their doctoral programs favorably, many did not consider themselves to be prepared for a faculty position (Adams 2002; Golde and Dore, 2001). Austin (2002, 105) found that few graduate students received guidance on advising, committee work, curriculum development, managing ethical issues or public service and outreach. In describing her experience, Newman (1999, 29) wrote, "The melodrama of graduate school did not prepare us for the denouement of the professional world."

Prior studies (e.g., Austin 2002, Gaff 2002, and Adams 2002) agreed that graduate students who participate in doctoral programs would benefit from activities or programs that supplement traditional doctoral studies. Gaff (2002, 12) supported better connections between preparation of future faculty and the work they actually will do, including additional education about teaching and learning, and skills they will need. Adams (2002, 4) advocated for a variety of teaching experiences to prepare doctoral students for career in higher education. Adams (2002, 5) also pointed out that graduate students need a realistic view of available resources for their research projects when they become faculty members. In addition, doctoral students should be advised about the "benefits and potential pitfalls" of participation in faculty governance or services (Adams 2002, 8).

Graduate programs are responsible for transforming doctoral students into faculty members prepared to join academe. Understanding and preparing for all aspects of faculty responsibilities are important to embracing and

---

[2] The Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program is a national movement to transform the way aspiring faculty members are prepared for their careers. The initiative was a partnership between the Council of Graduate Schools and the Association of American Colleges and Universities. The PFF program received support from the Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Science Foundation, and the Atlantic Philanthropies. See www.preparing-faculty.org.

successfully navigating academic life. Training doctoral students in teaching, research, and service and giving them advice about such things as advising and curriculum development will increase the number of new faculty members available for business schools to hire.

The PhD. Project

The PhD Project is primarily a support group. It encourages individuals to consider doctoral studies, offers scholarships to help pay for their graduate education and assists doctoral students associations in providing a myriad of services that can help doctoral students succeed when they take faculty positions: The PhD Project's mission is as follows:

The PhD Project's mission is to increase the diversity of corporate America by increasing the diversity of business school faculty. We attract African American, Hispanic Americans and Native Americans to business PhD programs, and provide a network of peer support on their journey to becoming professors. As faculty, they serve as role models attracting and mentoring minority students while improving the preparation of all students for our diverse workplace and society. (www.phdproject.org)

Our study examines two of the PhD Project's objectives; to 1) increase the number of minority business professors who can function as role models and mentors, and 2) influence more minorities to pursue business degrees/careers (www.phdproject.org). If minority doctoral students feel they are prepared to enter the academic world, they are likely to be more successful in helping the PhD Project in accomplishing these objectives.

Doctoral Students Associations

To provide additional assistance for individuals who receive their financial support, the PhD Project created Minority Doctoral Students Associations (DSAs) beginning in 1994 "to sustain a high level of commitment and a sense of connection among minority business doctoral students" (www.phdproject.org). These DSAs can make a significant contribution in accomplishing the two objectives we list above. There are five minority DSAs: Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, Management, and Marketing.

The PhD Project's programs for doctoral students supplement the students' education with activities that a majority of doctoral business students may not experience. The PhD Project offers its participants opportunities to network with experienced faculty and journal editors. Each year, the PhD Project hosts DSA conferences in conjunction with professional meetings. For example, last year, the Accounting DSA Conference met in San Francisco and the American Accounting Association's annual meeting also convened there, allowing doctoral accounting students to participate in the DSA conference and the professional meeting.

During the student association conferences, faculty members share their teaching, research, and service experiences and responsibilities with doctoral students, and editors discuss publishing students' research projects. Faculty members also share their "war" stories and discuss the politics of their department, so that doctoral students are aware of various aspects of faculty life.

During these professional meetings, doctoral students can attend scheduled paper presentation sessions that enhance their knowledge of various research topics. Students who are active with the PhD Project may attend the key professional meetings for their discipline years before many of their counterparts. Students also can increase their support network by interacting with faculty outside of their doctoral program.

