

# CoB News, 15 July 2008

"*Reward power* involves the capacity to provide outcomes such as salary increases, promotions, favorable teaching assignments, praise, and recognition. Studies have shown that individuals quite frequently employ ingratiation tactics as a means to secure such favorable outcomes (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). A problem that develops in such cases is that by relying on reward power deans become isolated from dissenting voices as sycophants vie for personal gains. The ready acquiescence and flattery that accompany such competitions can easily lead deans to believe that their ideas are superior to those of their faculty. Such obsequiousness is destructive enough when it simply involves the garden-variety self-seeker who chimes in dutifully, but evolves into further depths when it captures a dean's associate deans, department chairs, and other close advisors. When this occurs, a dean's office moves from being a bastion of character to one of personality (Stengel, 2000)."

Arthur G. Bedeian, 2002

## Google Scholar Cites in FM and MKT

USMNEWS.net reporters have completed the updates to CoB faculty Google Scholar citations totals. This installment of **CoB News** examines the new numbers for FM and MKT. These new data are shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1**  
**Google Scholar Cites in FM and MKT (as of mid July '08)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Google Scholar Cites</b>
Burgess, Brigitte	ASSOC	17
Drake, Erin	ASSIST	0
Yaoyuneyong, Gallayanee	ASSIST	0
Wittmann, Michael	ASSOC	75
LaFleur, Elizabeth	PROF	19
Smith, William	ASSIST	13

There is little to report for FM. It is a small unit, and two of its faculty are relatively new PhDs. As for the other, associate professor Brigitte Burgess, the number is a quite respectable 17 GS cites.

Turning to MKT, things are a bit different. This unit has almost disappeared in terms of returning faculty. The leader of this group is Michael Wittmann, the *Draughn Professor of Healthcare Marketing*. Wittmann is an associate professor. In second and third are Elizabeth LaFleur and William Smith, a professor and assistant professor, respectively. Neither of them is within 50 GS cites of Wittmann.

## The Future of Research Quality in the CoB?

The current department chairs in the CoB are George Carter (EFIB), David Duhon (MGT & MKT), and Steven Jackson (SAIS). It is no secret that both Carter and Duhon are within their respective "retirement windows." As such, Jackson could be the only holdover among these three in the very near future. As that transition takes hold, Jackson's stature in the CoB could grow to a point where he is very influential over policies and procedures that are adopted in the College. Given this possibility, it might be useful to analyze Jackson's views whenever such an opportunity presents itself.

That type of opportunity did recently present itself, with Jackson's deposition in a U.S. District Court proceeding. On that occasion, Jackson was queried about his procedure for evaluating the scholarly activities of the CoB's accounting, business law and information systems. In the process, Jackson expounded on his views on journal rankings, etc.

The relevant portions of Jackson's testimony are below (Q=counsel's question; A=Jackson's response). The portions begin with Jackson being questioned about what he (Jackson) wrote on a 2008 annual evaluation report for a faculty in the SAIS.

```
Q.    Now, the go second section is scholarly
activity.  Scholarly.  It says during 2007 you
produced no discipline specific peer reviewed
published journal articles in your case discipline
specifics means an accounting issue and more
specifically managerial costs or financial
accounting which are your primary teaching areas.

        You wrote that?

A.    That's true.
```

Jackson uses the phrase "discipline specific," which in the case of the faculty above means accounting. Had that person been Michael Wittmann (MKT) or John Clark (FIN), the meaning of "discipline specific" would have been marketing or finance, respectively. It is with his next phrase that Jackson goes awry. There he says ". . . more specifically [discipline specific means] managerial costs or financial accounting which are your primary teaching areas." Managerial costs and financial accounting are **sub-disciplines** of accounting, not separate disciplines. And, there is nothing in the written CoB regulations that requires faculty to publish in specific sub-disciplines, whether or not they teach in those areas. As one source put it, Jackson's use of this unwritten regulation is iniquitous.

```
Q.    Now, this document says given the
mission of the accounting unit of the SAIS,
meeting the intellectual contribution expectations
of the accounting program, i.e. three
peer-reviewed publications in the most recent
five-year period.

A.    Okay.

Q.    Is it fair to say that that is the
Gateway to AQ?

A.    I would say that's the gateway.

Q.    So you do that you're good to go?

A.    If they are discipline specific.
```

With the questions above, legal counsel is asking Jackson to explain the requirements for meeting the AACSB's standards for "Academically Qualified." Counsel asks if three refereed journal articles in five years is a gateway to AQ. Jackson responds that it is, so long as the articles are "discipline specific." For the faculty being discussed, that would mean "accounting." Likely sensing that Jackson has another understanding of "discipline," counsel probed further:

Q. In reading this document it says three peer reviewed publications. So if you have an accountant hit in a good pub and in a good accounting pub that the accounting department has said meets their rigger requirements whatever is on their journal for classification, if he hits it, based on this policy, there anything that discounts that article?

