

Carrying HoDo

How Harold Doty "St[ood] on the Shoulders of Giants"

The recently released [2008 Google Scholar cites report](#) shows that former CoB Dean and current CoB management professor, Duane Harold Doty, sits atop the current CoB with 1,595 GS cites. Many of those CoB faculty who have pondered this result are somewhat at a loss for words because they've never seen Doty display any behaviors while at USM (since summer of 2003) that bear any resemblance to academic research. What they do know is that Doty stood before them during his interview in the spring of 2003 and proclaimed that, though he considered himself only an average teacher, he "looooooves research." That statement didn't square with the fact that Doty had gone into academic administration at Syracuse University in 1995, eight years before that interview and only five years after taking his initial academic job (at the University of Arkansas). This report, **Part 2** in a new series here at USMNEWS.NET, takes a closer look at Doty's academic research record. In **Part 2** we examine what Doty has been able to accomplish *without the help of giants* since completing his PhD coursework in management from the University of Texas.

Googleocity: Solo-Authored Successes and Failures

As **Part 1** in this series indicated, Doty's research career has seriously benefited from associations with William Glick and George Huber. Now we know that these two management scholars have not only been more successful than Doty in their collaborations with others, they have also been much more successful than Doty in their solo endeavors. Table 1 below indicates just how successful these scholars have been in this regard, and how far the CoB's Doty lags behind them.

Table 1

Name	GS Cites to Solo-Authored Research
Doty, Harold	3
Glick, William	298
Huber, George	4,625

As some of the data in **Part 1** indicated, Huber is an "out of this world" type of scholar. Now, Table 1 above indicates that his solo-authored work alone has produced 4,625 Google Scholar cites, a figure that is *three times* the total number of GS cites that has been generated by all of Doty's management research, including that Doty has published with Huber. Well behind Huber, but still with a very respectable total in this category, is Glick, with 298 GS cites to his solo-authored work.

Doty, on the other hand, has only three GS cites to solo-authored research. All three of these particular GS cites are produced by Doty's 1990 PhD dissertation (from UT-Austin). From what USMNEWS.NET research staffers have been able to conclude, his 1990 PhD dissertation is the only solo-authored piece of research that Doty has generated over the past 18 years. However, it could be the case that Doty's 1990 PhD dissertation is the only solo-authored output from Doty that has garnered any GS

cites.¹ In any case, Huber now has *1,540 times* Doty's total in this same category. Doty's other mentor, Glick, has about *97 times* Doty's total number of GS cites to solo-authored work. As the data in Table 1 above point out, when Doty is not "**st[anding] on the shoulders of giants**," he's invisible.

Co-Authoring With and Without Glick and Huber: Doty & His Mates

Part 1 in this series indicated that Doty's research career began with a 1990 publication, written with Glick and Huber no less, in *Organization Science*, which is now one of the top journals in the field of management. **Part 1** also pointed out that Doty was the fourth of five authors of this particular article. The other two authors are Chet Miller and Kathleen Sutcliffe, who, like Doty, were PhD students at UT-Austin at the time this particular paper was written. Even though Doty was at the same stage as Miller and ahead of Sutcliffe in terms of academic program progression, the fact that the three of them were at UT-Austin at roughly the same time, and all working closely with Glick and Huber, means that a comparison of the three seems both reasonable and appropriate in assessing Doty's dependence ". . . **on the shoulders of giants**." To add a little more spice, Delery, the Texas Aggie, is also thrown into this mix, as he is even newer to academia than these three UT-Austin products. In fact, **Part 1** in this series indicates that Delery has 21 percent less time in academia than Doty, further supporting our addition of Delery to the group of Doty's "mates."

First, as pointed out in **Part 1** in this series, Doty has never held endowed professorship. Other reports here at USMNEWS.NET have also pointed out that Doty has never even achieved promotion (tenure) the usual way. When he left the University of Arkansas for Syracuse University in 1995, Doty negotiated promotion to associate professor. And, when he accepted Shelby Thames' offer to head USM's new College of Business and Economic Development in 2003, Doty again negotiated a promotion, this time to professor.

