

WEARING MANY HATS, PLAYING MANY ROLES:

A STUDY OF BUSINESS SCHOOL DEANS AT JESUIT AFFILIATED UNIVERSITIES

by

FRANK LAROCCA

(Under the Direction of James C. Hearn)

ABSTRACT

Business school deans, like deans of other colleges and divisions in universities, face many challenges in regard to the multiplicity of roles that they are expected to play. These deans are academic leaders within their divisions, and have a wide range of internal and external facing roles that they must take on with constituents as varied as students, faculty, alumni, potential donors, and upper level administrators within the institution. While a robust body of literature exists that examines the roles that academic deans in general undertake in universities, very little peer reviewed research exists examining the roles that business school deans in particular have.

This qualitative study sought to examine the numerous roles that specific business school deans at Jesuit affiliated universities in primarily the US, but also in international institutions in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. Deans at Jesuit business schools were selected as these institutions all present themselves as mission driven universities, yet face challenges common to all public and private institutions in developing programming that will attract students in an ever growing, more competitive environment. The research questions in the study, framed in the

theories of resource dependence and academic capitalism, specifically addressed the roles that challenged the deans the most, how these roles had changed, what conflicts and ambiguities were present in these roles. The study also sought to examine whether the roles of US based and international business school deans at Jesuit business schools were converging towards a similar model, with a growing emphasis on and importance given to external fundraising. While a truly definitive comparative study was not able to be completed due to the small number of international participants, the study revealed that international Jesuit school deans did not have extensive fundraising obligations. However, the vast majority of all deans interviewed, US based and international, noted the importance of promoting the development of programs that would attract students in a competitive marketplace, and therefore enhance revenues. The importance of balancing the need to develop marketable academic programs with the need to promote and support their institution's mission was emphasized by these same deans.

INDEX WORDS: Jesuit, business school, deans, role ambiguity, role conflict, academic capitalism, resource dependence, program development, mission, resource enhancement, international.

WEARING MANY HATS, PLAYING MANY ROLES:

A STUDY OF BUSINESS SCHOOL DEANS AT JESUIT AFFILIATED UNIVERSITIES

by

FRANK LAROCCA

BA, University of Pennsylvania, 1985

MA, Fordham University, 1991

MDiv, Jesuit School of Theology, 1997

MBA, Georgetown University, 2003

JD, Boston College, 2010

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2021

© 2021
Frank LaRocca
All Rights Reserved

WEARING MANY HATS, PLAYING MANY ROLES:
A STUDY OF BUSINESS SCHOOL DEANS AT JESUIT AFFILIATED UNIVERSITIES

by

FRANK LAROCCA

Major Professor: James C. Hearn
Committee: Charles B. Knapp
Libby V. Morris

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2021

DEDICATION

To all business school deans who devote their time and effort to bringing the Jesuit mission to life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my advisor, James C. Hearn, whose encouragement, support, and counsel made this work possible. I am thankful to the Jesuit Community at Loyola University Chicago, who made my doctoral studies and research possible. And finally, I give thanks to the members of my cohort in the Executive EdD in Higher Education Administration program, who made this journey of shared experiences a rich and fruitful one.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER 1	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of Study.....	12
Research Questions.....	12
Significance of the Study.....	13
CHAPTER 2	17
Literature Review.....	17
Gaps in the Literature.....	17
Theoretical Frameworks in Literature.....	20
Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity.....	24
Qualities, Attributes, Skill Set Development and Job Evaluations.....	26
Impact of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity on Job Satisfaction and Job Tenure.....	29
Role Distinctions between Academic Deans in Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Institutions.....	30
Distinctions between Academic Dean Leadership in US and International Higher Education.....	31
Theoretical Framework.....	34
CHAPTER 3	42
Research Design.....	42
Methods.....	43
Plan for Data Analysis	47
Trustworthiness.....	48
Positionality/Researcher Reflexivity Statement	49
CHAPTER 4	52
Summary of Findings.....	52
Recurring Findings and Themes	55
Issues of Innovation/Entrepreneurship.....	55
COVID and its Influence.....	59

Potential Shortcomings of Job Descriptions	60
Team Development: Building Teams that Advance the Institution.....	61
Program Development Is Key	63
Concerns with Contributions to University Overhead: Restrictions on Available Resources ..	64
Jesuit Mission: Similarities between Institutions, with Varying Emphases	64
Accreditation Pressures in Addition to Enrollment Pressures	66
Resources Are Key: But not Always Sufficient to Support Programming Initiatives	67
Exploring New Partnerships with Business Organizations.....	69
Least Enjoyable Aspects of Roles Regarding Personnel Obligations.....	71
Fundraising and Donations as Key to US Deans' Roles.....	72
Donors, Alumni, and Growing Expectations concerning External Roles.....	73
Concerns with the Need to Request Permissions from Higher Administrators	74
Chapter 5	76
Summary	76
Recommendations for Practice	79
Conclusion	81
REFERENCES	82
APPENDICES	90
APPENDIX A.....	90
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	90
APPENDIX B	93
LETTER TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY.....	93

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Leaders of business schools at colleges and universities find their institutions at a critical juncture in current times. These administrators are called to examine their school's positioning for a wide range of constituents: their students, their institutions, the surrounding society and leaders in the economy. Thomas and Thomas pose this challenge as follows:

Thus there seems to be increasing acknowledgement that change is necessary, and an acceptance of a business school model that acts to provide a moral and ethical compass beyond instrumental issues of status and salary and includes more focus on a mission as a professional school which both provides a conscience for business and contributes to a better world by examining issues such as ethics, health, poverty, corporate social responsibility, sustainability and the problems of urbanisation and the growth of cities. This presents an interesting challenge for business schools: if more emphasis is placed on a broader set of core values, will the school attract a different kind of student, and, still be an attractive proposition? Would this focus be highly valued by future employers? What impact might this have on ratings and consequently income? Would these ideas be welcomed by university presidents and vice-chancellors? (Thomas & Thomas, 2011, p. 526)

The business school dean could be said to be caught between two potentially opposing goals: developing academic programming that enhances the university's revenue streams while

at the same time developing academic programming that challenges students and forms them in a new transformative model of capitalism. And these are but two possible conflicting roles for the American business school dean. “Deans are in essence classic middle managers; they have enormous responsibilities, little positional power, insufficient resources, and limited authority” (Gallos, J.V., 2005, p. 174). Alajoutsijärvi and Kettunen add that business school deans work in three distinct contexts: traditional research university, academic capitalist university, and corporate university, and the differences among these institutions impact the intensity of the “dean’s squeeze” (Alajoutsijärvi & Kettunen, 2015). “Indeed, business schools are rather peculiar academic organizations whose activities consist of a complex combination of teaching, research, service, and outreach operations that are valued and emphasized differently among the three contexts” (Alajoutsijärvi & Kettunen, 2015, p. 335).