Doctoral students associated with the PhD Project also receive support through informal mentoring programs. The DSAs assign faculty mentors to current doctoral students to establish mentoring relationships. The faculty members and doctoral students are responsible for how they manage their mentoring relationship. Continuing the mentor/protégé relationship after graduation is at the discretion of the participants. As members of their business school faculty, the alumni mentor undergraduate students at their institution influencing minority students to major in business disciplines.

Though it is mentioned in the PhD Project's objectives, mentoring is not a major PhD Project activity. The DSAs do not offer sessions on mentoring at their annual meetings and neither the DSAs nor the PhD Project staff has any documentation about mentoring. Therefore, we did not examine mentoring in our study.

Hypotheses

Ideally, our hypotheses should be distributed throughout the Background section. However, the studies we reviewed for that section did not segregate the duties of faculty members. In prior studies, scholars studied research, teaching, and service as a unit.

Faculty members that participated in the PhD Project may differ from other faculty because the PhD Project program affords doctoral students opportunities to learn more about the responsibilities and realities of teaching, research, and service activities thereby easing the transition from doctoral student to assistant professor. Therefore, we hypothesize the following about teaching, research, service, and academic climate:

H_1:   Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, evaluate themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>teaching</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program.

H_2:   Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, evaluate themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>academic scholarship</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program.

H_3:   Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, evaluate themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>internal service</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program.

H_4:   Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, evaluate themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>external service</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program.

H_5:   Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, evaluate themselves at higher level than majority PhD alumni for the <u>academic climate</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program.

Finally, we hypothesize:

H_6:   Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, perceive that they were <u>better prepared</u> than other new faculty members for their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD Program.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

With the assistance of the PhD Project, we inquired about the respondents' first faculty position after completing their PhD program. The PhD Project forwarded our cover letter to PhD Project alumni who graduated within the last ten years and encouraged the alumni to respond to the survey.

The survey instrument sought their evaluation of preparedness for their first faculty position. We also asked for and demographic information and information about their current employer (i.e., the type of institution, whether the institution has a research or teaching mission, accreditation status and whether the institution is doctoral granting).

Sample Surveyed

We asked the PhD Project alumni to complete an on-line survey. We also asked PhD alumni from ten universities[3] who were not associated with the PhD Project but had graduated in the last ten years to complete a similar on-line survey that excluded questions about the PhD Project. We selected these ten institutions because they have large PhD programs in at least the five business disciplines in which the PhD Project is active. None of the schools participate in the Preparing Future Faculty Program for business students. The PhD Project gave us the names of the Program Directors. We contracted the directors with a letter from the PhD project encouraging them to assist us. The directors supplied us with names and contact information. We emailed the graduates telling them we received their names for the respective program directors. We asked them to complete the on-line survey.

The PhD Project alumni (PPA) consisted of 869 individuals (237 faculty in accounting, 60 in finance, 128 in information systems, 274 in management, and 170 in marketing). The majority (76 percent) of PhD Project alumni were African American. Three hundred and fifty-one majority PhD alumni (MPA) represented the other group surveyed. We received surveys from 205 PhD Project alumni (24 percent) and 91 surveys (26 percent) from the majority PhD alumni. We only included faculty members who are U.S. citizens so that any differences would not be due to cultural differences of international faculty. The original MPA respondents included 16 Asians, two Europeans, one South American, and one faculty member from the Mid East. Our final sample size included 71 MPA respondents (20 percent) who are U.S. citizens.