Meanwhile, Miller is currently the *Farr Leadership Fellow* at Wake Forest University, while Sutcliffe is currently the *Gilbert and Ruth Whitaker Professor* at the University of Michigan. Not only do these two hold prestigious positions at their respective affiliations, the affiliations themselves -- Wake Forest and Michigan -- are much more highly regarded than the best that Doty has experienced since leaving UT-Austin. Finally, as **Part 1** in this series indicated, Delery is currently the *Raymond F. Orr Professor* at the University of Arkansas.

Second, despite having put in as much or even less time in academia than Doty -- 21 percent less time in the case of Delery, and six percent less time in Sutcliffe's case -- the trio of Delery, Miller and Sutcliffe have done about as well as Doty. This trio has, on average, produced 1,568 Google Scholar cites since the early 1990s. Using the figure reported previously, Doty has garnered 1,595 GS cites himself.

Table 2 below indicates that, on an individual level, Doty has produced 626 GS cites *more than* Miller (1,595 vs. 969). However, Sutcliffe has exceeded Doty in terms of

¹ As one source stated, given all of the co-authoring (with Glick and Huber) that Doty did out of the gate (i.e., at the beginning of his career), it's difficult to count his PhD dissertation as solo-authored work.

GS cites by a similarly wide margin -- 589 GS cites. Doty's total of 1,595 GS cites is only 73 percent of Sutcliffe's total of 2,184 GS cites.

Table 2

<i>Name</i>	<i>Total GS Cites</i>
<i>Delery, John</i>	1,551
<i>Doty, Harold</i>	1,595
<i>Miller, Chet</i>	969
<i>Sutcliffe, Kathleen</i>	2,184

On a per-year basis, the gap between Doty, who has produced 88.6 GS cites per year since 1990, and Sutcliffe, who has produced 128.5 cites per year since 1991, is even wider. Doty's annual average is only 69 percent of Sutcliffe's. Remarkably, Sutcliffe's total of 2,184 is 98 percent of Glick's total of 2,228 (which was reported in **Part 1**). Finally, though the aggregate cite counts for Delery and Doty appear similar -- Delery's is 97.2 percent of Doty's -- their per-year cite counts differ substantially. Delery's per-year total of 103.4 is 116.7 percent of Doty's 88.6 annual figure.

Third, as this series has shown, Glick and Huber have played a big role in advancing Doty's research career, which began with the 1990 OS article with these two **giants** in management. Both Miller and Sutcliffe were also co-authors of this 1990 OS piece. How much have these same two **giants** meant to their respective academic research programs? Table 3 below addresses that very question.

Table 3

<i>Name</i>	<i>GS Cites to Research without Glick and/or Huber</i>
<i>Delery, John</i>	1,551
<i>Doty, Harold</i>	915
<i>Miller, Chet</i>	388
<i>Sutcliffe, Kathleen</i>	2,004

As Table 3 above indicates, Delery maintains all (100 percent) of his 1,551 GS cites when his research with Glick and/or Huber is omitted from the analysis. However, this is to be expected since Delery is an Aggie, not a Longhorn. So, for now we leave Delery and turn to comparisons between Doty and his two UT-Austin cohorts.

Table 3 above shows that when her collaborations with Glick and Huber are omitted from Sutcliffe's research record, those omissions cost Sutcliffe only 180 GS cites. This figure (180) represents only 8.2 percent of her previous total of 2,184 (see Table 2). Doty, on the other hand, loses a whopping 680 GS cites -- a figure representing 42.6 percent of his previous total of 1,595 (see Table 2) -- when his work with Glick and/or Huber is omitted from the analysis. Clearly, Doty has needed (in a big way) Glick and Huber to help advance his research career, while Sutcliffe, on the other hand, has not. Lastly, before the Glick/Huber omission, the difference between Doty's and Miller's GS cites totals is 626 GS cites. After the Glick/Huber omission, that difference shrinks to 527. In terms of absolutes, Glick and Huber have impacted Doty's research record much more so than they have that of Miller.