The role of American business school deans, like that of other academic deans, has evolved over the past decades. It would be important to assess the impact that shifting expectations from various constituents have on the ability of deans to effectively lead their academic units while fulfilling the additional administrative responsibilities that are imposed on them. These increasing responsibilities include those from external as well as internal stakeholders, as deans need to balance growing demands from alumni, students, faculty, and university administrators with rising expectations for the deans to take on expanding roles in fundraising for their schools, as well as in increasing their schools’ visibility within the broader communities in which their universities operate. “Another recent addition to the dean’s job is the role of ambassador. Deans are now expected to crisscross the globe to make connections with alumni, recruit students, and set up partnerships that will provide students with a global education” (June, 2014, p. 4).

Top academic leaders in institutions of higher education should be interested in the changing roles and obligations of academic deans precisely because of the fact that these deans represent the intermediaries between higher administrators and multiple university constituencies both internal and external, such as students, staff, faculty, alumni, donors, political figures and community members. These deans function, as stated previously, as bridges between the academic and the administrative sides of the institution. As such, they may find themselves in at times conflicting roles, and depending on the institution, they may not be given sufficient information as to what they need to prioritize in their positions. Should they devote more time to external fundraising (which given the financial restraints that public and private institutions are facing, and will continue to face in the future, will likely only grow more), or to building new academic programming (which would also provide other sources of income for the university)? Given the limited amount of time that all professionals have in their workday lives, it behooves higher level administrators in institutions of higher education to address academic deans' productivity and effectiveness before job dissatisfaction and disaffection potentially contribute to early departure from the job. Academic deans need to shepherd strategic planning initiatives and innovate programming initiatives to their completion and as such this would require a longer-term commitment.

Business school deans are asked to not only be academic leaders, but also administrative leaders with multiple duties. They need to be strategists, catalysts, stewards, and operators (Kambil & Budnik, 2013). They need to be strategists in terms of positioning their schools to meet the various challenges of the marketplace, catalysts in engendering support from different constituencies key to the success of the school such as students, faculty, staff, alumni, donors, and university administrators, stewards in terms of sage management of the intellectual, professional,

and financial capital the school has at hand, and operators in terms of oversight for all of the school's endeavors (Kambil & Budnik, 2013). Nonetheless, there also can be a disconnect between the skill sets needed for leadership roles on the dean's level, and in the individual dean's own previous professional development. As Kambil & Budnik point out:

Business school deans have an expansive and complex role in the fabric of the universities and communities served by their programs. Yet many newly minted deans discover that the experiences they acquire while climbing the ranks of academia or industry do not adequately prepare them for their new responsibilities. While some deans served in department chair roles where they managed a small group of faculty peers, becoming a dean requires them to oversee a broader range of issues and operations (Kambil & Budnik, 2013, para. 2).

The role of business school deans at universities outside of the United States is evolving too, but certain distinctions may exist between domestic and international deans. Business school deans in institutions outside of the United States in Latin America, Europe, and Asia might have in general retained higher priority for academic oversight in their roles, as fundraising for both private and public institutions of higher education outside of the United States has not generally been an important role for international business school deans in the past (de Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009). But just as in the United States, traditional funding sources from governments have not kept pace with financial needs of institutions of higher education in many universities abroad (Johnstone, 2002). In addition, many of these institutions, both public and private, are restricted in terms of what tuitions they can charge, further limiting potential income streams.

In the US business school deans may come from both academic and non-academic backgrounds (Kambil & Budnik, 2013; Mangan, 2014). Deans from academic backgrounds may feel pressure to sustain their research agendas while continuing their work as administrators, while deans from non-academic backgrounds may experience conflict due to their management styles not necessarily transferring seamlessly to a university model based on shared governance. These deans may also be challenged by experiences of role conflict and role ambiguity (Arntzen, 2016; Biddle, 1986; Montez et al., 2002). US business school deans are increasingly asked to develop new revenue streams from innovative programming to make up for reduced institutional support. Deans are also asked to provide financial support for the research and academic agendas of their faculty, while at the same time facing pressures to reduce budget expenditures (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016; Mangan, 2014).

US deans might not always be clear in their perception of university administration's hierarchy of expectations for them, and subsequently how they are to prioritize their duties and tasks (Montez et al., 2002). In general, the international business school deans' role has been for the most part a role of academic leadership. But as higher education institutions around the world experience increasing pressure to provide attractive, innovative programming that attracts students, in addition to finding new revenue sources to address insufficient current funding sources (Kehm, 2014; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), international business school deans might be asked to increasingly take on more external roles in a manner reminiscent of their US counterparts. International and US business school deans, like other academic leaders across the world, also compete in an increasingly multinational market for students and business support (see Altbach, 2011), and as such look to internationally recognized accreditation, such as the US based AACSB and/or the European based EQUUS. How the incorporation of these norms of accreditation with

the school's own structures and priorities impact the evolution of the dean's role in these international business schools remains to be seen.

As this study will focus on the roles of business school deans at Jesuit universities, it is important to highlight the key, distinctive elements of these institutions. The 27 Jesuit universities in the United States represent a variety of institutions, from small (roughly 2,000 full time students) to large (around 16,000 students), most of which were established in the nineteenth century in sections of the nation that had large Catholic immigrant populations, mostly in the Midwest and the Northeast regions of the country. The institutions range from small liberal arts colleges to large universities with professional schools in law, business, medicine, and engineering (AJCU, www.ajcunet.edu/institutions). Out of the 27 Jesuit universities, 26 have business schools (see Table below). Common to all these institutions is a robust liberal arts core on the undergraduate level that includes coursework in theology, philosophy, and English. While many have large Catholic populations among their student bodies, all welcome individuals of all faiths and of no faith tradition among their staff, professoriate, and student bodies.