We included six items for respondents to evaluate their preparedness. Using seven-point Likert scales, respondents evaluated how prepared they were when they began their first faculty position. Participants responded (1=not prepared to 7=well prepared) to (1) "How prepared were you for <u>teaching</u> in your first full-time faculty position after completing your PhD?" (2) "How prepared were you for <u>academic scholarship</u> in your first full-time faculty position after completing your PhD program?" (3) "How prepared were you for <u>internal service</u> inside the institution in your first full-time faculty position after completing your PhD programs?" (4) "How prepared were you for <u>external service</u> outside the institution in your first full-time faculty position after completing your PhD programs?" (5) "How prepared were you for understanding the <u>academic climate</u> (or politics) of your first full-time faculty position after completing your PhD program?" The sixth preparedness item was, "After completing my PhD Program, I seemed to be <u>better prepared</u> for my first full-time faculty position compared to other new entering faculty." Participants responded to the sixth item from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

RESULTS

Demographics

Demographics of the respondents and their institutional characteristics appear in Tables 1 and 2. To test for significant differences between the two groups we used Chi-square and t-test statistics. Table 1 shows no significant differences between the two groups for several variables including tenure status, whether they still are in their first faculty position, years in first faculty position, and years since receiving their PhD. The typical individual in either group did not have tenure, was still in their first faculty position, had served in that first position between five and six years, and have had their PhD degree between six and seven years.

There also were several variables with significant differences between the two groups including academic discipline, gender, age, marital status, and ethnicity. Discussion of additional analyses for these variables follows the hypotheses testing.

The academic disciplines for PPA and MPA were similar for Accounting (37 percent for both groups), Information Systems (16 percent for both groups), and Marketing (15 and 17 percent for PPA and MPA, respectively). Thus, the Finance and Management disciplines accounted for most of the significant difference ($X^2 = 11.393$; $p = .022$). Six percent of PPA received their PhDs in Finance compared to 17 percent of MPA. Conversely,

---

[3] The ten schools include: University of Alabama, University of Florida, University of Kentucky, Louisiana State University, University of Mississippi, University of North Texas, Ohio State University, University of South Carolina, University of Southern California, and University of Wisconsin.

26 percent of PPA majored in Management compared to 13 percent of MPA.

Our study included 58 percent females for PPA and 69 percent males for MPA, which is a significant difference between groups ($X^2 = 15.294$; $p = .000$). Age of respondents showed a significant difference between groups ($X^2 = 12.987$; $p = .023$). Eleven percent of PPA and 18 percent of MPA were between 26 and 35 years old. Thirteen percent of PPA and six percent of MPA were older than 55 years old. However, most of the respondents, 76 percent for both groups, were between the ages of 36 and 55. Marital status showed a significant difference as well ($X^2 = 6.081$; $p = .014$). Sixty-two percent of PPA respondents were married compared to 78 percent of MPA.

We expected ethnicity to be significantly different between the groups given that the PhD Project's goal is to attract African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans to business PhD programs. The majority of the PPA respondents from the PhD Project were 80 percent African-American, while 87 percent of the MPA were Caucasian ($X^2 = 227.074$; $p = .000$).

Table 1: Demographics: Respondent Characteristics

Academic Rank (ns)	PPA [a] (%)	MPA [b] (%)	Academic Discipline (p = .022)*	PPA [a] (%)	MPA [b] (%)
Assistant	112 (59)	40 (56)	Accounting	70 (37)	26 (37)
Associate	52 (27)	27 (38)	Finance	11 (6)	12 (17)
Full	13 (7)	2 (3)	Info Systems	29 (16)	11 (16)
Other	13 (7)	2 (3)	Marketing	28 (15)	12 (17)
			Management	49 (26)	9 (13)
Ethnicity (p = .000)*			**Age (p = .023)***		
Black/African American	150 (80)	1 (1)	26-35	20 (11)	13 (18)
Hispanic/Latino	30 (16)	1 (1)	36-40	44 (24)	19 (27)
Native American	3 (2)	1 (1)	41-45	35 (19)	21 (29)
Multiracial	4 (2)	4 (5)	46-50	29 (15)	10 (14)
White/Caucasian	--	59 (87)	51-55	33 (18)	4 (6)
Asian	--	2 (3)	56-over	24 (13)	4 (6)
Gender (p = .000)*			**Marital Status (p = .014)***		
Female	110 (58)	22 (31)	Married	115 (62)	54 (78)
Male	79 (42)	49 (69)	Single/Divorced	71 (38)	15 (22)
Tenure Status (ns)			**Still in First Position (ns)**		
Untenured	130 (68)	47 (66)	Yes	126 (62)	48 (68)
Tenured	60 (32)	24 (34)	No	79 (38)	23 (32)
Years in First Position (ns)			**Years since PhD (ns)**		
Mean	5.51 years	5.72 years	Mean	6.78 years	6.87 years
SD	3.17	3.17	SD	3.55	3.26
[a] PPA = PhD Project Alumni [b] MPA = Majority PhD Alumni PPA [a] n = 205; MPA [b] n = 71 ns = not significant, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001					