Counsel asks Jackson: Is there anything that keeps an *accountant* who publishes in a reputable *accounting journal* from moving closer to meeting the AQ standard for that *accountant*? Jackson's answer is interesting:

A. Not if it's in his discipline. I've answered that question.

Again, Jackson is back to the "in his discipline" explanation. What is it that stands in the way of an *accountant* who publishes in reputable *accounting journals*?

Q. But in his disciplin, the journal in his discipline?

A. No, the topic.

Q. So you're saying that you are relying on the substance of the article?

A. Absolutely.

As the text above indicates, in Jackson's mind the editors of journals such as *The CPA Journal* are not sufficient gatekeepers of what is, and what is not, relevant to the accounting audiences they serve. It takes someone like the CoB's Steven Jackson to come behind them and sweep up the messes that they (the editors) sometimes make. That is, according to Steven Jackson, the editor of *The CPA*

*Journal* sometimes accepts articles for publication that she should not have, and it becomes his duty to discount those articles that fall under his administrative umbrella.

Next, things continue to unravel for Jackson, and it begins with the following question:

Q. If you're evaluating the substance of the articles what's the necessity to rank the journals, then?

Counsel's question above really is an excellent one. Jackson is asked why, if the CoB's administrators are not going to rely on journal editors to serve as gatekeepers, at least insofar as the CoB's faculty evaluation process is concerned, does the CoB bother to rank academic journals? The ranking of journals in any area is a time-consuming and often contentious process. Here's what Jackson said in response:

A. In my opinion, we shouldn't rank journals.

In Jackson's mind, the year-long efforts of Sami Dakhli's 2007-08 journal ranking committee were completely unnecessary. Presumably, the professional judgment of CoB administrators is all that is necessary to properly complete an annual faculty evaluation. In Jackson's eyes, CoB administrators can read the intellectual contributions of their faculty and rate those faculty in the research category.

Can this deposition get any more bizarre? The following passages say it could, and did:

Q. But currently the college and the school ranks journal?

A. It does rank journals. And for tenure it matters. You're supposed to hit an A journal to get tenure. Other than that, I don't think it matters in our institution.

According to Jackson, publishing in A-level journals matters only for tenure. That would mean that A-level hits add nothing to one's annual evaluation package, or to one's promotion application. The CoB's administrators, and USM President Martha Saunders for that matter, do not really care whether or not USM faculty publish in A-level journals. As far as Jackson is concerned, journals should not even hold the distinction of being "As" (or "Bs," etc.).

Jackson's opinions harken back to the 1970s business school at USM, which was a time when research carried no real importance. Jackson's own professional trail supports the view of his testimony vis-à-vis the significance of scholarly activities. Other than at USM, Jackson has served

stints at the University of Tennessee at Martin, the University of Southern Maine, and Loyola University of New Orleans. Relative to these institutions, USM is like a state flagship institution, not a Tier IV university. As so many reports here at USMNEWS.net have shown, Jackson's own research profile is one comprised of low-grade publications that have yet to receive any attention from the accounting profession.

Jackson's testimony above was taken in July of 2008, not July of 1978. His words, however, show that the CoB's downward slide is not only continuing, it may be gathering speed.

## GS Cites Top 10 -- Summer, 2008

Now that USMNEWS.net reporters have completed the updates to CoB faculty Google Scholar citations totals, it is time to take stock of the best of the CoB. This section of **CoB News 15 July 2008** presents the CoB's Top 10 scholars (in terms of GS citations). These are shown in Table 2 below, along with their unit, academic rank and GS citations total.

**Table 2**  
**Top 10 Google Scholar Cites in CoB (Summer, 2008)**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Google Scholar Cites</b>
1	Doty, Harold	MGT	PROF	1,739
2	Lindley, James	FIN	PROF	471
3	Nail, Lance	FIN	PROF	222
4	Hsieh, Chang-Tseh	MIS	PROF	214
5	Davis, Donna	MIS	PROF	201
6	King, Ernest	BL	ASSOC	165
7	Niroomand, Farhang	ECO	PROF	88
8	Klinedinst, Mark	ECO	PROF	86
	Nissan, Edward	ECO	PROF	86
10	Marvasti, Akbar	ECO	PROF	83

As Table 2 above indicates, former CoB dean Harold Doty is well out in front with a GS cites count of 1,739. Behind Doty are James Lindley (FIN) and new CoB dean Lance Nail (FIN). Lindley and Nail have 471 and 222 GS cites, respectively. Rounding out the Top 5 are MIS' Chang-Tseh Hsieh, the *McCarty Distinguished Professor of MIS*, and Donna Davis. Each of them has more than 200 GS cites.

Interestingly, EFIB dominates Table 2 above, with six (6) entries. Thanks to MIS and BL, the SAIS accounts for 30 percent of the Top 10. Doty is the only representative from the MGT & MKT department. If this type of imbalance is reflected in the CoB's 2012 AACSB effort, then more accreditation issues could await the CoB four years from now.