TABLE
JESUIT WORLDWIDE UNIVERSITY LEVEL BUSINESS SCHOOLS
BY REGION

ASIA

INSTITUTION	CITY, COUNTRY
Sogang University	Seoul, Korea
St. Joseph's Institute of Management	Bangalore, India
Xavier Institute of Management/Xavier University	Bhubaneswar, India
Loyola Institute of Business Management	Chennai, India
XLRI	Jamshedpur, India

Xavier Institute of Management	Mumbai, India
Loyola Institute of Business Management	Chennai, India
Sanata Dharma University	Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Ateneo de Davao University	Davao, Philippines
Ateneo de Manila University	Manila, Philippines
Fu Jen University	Taipei, Taiwan

EUROPE

INSTITUTION	CITY, COUNTRY
University of Namur	Namur, Belgium
University of Antwerp	Antwerp, Belgium
National College of Ireland	Dublin, Ireland
ESADE	Barcelona, Spain
IQS	Barcelona, Spain
Loyola University Andalusia	Cordoba and Seville, Spain
Pontifical University of Comillas	Madrid, Spain
University of Deusto	Bilbao, Spain

MIDDLE EAST

INSTITUTION	CITY, COUNTRY
St. Joseph's University	Beirut, Lebanon

NORTH AMERICA (MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA)

INSTITUTION	CITY, COUNTRY
Iberoamericana University	Leon, Mexico
Iberoamericana University	Mexico City, Mexico
Iberoamericana University	Puebla, Mexico
Iberoamericana University	Tijuana, Mexico
ITESO	Guadalajara, Mexico
UCA	San Salvador, El Salvador

NORTH AMERICA (USA)

INSTITUTION	CITY, STATE
Boston College	Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
Canisius College	Buffalo, New York
Creighton University	Omaha, Nebraska
Fairfield University	Fairfield, Connecticut
Fordham University	New York, New York
Georgetown University	Washington, DC
Gonzaga University	Spokane, Washington

John Carroll University	Cleveland, Ohio
Le Moyne College	Syracuse, New York
Loyola Marymount University	Los Angeles, California
Loyola University Chicago	Chicago, Illinois
Loyola University Maryland	Baltimore, Maryland
Loyola University New Orleans	New Orleans, Louisiana
Marquette University	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Regis University	Denver, Colorado
Rockhurst University	Kansas City, Missouri
St. Joseph's University	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
St. Louis University	St. Louis, Missouri
St. Peter's University	Jersey City, New Jersey
Santa Clara University	Santa Clara, California
Seattle University	Seattle, Washington
University of Detroit Mercy	Detroit, Michigan
University of San Francisco	San Francisco, California
Scranton University	Scranton, Pennsylvania
Spring Hill College	Mobile, Alabama
Xavier University	Cincinnati, Ohio

SOUTH AMERICA

INSTITUTION	CITY, COUNTRY
Catholic University of Cordoba	Cordoba, Argentina
FEI	Sao Bernardo do Campo, Brazil
Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Catholic University of Pernambuco	Recife, Brazil
UNISINOS	Sao Leopoldo, Brazil
Alberto Hurtado University	Santiago, Chile
Pontifical Xaverian University	Bogota, Colombia
Pontifical Xaverian University	Cali, Colombia
Pontifical Catholic University	Quito, Ecuador
Pacific University	Lima, Peru
Catholic University of Uruguay	Montevideo, Uruguay
Catholic University Andres Bello	Caracas, Venezuela
Catholic University of Tachira	San Cristobal, Venezuela

Source: <https://iaju.org/>

The founder of the Jesuit religious order, St. Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), was born into a noble Spanish family, and followed family tradition to become a soldier. However, while

recuperating from his wounds suffered during battle, he decided to change his life. He subsequently laid his sword at the base of a statue of St. Mary and child and vowed to live a life dedicated to caring for the poor (Loyola University of Chicago, Jesuit Community of Loyola University Chicago, 2020). Soon, he gathered a group of men around him who proclaimed vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, dedicating themselves to mission work around Europe, Asia, and Latin America. Eventually, in the seventeenth century, Jesuits came to work in North America. Ultimately the Jesuits became renowned for the quality of education they offered in private colleges, high schools, and universities. These institutions began in Europe and expanded to all six continents during the period of the next four hundred years. Currently, Jesuits collaborate with individuals from a multitude of cultural backgrounds and faith traditions in administering, teaching, and staffing Jesuit high schools, colleges, and universities around the world.

John O'Malley, noted historian of Jesuit history, and a Jesuit priest himself, expressed in a lecture given at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio the 12 characteristics of Jesuit higher education that he found to be essential:

- 1) Jesuit institutions are “not churches nor indoctrination camps;”
- 2) Jesuit schools have a practical side, to help students “survive economically and to advance professionally;”
- 3) while the schools may have a “religious purpose,” they are present for the good of all society;
- 4) the common good can only be achieved through “upright and inner directed human beings;”

- 5) and 6) schools have multiple purposes and goals;
- 7) “belief in the transcendent God and indeed in the Christian God is compatible with the best of human inquiry” (even though not everyone might agree with this);
- 8) “schools should reverently foster and not impede [the previous] belief;”
- 9) Jesuit institutions should make use of programming such as retreats, mass, and other co-curricular formation activities to “foster an ever deeper adult and inner appropriation” of this belief;
- 10) Jesuit institutions offer instruction in theology “commensurate with the sophistication of the other instruction” in other subject matter;
- 11) Jesuit institutions provide an environment that promotes faith that does justice; promoting the intersection and promotion of an understanding of faith as contributing to the common good;
- 12) Jesuits institutions should promote research in areas of interest to Catholics and Christians (Xavier University, 2020) .

The above characteristics are foundational to the common mission of Jesuit universities in the US and abroad. Each nation has distinct, particular regulations and curricular mandates that would inform how Jesuit universities carry out their particular mission embodied in these common characteristics. Because of this, it would be important to examine how the Jesuit business school deans around the world incorporate and direct the implementation of their university’s own particular mission in their school, and the kinds of challenges that exist in carrying out this implementation.