Table 2: Demographics: Institutional Characteristics

Classification [c] (p = .000)***	PPA [a] (%)	MPA [b] (%)	Type (ns)	PPA [a] (%)	MPA [b] (%)
HBCU	35 (19)	-	Research	100 (53)	38 (56)
THI	13 (7)	1 (2)	Teaching	88 (47)	30 (44)
PWI	137 (74)	64 (98)			
AACSB Accreditation (ns)			**Doctoral Granting (ns)**		
Yes	168 (90)	65 (92)	Yes	112 (63)	38 (54)
No	19 (10)	6 (8)	No	65 (37)	32 (46)
[a] PPA = PhD Project Alumni [b] MPA = Majority PhD Alumni [c] HBCU=Historically Black College or University; THI=Traditionally Hispanic Institution; PWI=Predominately White Institution PPA [a] n = 205; MPA [b] n = 71 ns = not significant, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001					

Table 2 shows a majority of the PPA, 74 percent; currently work at Predominately White Institutions (PWIs), while 19 percent were employed at HBCUs. Ninety-eight percent of MPA were employed at PWIs and none were employed at HBCUs at least from the ten schools we selected for our study. Differences between the groups were not significant for other institutional characteristics including type of school, AACSB accreditation, and doctoral granting. The majority of the employing institutions were research institutions, with AACSB accreditation, and doctoral granting.

Measured Variables for Preparedness

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for measured variables appear in Table 3. Both groups indicated they were prepared for teaching and academic scholarship in their first faculty position. PPA means for teaching and academic scholarship preparedness were 5.53 and 5.01, respectively. MPA means were slightly higher at 5.75 for teaching and 5.35 for academic scholarship. However, the respondents were not as confident when asked about their preparedness for internal service and external service and their understanding of the academic climate or politics. The PPA means were 4.65 for internal service, 4.51 for external service, and 4.26 for understanding academic climate. MPA means were 4.49 for internal service, 4.63 for external service, and 4.46 for understanding the academic climate. Finally, the PPA group mean was 4.87 and the MPA group mean was 4.94 for being better prepared for their first faculty position than other new PhDs starting their first faculty position.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics [c] of Measured Variables and Test of Hypotheses

Hypotheses	Group	Mean	SD
H_1: Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, assess themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>teaching</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program. **(ns)**	PPA[a] MPA[b]	5.53 5.75	1.56 1.36
H_2: Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, assess themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>academic scholarship</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program. **(p = .042)***	PPA MPA	5.01 5.35	1.46 1.36
H_3: Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, assess themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>internal service</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program. **(ns)**	PPA MPA	4.65 4.49	1.76 1.84
H_4: Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, assess themselves at a higher level than majority PhD alumni for <u>external service</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program. **(ns)**	PPA MPA	4.51 4.63	1.74 1.68
H_5: Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, assess themselves at higher level than majority PhD alumni for the <u>academic climate</u> preparedness in their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program. **(ns)**	PPA MPA	4.26 4.46	1.87 1.82
H_6: Business school faculty members, who are PhD Project alumni, perceive that they were <u>better prepared</u> than other entering faculty members for their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD Program. **(ns)**	PPA MPA	4.87 4.94	1.59 1.36
[a] PPA = PhD Project alumni [b] MPA = Majority PhD alumni [c] H_1 through H_5 Scale: 1 = Not Prepared to 7 = Well Prepared H_6 Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree PPA[a] n = 205; MPA[b] n = 71 ns = not significant, *$p < .05$			