Fourth, while Table 3 shows how Doty has used associations with Glick and Huber to his advantage in comparison with Sutcliffe and Miller, the issue of what his research collaborations with Delery, Miller and Sutcliffe have meant to Doty (and vice-versa) remains unaddressed. That issue is important, given that Doty has relied upon Glick and Huber more than have Delery, Miller and Sutcliffe. If that is so, then Doty's association with any/all of these three (near-)contemporaries may have been more about advancing Doty's career than advancing theirs. This issue is addressed by Table 4 below, which shows the number of GS cites garnered by Delery, Doty, Miller and Sutcliffe to their own research without Glick, Huber and/or each other.

Table 4

Name	GS Cites to Research without Glick, Huber and/or Mates
Delery, John	677
Doty, Harold	57
Miller, Chet	388
Sutcliffe, Kathleen	2,001

As Table 4 indicates, not only has Sutcliffe gotten along just fine without collaborating with Glick and/or Huber, she hardly notices it when her collaborations with Doty and/or Miller are extracted from the Table 3 data. When extracted, her GS cites total falls by only three, or by 0.1 percent. Apparently, Sutcliffe is a management luminary in her own right. Similarly, when Miller's collaborations with Doty and Sutcliffe are omitted from the Table 3 data, his GS cites total is stable. Miller's 388 remaining GS cites are enough to rank him among the Top 5 in the CoB, using total GS cites for actual CoB faculty.

Though Delery loses 874 GS cites when his collaborations with Doty are no longer considered, he still retains 677 GS cites, a total that is well above 50 percent more than the total for the current CoB's top faculty (Doty's total excluded). Doty, on the other hand, shrivels up almost completely when his collaborations with Delery are removed from Table 3. To be specific, Doty's count falls from 915 to 57 when his work with Delery is extracted from the Table 3 data. Doty's remaining count of 57 is about the same total as that garnered by former CoB Tourism Management Chair, Cherylynn Becker. These new numbers clearly indicate that Delery has meant much more to Doty, and Doty's research career, than Doty has meant to Delery, and Delery's research record.

To parse these GS cites numbers one final time, Table 5 below presents the GS cites totals to the solo-authored studies from each of the four management faculty discussed in this issue. As seen above, Doty's solo-authored GS cites total is only three, with all of these being garnered by his 1990 PhD dissertation.

Table 5

Name	GS Cites to Solo-Authored Research
Delery, John	205
Doty, Harold	3
Miller, Chet	17
Sutcliffe, Kathleen	138

Delery, Miller and Sutcliffe all have solo-authored GS cites totals well above Doty's total of three. At 17 GS cites, Miller's total is 14 more than Doty's. On the other end at 205 GS cites, Delery's total is 202 more than Doty's. In the middle, Sutcliffe's total is a healthy 135 GS cites more than Doty's. Looked at another way, Doty's total (3) is only 17.6 percent, 2.2 percent, and 1.5 percent of the totals of Miller, Sutcliffe and Delery, respectively. Apparently, as these data and those above it indicate, while Doty needs Glick, Huber, Delery, Miller and Sutcliffe in order to be a highly visible management scholar, he (Doty) also needs the help of someone -- anyone -- when it comes to avoiding being completely *invisible* with regard to academic research.

A Preview of Parts 3 and 4

Part 2 of this series has closed the door a little more on arguments *against* the proposition that Doty's research career has been one mostly about "**st[anding] on the shoulders of giants.**" In **Part 3**, Doty's publication record will be presented and compared to those of the giants and cohorts whose shoulders carried him from 1990 and beyond. Then, in **Part 4**, the door will be slammed shut by new evidence that just today arrived at the offices of USMNEWS.NET. You will definitely want to stay tuned.