Currently, the International Association of Jesuit Universities (www.iaju.edu), through a working committee comprised primarily of deans of Jesuit business schools in the US and abroad, in response to the reality and challenges inherent in linking mission with curricula in Jesuit business schools, has developed a working paper: “An Inspirational Paradigm for Jesuit Business Education” (June 2020). The paradigm is very much a work in progress, involving Jesuit business school administrators and faculty from around the world, but key elements include the following:

Renewing Business Curricula-New curricula would be developed in light of the insights of Catholic social teaching, and would encompass anthropology, ethics, corporate social responsibility, governance, sustainability, and understanding of the current social reality. While embracing the efficacy of the market economy, it would stress that economic activity must serve the common good, especially by meeting the needs of the poor and the excluded. In addition, it would emphasize that all private and public economic activity must be based on environmentally sustainable practices (International Association of Jesuit Universities, 2020, p. 6).

As of November 2021, the working paper has been developed further, with a new name, the New Inspired Paradigm for Jesuit Business Education. This document has inspired faculty in key academic disciplines along with deans and other administrators from Jesuit business schools around the world to engage in working committees that are exploring creative and innovative ways to teach business subjects while remaining faithful to the challenging, transformative vision expressed in the quote above.

So while acknowledging and engaging with the demands of the market in developing academic and co-curricular programming, deans at Jesuit business schools around the world are

challenged to accomplish these tasks while remaining faithful to the Jesuit educational mission of forming students who will be committed to serving the common good, attending to the disadvantaged, and caring for the environment.

Therefore, given the aforementioned pressing reality, this study will examine the complex and evolving roles that US Jesuit business school deans play, and compare these with the evolving roles that international Jesuit business school deans play. This can incentivize upper level university administrators to clarify priorities for the deans, reduce role ambiguity and role conflict, address potential ambiguity in criteria for deans' job performance evaluation, and in doing so help to address the decreasing average tenure of business school deans that has taken place in recent years.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the roles performed by US business school deans in Jesuit universities and their counterparts abroad are converging to a similar model, or if they remain distinct, with the US deans more restricted by the pressures of academic capitalism in their obligations and commitments than their counterparts abroad. Jesuit schools around the world proclaim that they are mission focused on service to the world and promotion of the common good. Therefore, if revenue generating programs and other elements of academic capitalism (see Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) are prioritized at the expense of education for the common good, then mission focused education might suffer.

Research Questions

1) What roles do business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad find that particularly challenge them, and how have these roles changed and evolved over the past decade?

2) How do business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad experience role conflicts and role ambiguities?

3) How and to what extent have tensions between academic capitalism and educating for the common good influenced the responsibilities and decision-making of these US Jesuit business school deans and their counterparts abroad?

Significance of the Study

Higher level university administrators might wish to know what roles business deans find to be in conflict and ambiguous, so that these administrators can work to mitigate the concerns that arise from this, reducing conflict and ambiguity. Institutional effectiveness might be improved when business school deans remain in their positions long enough to provide stability for strategic planning and to carry out program initiatives that are beneficial to the institution.

The average overall turnover rate for academic deans in 2016 was about four years (Butin, 2016). However, business deans have higher rates of turnover, with shorter tenure than the overall rate stated above. In a survey conducted by the AACSB in 2014-2015, only half of current business school deans had been in their position for three years or more (Bradshaw, 2015). In addition, there was a steady reduction in the median tenure of business school deans from almost four years in the period of 2006-07 to barely three years in the period of 2014-2015 (Bradshaw, 2015).

As an assistant dean in an AACSB accredited business school for the past five years, and as the executive director of the business school deans' professional association IAJBS (the International Association of Jesuit Business Schools) I have witnessed from up close the pressures on academic deans in business schools. I have seen how they are expected to engage

with and respond to multiple stakeholders, and to satisfy these constituencies' varied requests and needs. I have also seen firsthand how important clarification from upper level administration is as to what job functions deans need to prioritize, and how evaluation metrics concerning deans' performance in accomplishing these goals need to be clearly stated. Having also been a faculty member for over a decade in several institutions, I see how increasing turnover in the deans' office can potentially contribute to feelings of frustration and cynicism in faculty and staff towards administration. I have heard frustrations from faculty and staff about being asked to participate in strategic planning initiatives and in new programming development, to invest precious time and resources in participation in planning for these, and then see implementation of these same initiatives fizzle out when deans leave their posts early.

A study that can help identify significant contributing factors to the decrease in business school deans' tenure would potentially help higher level university administrators develop personnel policies to retain them, so as to see these deans implement elements of strategic plans and new curricula that would endure for longer than a period of five years. These lessons could also be applicable to academic deans in general. High turnover in the academic dean's office might lead to lower morale among faculty and staff, and make it increasingly difficult to position the school in such a way to achieve the goals of attracting crucial external financial support.

One of the most important points that the literature has shown is that higher level administrators including presidents and provosts need to be clearer in how they use evaluative metrics to help the deans prioritize their long list of duties in order to devote more appropriate amounts of time to those job tasks that upper level administration deems more essential (Montez et al., 2002). In addition, higher level administrators might look to the types of supplementary training and mentoring that the business school deans would need to learn how to socialize

themselves into their new positions as managers as well as academics. If the deans feel more confident in their abilities to fulfill their duties successfully, then they may be more willing to remain in their positions for longer periods of time in order to lead the strategic plans that their divisions have for academic programming, student enrollment, and faculty and staff development. Universities invest major resources in dean searches, and these institutions benefit from the accumulated wisdom, knowledge, and social connections that deans bring to their particular position. It is in the interest of top administration at universities, particularly as many institutions currently face an increasingly insecure future regarding financial resources, that these administrators make the best long-term use of their investment in personnel at this level.

If it is found that international business school deans find the demands of their roles increasingly conflicting and ambiguous as US deans might, then higher level administrators abroad might also see the problems that arise from this model, and therefore strive to address these concerns to facilitate business school deans' job success. This could in turn provide similar benefits to international institutions as to US institutions, with potential longer tenure for business school deans providing stability for strategic planning and promotion of beneficial program initiatives.