Hypotheses Testing

PhD Project doctoral students participate in activities beyond the doctoral program learning more about the responsibilities and realities of teaching, research, and service activities, preparing them for academic life, and easing the transition from doctoral student to assistant professor. Therefore, we predicted that PPA, for their first full-time faculty position after completing their PhD program, would evaluate themselves for preparedness at higher levels than MPA for teaching (H_1), academic scholarship (H_2), internal service (H_3), external service (H_4), and understanding the academic climate or politics (H_5). The results in Table 3 did not support our hypotheses. To

analyze the responses for the test of the hypotheses we used t-test statistics. We did not observe significant differences for Hypotheses 1, 3, 4, and 5. However, we observed a significant difference, $t(274) = 1.736$, p = .042, for Hypothesis 2 for academic scholarship preparedness but not in the expected direction. MPA (mean = 5.35) evaluated themselves at a higher level for academic scholarship preparedness than PPA (mean = 5.01).

We predicted further that PPA would feel, overall, that they were better prepared than MPA, for their first faculty position after completing their PhD program when compared to other new PhDs starting their first faculty position. We found that PPA were no better prepared for their first faculty position than MPA (means = 4.87 and 4.94, respectively). The groups were not significantly different; thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Additional Analyses

We performed additional analyses to determine if our results were influenced by demographic variables that were significantly different between the two groups. We also wanted to know whether there were any significant relationships between variables. Table 4 shows the results of correlations between variables. All six preparedness hypotheses were significantly related to each other as expected.

Table 4: Correlations between Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	1											
2	.165*	1										
3	.389**	.212**	1									
4	.309**	.278**	.678**	1								
5	.224**	.327**	.462**	.370**	1							
6	.243**	.418**	.342**	.384**	.479**	1						
7	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	1					
8	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	-.136*	1				
9	ns	-.224**	.133*	ns	ns	ns	-.197**	ns	1			
10	ns	ns	ns	ns	.145*	ns	ns	.346**	ns	1		
11	ns	.132*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	.242**	-.210**	.165**	1	
12	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	.243**	-.190**	.154*	.814**	1
1	Hypothesis 1 – teaching											
2	Hypothesis 2 – academic scholarship											
3	Hypothesis 3 – internal service											
4	Hypothesis 4 – external service											
5	Hypothesis 5 – academic climate											
6	Hypothesis 6 – better prepared											
7	Discipline (1 accounting, 2 finance, 3 information systems, 4 marketing, 5 management)											
8	Gender (1 female, 2 male)											
9	Age (4=26-35, 5=36-40, 6=41-45, 7=46-50, 8=51-55, 9=over 55)											
10	Marital Status (1 single/divorced, 2 married)											
11	Ethnicity (1 Black, 2, Hispanic, 3 Native American, 4 Multiracial, 5 White, 6 Asian)											
12	Group (1 PPA, 2 MPA)											
	ns = not significant, *p < .05, **p < .01											

Beginning with the five academic disciplines, our initial study results indicated a significant difference contributable mainly to the number of Finance and Management majors between the two groups. We used ANOVA and Tukey post hoc comparisons here. Our analyses showed that academic disciplines are significantly different only for Hypothesis 2, teaching preparedness, $F(4, 252) = 2.937$, $p = .021$. We did not have significant differences for the other five hypotheses. The post hoc comparisons showed only a significant difference between Information Systems and Marketing majors for teaching preparedness with means of 5.15 and 6.10, respectively ($p = .027$). Since we found no significant difference for teaching preparedness between the PPA and MPA groups, we conclude that academic discipline did not have a direct impact on our results. There were no significant correlations between discipline and the six hypotheses. We found significant relationships between discipline and age or gender suggesting that certain age groups or genders may prefer one discipline to another.