Abbreviated tenure as a dean can have a number of negative impacts on the school's and the overall institution's long term effective strategic planning, program development, and effective long-lasting institutional relationships with external stakeholders such as alumni, community leaders, and potential sources of funding. Abbreviated terms in office could also affect building trusting relationships with faculty, as faculty members may disengage from long term planning and strategic planning if the perception is that since leadership will not stay for an extended period of time, personal investment in long term strategic plans may not be worthwhile. Unsatisfied deans

who are overwhelmed with expectations and duties, and who leave their positions after a short period of time hinder universities in their long-term planning and effective strategic development. “Instead of simply looking for someone who gets along with the faculty, has a solid research reputation, and gets things done, search committees want someone who can build rankings, as well as market share, and ‘manage relationships with multiple stakeholders’...” (Mangan, 2014, p. 10).

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Gaps in the Literature

While there is a somewhat robust body of literature studying the multiple roles that an academic dean plays in US institutions of higher education, and the potential conflicts and ambiguities in these roles, there is very little peer reviewed literature that studies specifically the roles that business school deans play. As leaders of professional schools, business school deans may well have duties, responsibilities, and challenges distinct from those of academic deans of schools of arts and sciences. What literature does exist regarding business school deans tends to not come from peer reviewed works, but rather from studies produced by consulting firms (e.g., Deloitte), accreditation agencies (e.g., AACSB), and publications studying higher education (e.g., Chronicle of Higher Education). A more robust body of literature addresses shifting roles of academic deans in certain countries abroad, and the pressures that come from increasing pressure to seek alternative funding sources (e.g., the Netherlands, Australia) (Altbach, 2011; de Boer, H., & Goedegebuure, L. (2009); Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). But again, there is very little that addresses the specific challenges in the roles that business school deans play in these institutions outside of the US.

Overview

Much of the literature has addressed the increasingly complex roles of US academic deans (Montez et al., 2002; Wolverson et al., 1999; Wolverson & Poch, 2000; Wolverson, 2009). We see from the research done over the past twenty years that deans deal with a great deal of role conflict and role ambiguity, with expectations to exhibit financial restraint yet at the same time encourage academic output in their faculty, and lack of direction in terms of prioritization of duties and expectations from higher level administrators, and even clear metrics for their own professional evaluation (Montez et al., 2002; Wolverson et al., 1999; Wolverson & Poch, 2000; Wolverson, 2009). We also know from the literature some of the duties and functions that deans in the US tend to find more stressful, and that potentially lead to more job dissatisfaction (Coll et al., 2019; Morris & Laipple, 2015). What is not clear from the research is if the role conflict, role ambiguity, and subsequent job dissatisfaction have a causal or correlative relationship with the decreasing job tenure that academic deans overall in the US have experienced in the past decade; academic leaders in general complete less than six years on average (Morris & Laipple, 2015). In 2016, the average overall turnover rate for academic deans in 2016 was about four years (Butin, 2016). We also have conflicting data regarding whether deans are better off with management training, or simply by having clearer metrics of evaluation and better mentoring with other deans (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016; Morris & Laipple, 2015). We also do not know if the decreasing average job tenure of academic deans (and more specifically for business school deans) over the past decade is due to deans moving on to other administrative positions or to their job dissatisfaction with the position.

While the academic dean's position has evolved to include substantial managerial responsibility, the preparation for this role has not been consistent in many academic deans' professional development (whereas more business school deans with management backgrounds would have preparation for this kind of role). Business school deans are asked to address the needs and concerns of not just internal stakeholders, such as students, faculty, and staff, but also external stakeholders, such as alumni, community supporters, and donors. Neo-liberal approaches to higher education, where the emphasis is on prioritization of academic programs that are profitable, pose challenges to the promotion and development of programs that ensure and support other traditional formative purposes of higher education that serve the public good, such as creating informed citizens (Pusser, 2014). But deans, as academic leaders who must be grounded in the culture of their school and institution, must be aware of the importance of seeing that new key revenue streams must be considered as an integrative part of the culture and mission of the institution; deans, along with other university leaders, must ask if these new revenue sources are core to the institution (Hearn, 2003). In addition, the business dean like other academic deans must acknowledge that much of the decision making within the nonprofit educational sector does not mimic the for profit; economic utility and efficiency are not the crucial drivers of nonprofit decision making as they are for the for profit sector (Hearn, 2003).

This literature also addresses the challenges that deans face today in their unique roles in university leadership, as these roles have both academic and administrative components that require that they bridge different divisions within university structures. The literature search included articles on performance metrics and job satisfaction for academic deans in general, and was limited to the past two decades, with a few key exceptions: for example, an article published in 1999 that has been cited frequently by subsequent articles (see Wolverton et al., 1999). This

article highlighted effectively the complicated, varied, and sometime contradictory roles that academic deans assume. Deans serve as administrators, intermediaries between presidents and provosts, but they are also faculty members, and as such different social behaviors may be required of these deans depending on the situation; e.g., they must be persuasive with provosts, yet take on more of a negotiating stance with faculty (Wolverton et al., 1999). In addition, as administrators deans may need to cut costs, yet at the same time they must advocate for their faculty who want and need travel grants and research support. Higher level administrators may want deans to use their disciplinary authority in a direct and expedient manner, but a direct and expedient manner may cause tension in their relationship with faculty (Wolverton et al., 1999).

Theoretical Frameworks in Literature

As stated previously, the literature has a robust body of studies addressing prominent issues concerning role conflict and role ambiguity for academic deans, due to the complicated multifaceted roles that they are increasingly asked to undertake, and the numerous potentially conflicting directions into which they are pulled. Some of the research in the literature has made use of role theory as a theoretical framework to examine these roles. Most role theories posit that expectations are the generators of roles, and expectations are learned through experience (Biddle, 1986). The integration of roles, positions, and expectations are key elements of role theory (Montez et al., 2002), and the literature has provided us with a number of examples of studies that demonstrate the dilemma that academic deans have in attempting to integrate the at times ambiguously defined expectations that higher level administrators have for them with the multiple roles that they play at their schools. Role theory also frames the major issues of role conflict and role ambiguity that academic deans can experience if a clear relationship is not established between roles, positions, and expectations (Montez et al., 2002).

Role conflict research within the theoretical framework of role theory has shown that role conflicts have been predictive of elements of deans' poor integration into jobs, with results such as poor job performance, less commitment to the organization, and a higher rate of resignation from jobs (Biddle, 1986). Still, in examining studies in the literature that examined academic deans' perceptions of their job demands and the complex issues therein, it is clear that role theory is not the only theoretical framework used. In addition, the issue of linking job dissatisfaction and burnout with decreasing tenure of academic deans has not been explicitly linked or studied in depth in the literature reviewed here. Therefore, this remains to be further researched and studied, and role theory provides but one lens through which we can clarify the potential role conflicts that may be associated with job resignation of academic deans in the US.

Studies in the literature that used socialization theory as a theoretical framework demonstrated that academic deans experience leadership first through their lenses as faculty members, and these perspectives may depend on the discipline in which they were professionally trained (Del Favero, 2006). Deans learned what is expected of them not through trial and error, but more through previous experiences as an administrator, and in building professional relationships with other administrators (Del Favero, 2006). Would this mean that there would be appreciable differences between deans who come from outside of academia and those who do not? This remains to be explored in future research. In addition, deans also could experience conflict between their role of manager in charge of implementation of institutional policies and their role of being an academic leader (Arntzen, 2016). Academic deans will be expected in the future to accommodate multiple constituencies. "Instead of simply looking for someone who gets along with the faculty, has a solid research reputation, and gets things done, search committees want someone who can build rankings, as well as market share, and 'manage relationships with

multiple stakeholders'..." (Mangan, 2014, p. 10). And lest we think that academic deans outside of the US have avoided this shift to deans being considered managers as well as academics, these academic deans of international institutions are also faced with the need to deftly manage increasingly acute funding, ranking, and enrollment concerns (de Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009). And while deans may play key roles in budget development and budget management, they also acted as brokers of resources, identifying funding priorities for their faculty and schools (McBride, 2000).

Another theoretical framework, upper echelons theory, holds that upper level managers' experiences, background, training, and values impact strongly the outcomes of the decisions they make (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). The theoretical framework looks at how personal attributes contribute to the academic dean's performance. This theory can also shed light on how an academic dean's distinctive personal characteristics influence how they used financial and non-financial performance measures differently (Bobe & Kober, 2018). The older the dean the more they used non-financial performance measures; female deans used non-financial performance measures more than male deans; the longer the dean was in academia the more they used non-financial performance measures, and surprisingly, deans of non-business schools used financial performance measures more than deans of business faculties (Bobe & Kober, 2018). This theory sheds light on the understanding of metrics that deans use for evaluations, and in turn the interpretive lenses used to determine priorities within their divisions. When looking at building a framework to identify faculty who could move to administration, one study actually supported the concept that successful administrators demonstrated the same characteristics for success that worked for them when they were members of the faculty, and those administrators would bring

new perspectives from their administrative experiences back to their faculty roles when and if they returned to the faculty (Strathe & Wilson, 2006).

The theoretical framework of transformational leadership can also be used to examine how deans can influence their institutions' becoming more inclusive and welcoming of diverse voices and experiences, looking at the ability of academic deans and department chairs to facilitate inclusivity and encourage a more supportive climate for women and underrepresented minorities on their faculties (Bystydzienski et al., 2016). Chairs and deans who participated in workshops raised their awareness of departmental and college culture, and this experience in turn gave them tools to facilitate change (Bystydzienski et al., 2016). These deans were subsequently more likely to report cultural transformation in their departments and colleges, and faculty and staff were more likely to confirm this. This affirms the concept that attention to building new skill sets for academic deans is crucial to enable them to achieve the goals of diversifying their division's cultural environment, which is another key demand that university leadership makes on deans currently (Bystydzienski et al., 2016). The use of the theoretical framework of transformational leadership is enlightening here, as while many academic deans are concerned with transactional obligations, in terms of fulfilling financial requirements and addressing budget issues, they still need to examine, question, and view cultural assumptions to transform leadership in their institutions (Bystydzienski et al., 2016). Transformational leadership involves giving a clear leadership vision, engaging and motivating staff commitment through identification and involvement, and institutionalizing change in organizations (Kirkbride, 2006).

Other literature makes use of the theory of connoisseurship, which examines the concept that academic deans are connoisseurs that learn how to identify patterns and interpret frameworks for specific phenomena (Henk et al., 2017). "Leaders who use his model engage in a

continuing exploration of self and others, use critical disclosure to enable others to learn from past experiences, reflect about actions and make informed and committed judgments, and work collaboratively with others” (Henk at al., 2017, p. 198). This theory would be distinct from the theory of academic capitalism, which posits that institutions of higher education are now informed by neo-liberal capitalistic principles of financial efficiency and cost benefit analysis to determine what programs should be maintained and developed, and what faculty initiatives should be supported (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016). These neo-liberal capitalistic metrics could be in direct conflict with other pedagogical and academic obligations that the school might have to academe as well as to the profession of teaching (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016). Again, these metrics would be very familiar to academic deans from other professional schools, as well as those from colleges of arts and sciences.

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

In their roles as liaisons between higher level administrators and faculty, and advocates and spokespersons for faculty, staff, and students, deans may well suffer from role conflict and role ambiguity (Wolverton et al., 1999). Role conflict could result from such job demands as evaluating faculty and department chairs, while at the same time supporting them in their academic endeavors, whereas role ambiguity was more of a result of ambiguous and unclear performance expectations from higher level administrators (Wolverton et al., 1999).

These concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity would be seen in numerous subsequent studies of academic deans’ job satisfaction. The methodology in this particular study involved sending surveys to academic deans in a wide range of higher education institutions between October 1996 and January 1997 (Wolverton et al., 1999). The authors found that as role

conflict and role ambiguity decreased for deans, their overall satisfaction increased, and that deans self-reported more role ambiguity when they perceived themselves as both faculty and members of administration rather than solely as administrators (Wolverton et al., 1999).

Interestingly enough, business school deans saw significantly higher levels of role conflict than other groups (Wolverton et al., 1999). This is an important finding that begs further examination.

Other notable findings were that gender-based differences were not significant, but racially based distinctions were, and the higher the number of tenured faculty and associate deans with whom deans worked, the more role conflict these deans experienced (Wolverton et al., 1999).

Interestingly enough, managerial experience and expertise have been highlighted as very important characteristics for potential business school dean candidates over the past decade (Mangan, 2014).