We also analyzed the six hypotheses by gender since we found more females represented in the PPA group in comparison to more males represented in the MPA group. We found no significant differences along with any significant correlations for the six hypotheses associated with gender. We found significant relationships where males tend to be married, in the ethnic majority, and belonging to the MPA group.

Next, we considered that age might be a factor in our results. We found no significant differences for Hypotheses 1, 4, 5, and 6 across six age categories. However, we found significant differences for Hypotheses 2 and 3 for academic scholarship preparedness, $F(5, 250) = 5.021$, $p = .000$, and internal service preparedness, $F(5, 249) = 3.055$, $p = .011$. For academic scholarship preparedness, Hypothesis 2, we found in our post hoc comparisons that younger faculty in ages 26-35 and 36-40 (means = 5.76 and 5.56, respectively) were significantly more prepared for academic scholarship than those older faculty in ages 46-50 and 51-55 (means = 4.49 and 4.76, respectively), $p < .05$. The PPA group had fewer percentage younger faculty ages 26-40 (36 versus 45 percent) and a greater percentage of older faculty ages 46 and older (46 versus 26 percent) than the MPA group as shown in Table 1. Thus, older faculty may be a contributing factor as to why the PPA group is less prepared for academic scholarship. We also found a significant positive relationship between the ethnic majority and Hypothesis 2 suggesting that the ethnic majority are more prepared for academic scholarship. The significant correlation coefficient for age and academic scholarship preparedness was negatively correlated suggesting that less prepared faculty are older. For internal service preparedness, Hypothesis 3, we found that older faculty over age 55 (mean = 5.50) were significantly more prepared for internal service than younger faculty in ages 36-40 (mean = 4.16), $p = .010$. This was confirmed by the significant positive correlation coefficient between age and internal service preparedness suggesting that older faculty regardless of group chose to be more service oriented the later they start their academic careers. However, we found no significant difference between the PPA and MPA groups for Hypothesis 3.

We deemed the significant difference between the groups for marital status to be interesting. There have been numerous studies on married and single/divorced individuals in various fields of disciplines, so we did not speculate on the reasons for the difference between groups. However for the purpose of our study, we did analyze the data to identify significant differences in evaluation of preparedness between married and single/divorced respondents. We found mixed results. We found no significant differences between married and single/divorced respondents for Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4. However, we found significant differences for Hypotheses 5 and 6 for academic climate preparedness, $t(253) = 2.323$, $p = .011$, and being better prepared than other faculty in their first full-time faculty position, $t(252) = 1.811$, $p = .031$. For Hypothesis 5, academic climate preparedness, married respondents (mean = 4.51) were better prepared for their academic climate than single/divorced respondents (mean = 3.95). This was confirmed with the significant positive relationship we found suggesting that being married helps faculty for dealing with the academic climate. Married respondents (mean = 5.01) were better prepared than other faculty in their first full-time faculty position than single/divorced respondents (mean = 4.64). We also note that married faculty members tend to be in the ethnic majority and in the MPA group. We conclude that marital/status had no direct impact on the results of our study with respect to Hypothesis 2, academic scholarship preparedness.

CONCLUSION

Our study investigated the differences between PhD Project alumni and majority PhD alumni regarding their attitudes toward their own preparedness for the first faculty position after completing their PhD program. We expected PhD Project alumni to feel they were better prepared for their first faculty position because the PhD Project offers opportunities to interact with faculty, journal editors, and others who inform the PhD Project alumni of the nuances vital to successful careers in academe. The PhD Project alumni also have continued support of minority doctoral students associations and faculty mentors as they progress through their doctoral programs to faculty positions.