Certain literature has acknowledged that the roles of academic deans have changed considerably over the past century, examining the roles and expectations of deans through role theory. “The fundamental proposition of role theory is that behaviors within contexts (roles) are associated with persons who share a common identity (in positions) and who are aware of their roles (by expectations)” (Montez et al., 2002, p. 244). Ambiguity and conflict result when there is not a clear relationship among the three elements (Montez et al., 2002). Then deans ranked internal productivity and managing academic personnel as their most important roles, with resource management given less importance (Montez et al., 2002). The authors concluded that “when role ambiguity is present, deans may have difficulty determining the roles in which they should engage at any one given time. Ill-defined responsibilities, mixed messages about how much authority deans actually have, unclear or unstated expectations and goals, and a lack of

clarity about what is to be done and how much time should be spent doing it leave deans in a kind of leadership limbo” (Montez et al., 2002, p. 250).

Role conflict and role ambiguity could continue to be significant elements contributing to deans’ job dissatisfaction as these concepts have been highlighted in the literature of the past two decades, along with studies that have noted frustration at the lack of clarity and prioritization of job duties from higher-level administration for these academic and managerial leaders. Conflicts could derive from business school deans’ need to both encourage academic innovation and develop new programming with their faculty, while at the same time call their faculty to be more efficient in their use of financial resources. In addition, conflicts might result from needing to procure external support and resources from outside stakeholders such as alumni, private corporations, and foundations, while at the same time address the academic and resource needs of internal stakeholders such as students, faculty, and staff. In addition, role ambiguity, where higher university administrators do not give clear indications in regard to prioritization of job duties, as well as using unclear metrics to measure achievement of these duties in the deans’ evaluations, could also strongly influence the deans’ beliefs that their position has pulled them in multiple directions with an ill-defined sense of priority and ability to complete all of these tasks successfully given time and resource constraints. This conundrum could potentially lead deans to leave their positions to either return to the faculty or to move into other administrative positions.

Qualities, Attributes, Skill Set Development and Job Evaluations

Wolverton and Poch acknowledged in their study that while academic deans are not CEO’s given that they lead academic divisions and not private businesses, their backgrounds and roles may have a good deal in common (Wolverton & Poch, 2000). Academic deans and CEO’s find connections in sharing the skill sets that each group have honed in their respective

institutions; for example, academic deans can develop personal capacities for successful financial and personnel management from CEO's, and CEO's can learn about modalities of consensus building that good academic deans have learned in their academic working environments (Wolverton & Poch, 2000). In addition, academic deans and CEO's may learn key insights into skill sets that each group needs to develop by shadowing the other at their place of work for a brief period (Wolverton & Poch, 2000). And while they may work in organizations with distinct groups of stakeholders and constituencies, academic deans and CEO's have common backgrounds such that many share similar gender, age, and race characteristics, and interestingly enough, developmental stages in their early educational experiences that saw a majority of them with parents very much involved in supporting and encouraging their educational endeavors, as well as many of them taking first leadership roles in youth organizations (Wolverton & Poch, 2000).

In terms of performance evaluations for deans, certain literature has examined the perspectives from varied voices within the institution. These include studies that examined criteria needed for success that were not specified by upper level administrators, but by faculty and staff (Rosser et al., 2003). These criteria could include "articulating a vision for the unit and setting appropriate goals, managing the unit, having high quality interpersonal relationships, possessing strong communication skills, contributing to research and professional endeavors of the unit, building the overall quality of the unit's educational processes, and providing support for the institutional goal of increasing diversity" (Rosser et al., 2003, p. 7). This study focused less on particular leadership attributes that a successful dean should have, but rather what they were perceived to be doing and could do in their particular unit (Rosser et al., 2003). The study "suggests that deans and directors need to be aware of the effectiveness of their interactions and

transactions – an effectiveness that comprises the ability to garner individual as well as group support, to conceptualize and pull ideas together, to provide a clear direction for the unit, to exemplify fairness and good judgement, and to process the leadership savvy to perform the various functions, tasks, and duties in a manner and style reflective of the organization’s goals and mission” (Rosser et al., 2003, p. 21). Four significant proscriptive norms that faculty had for deans included having un conveyed expectations, undermining faculty control, bending to pressure, and being publicly critical (Bray, 2008). It can be deduced from these studies that communication skills are important for academic deans’ effectiveness with their faculty and staff.

Other studies noted that thinking and acting strategically were key in prioritizing the obligations that came from the myriad of demands on their time that caused stress in their professional and their personal lives (Henk et al., 2017), as well as the stresses of being “manager deans” in a new capitalistic environment that demanded they introduce financial efficiencies and develop new revenue streams (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016). Many deans showed a lack of preparation for their leadership; as a result, institutions were called upon to train senior faculty for leadership roles “through workshops, mentoring, and opportunities to shadow or work closely with acting deans” (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016, p. 806). With more goals for deans mimicking those of executives in the for-profit world, such as those based on empirical decision making, metrics to evaluate deans’ performance have been proposed to be used to monitor short-term goals that can lead to long term success (Morris & Laipple, 2015). This latter study showed that those dean candidates who had courses in leadership and management may have had an “advantage” in on the job effectiveness (Morris & Laipple, 2015); in a similar vein, business school deans with “softer” management backgrounds may also have

been more predisposed to be more successful in promoting and supporting collegial environments in their schools, as well as being more likely to use consensus building as a basis for decision making and building relationships with external and internal stakeholders (Del Favero, 2005).

As studies from the literature review cited here show, deliberate leadership preparation and skill formation is lacking for many academic deans, as a large number still come from academic faculties where their skill sets (i.e., writing, research, teaching, service) for which they have been rewarded in the past do not match the managerial skill sets needed to lead an academic division with multiple competing demands, such as fundraising obligations, personnel management, and resource management. Deans are at the “front lines” in terms of mediating the demands and needs of faculty, students, and staff, along with the concerns of alumni and important constituencies in the communities where their institutions are established. As such, these business school deans are pulled in multiple directions, and may not be able to devote sufficient time and resources to effectively address these obligations. “As leaders of increasingly complex enterprises, deans must think big and be the public face of their schools even as they still tend to the day-to-day needs of professors and students. Deans must be able to motivate faculty and staff to embrace a university’s broad, strategic goals. They need to be shrewd money managers who can attract donations to augment limited budgets” (June, 2014, p. 3).