We found that the two groups were similar in their evaluation in most respects of how well they were prepared for their first faculty position using six preparedness measures. However to our surprise, majority PhD alumni felt they were better prepared for research than PhD Project alumni. This difference was significant and further analyses showed that younger faculty and those in the ethnic majority were better prepared for research, which were both expected demographics of majority PhD alumni. Both groups indicated they were well prepared for teaching and research but neither group was as optimistic about being prepared for service responsibilities and the

academic climate or politics of an academic career. Teaching and academic scholarship are activities that remain consistent across business schools with variations influenced by the school's mission. However, service and academic climate may be more difficult to identify, are more specific to the school, and may be difficult to be prepared for thereby leaving new faculty members less confident about their preparedness.

Additional analyses showed some interesting demographic relationships using the six preparedness measures regardless of group. As mentioned above, younger faculty and those in the ethnic majority were better prepared for research. Older faculty members were better prepared than younger faculty for internal service preparedness. For academic climate preparedness, married faculty were better prepared than those single or divorced. Married faculty also were better prepared than other faculty in their first-time faculty position than those single or divorced.

The PhD Project has made inroads into diversifying business schools (doctoral programs and faculty) with the goal of increasing diversity in corporate America. This important mission warrants future research to independently assess its progress and recommend changes to enhance its success. For example, future research could include questions about whether PhD Project alumni participated in the activities that the PhD Project offered.

Two objectives of the PhD Project are (1) to increase the number of minority business professors who can function as role models and mentors, and (2) to influence more minorities to pursue business degrees and careers. In our study we found that the PhD Project alumni did not evaluate themselves at a higher level of preparedness than majority PhD alumni or perceive themselves as more prepared than other entering new faculty members. However, they did, in fact, perceive that they were prepared, and therefore, will more likely succeed in their academic careers and achieve these two objectives of the PhD Project. Our findings show that the PhD Project is necessary to help ensure that minority faculty members are adequately prepared for research and their academic careers.

The PhD Project has succeeded in increasing the number of minority PhD's in business disciplines, which is a major factor in achieving diversity goals of business schools and corporate America. However, retaining these the PhD Project will accomplish its objectives only if faculty members of color are prepared to teach, research, and serve.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Bill N. Schwartz, PhD, CPA is a visiting faculty member in the Department of Accounting and Legal Studies at the College of Charleston; Charleston, South Carolina. He served on the faculties at California State University, Northridge; Arizona State University, Temple University, Virginia Commonwealth University (where he was Accounting Department Chair), Indiana University-South Bend (where he was Dean of the School of Business) and Stevens Institute of Technology. He was co-editor for Advances in Accounting and Advances in Accounting Education. He also was editor for *Research on Accounting Ethics*. He earned his doctorate at U.C.L.A. E-mail: bschwartz0109@nj.rr.com.

W. Darrell Walden, PhD is an Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Accounting, Robins School of Business, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA 23173 USA. His research agenda is diverse. He earned his doctorate at Virginia Commonwealth University. E-mail: dwalden@richmond.edu. Corresponding author.

REFERENCES

1.   Adams, K. A. 2002. What colleges and universities want in new faculty. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
2.   Austin, A.E. 2002. Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education* 73 (1): 94-122.
3.   Gaff, J.G. 2002. The disconnect between graduate education and faculty realities: A review of recent research. *Liberal Education* 88 (3): 6-13.

4.   Golde, C.M. and T. M. Dore. 2001. At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education (www.phd-survey.org). Philadelphia, PA: A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts.
5.   Milano, B. J. 2008. Taking a systematic approach. *Journal of Accountancy* 205 (5): 78.
6.   Mitchell, T. R. 2007. The academic life: Realistic changes needed for business school students and faculty. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 6 (2): 236-251.
7.   Newman, K. 1999. Confessions of a junior faculty. *Academe*, 85 (3): 28-33.
8.   Richlin, L. and A. Essington. 2004. Faculty learning communities for Preparing Future Faculty. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (97 Spring): 149-157.

<u>NOTES</u>