Impact of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity on Job Satisfaction and Job Tenure

Yet the literature lacks sufficient studies that examine how the complicated and at times conflicting demands made on academic deans influence their job dissatisfaction, burnout and effort-reward imbalance (Coll et al., 2019). Perceived high stress and low perceived rewards were seen as the main causes for the departure of as much as one out of five academic deans

from their positions each year (Morris & Laipple, 2015). Burnout, effort-reward imbalance, and overcommitment can result from this perceived high stress (Coll et al., 2019). These stressors might have contributed to these deans' departures from their jobs, although more research remains to be done regarding this. Significant sources of stress for academic deans of education schools that were predictors of burnout, effort-reward imbalance, and overcommitment included "balancing financial resources, having administrative support from the provost's office, creating a new vision for majors and/or academic disciplines, promoting positive change, and dealing with resistance and conflict about change" (Coll et al., 2019, p. 132). These sources of stress could also be attributed more broadly to academic deans in general as they deal with many of the same stressors as deans of schools of education, and thus potentially contribute to shortened job tenure.

Role Distinctions between Academic Deans in Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Institutions

Nonetheless, the literature also does not appear to have much research regarding distinctions between academic deans who have leadership roles in sectarian institutions and those who work in non-sectarian institutions. As this study proposes to examine roles of business school deans in sectarian institutions, such literature would be helpful to identify whether distinctions can be made between academic deans' roles in these two respective kinds of institutions. Research exists that does examine distinctions between academic deans' roles in public and private institutions, but it would be interesting to explore potential differences between competing constituencies in sectarian and non-sectarian institutions, and how these differences might drive deans to devote more time to certain activities than in others. For example, would a dean in a sectarian institution be called to be more mission specific in developing new programming, and in messaging the school's accomplishments to board

members, prospective students, alumni, and prospective donors? Or would the pressures of academic capitalism and marketization overwhelm the efforts to remain faithful to the institution's mission?

Distinctions between Academic Dean Leadership in US and International Higher Education

As shown, the literature demonstrates that there are increasing pressures on US and international institutions of higher education to yield to market forces through program prioritization and academic capitalism. International institutions are also under pressure to diversify revenue streams and tailor academic programs to attract students, and to appease other market participants such as potential employers and donors. Diversification of revenue streams and the increasing prominence of market pressures in program determination could pose potential conflicts with academic priorities that business school deans may be tasked with implementing. The increased search for private funding sources and the inherent accountability standards and accompanying pressures to be efficient in using these funds also represent increasingly important drivers in institutions of higher ed in the US and abroad, as the demands of the market ramp up for institutions competing for students, donors, and rankings (de Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009). This would include higher pressure for accountability to the public, for efficiency, and for effectiveness (Kehm, 2014). As noted previously, Slaughter and Leslie developed the theory of academic capitalism to explain the increasing pressure on the institutional and professorial level to search for external, non-governmental funding for revenue streams to maximize efficient use of human capital and financial resources, stating that it has been a major factor in the US and Anglo Saxon higher education institutions in Canada, UK, and Australia since the 1990's (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). The deans of these institutions are therefore overseeing academic entrepreneurs who make use of their own human capital to produce concrete, measurable benefits to society in the form of

marketable research output, as well as formation of workers for that same society. (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Other pressures concern a potential focus on internationalization as a form of profitmaking, instead of focusing on the inherent benefits to the educational mission of the institution (Altbach, 2011). Bruce Johnstone pointed out that many universities across the world are feeling the impact of many of their governments' inability to continue to tax their populations in a manner sufficient to support the growing needs of their higher education institutions, due to multiple pressures from globalized capital markets and increased austerity measures (Johnstone, 2002). Worldwide pressures exist for universities to seek diversification of potential revenue streams and cost sharing (Johnstone, 2002). A stronger push for external donations and academic programs that bring in more tuition from lucrative international student markets will be important drivers and pressures on academic deans (Johnstone, 2002). But focusing on entrepreneurial academic programs that provide profit can potentially divert the institution from its mission, potentially impact scholarly integrity if there is a perceived donor influence on research outcomes, and finally, create haves and have nots within the same institution (Johnstone, 2002). Another limit on revenue diversification also concerns the difficulty in developing a solid donor base for institutions (Johnstone, 2002).

Deans in certain institutions abroad have seen a much more entrepreneurial spirit be rewarded, with the deans having greater control over budgets and incentives to maximize revenue and produce efficiencies in their use of resources (Clarke, 2004). Resource dependency theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) would support the concept that when crucial revenue streams are restricted or dried up, leaders at the institution would look for other resources, and these resources

according to academic capitalism would inevitably shape and determine strategic plans and directions for the university (Rubins, 2007).

International higher institutions are also under pressure to become economic drivers for their regions, and to treat students as consumers, rather than engaging them in a transformative manner to help them become informed citizens (Hearn et al., 2016). Worldwide, institutions find themselves increasingly driven by factors of privatization and accountability, due to cash strapped governments call to find alternative revenue streams, to embrace marketable research and attract enrollees from an increasingly mobile international student market, and make use more of private capital and encourage innovation (Hearn et al., 2016). This may result in deans emphasizing practical research with more short-term outcomes, and favor already better resourced students, leaving those disadvantaged students with fewer resources with less access to educational opportunities (Hearn et al., 2016). Could these international public higher ed institutions follow the pattern observed in the US where already more resourced, prestigious universities are able to monetize these advantages to procure even more resources and prestige, supporting their drive towards autonomy, while lesser resourced, less prestigious institutions become even more disadvantaged along with their students (Hearn et al., 2016)? Or perhaps there will exist a growing division in resources between those private international institutions that are relatively free to charge high tuitions and prioritize profitable programs such as business and information technology, and those public institutions that need to provide a range of academic offerings that may not be as profitable, in addition to being restricted in the tuition they charge to their citizens (Weiler, 2000).

But international institutions face an uphill challenge in their need to develop a culture of giving in their countries, along with advocating for favorable tax laws and promoting development

and fundraising training for their academic leaders (Johnstone, 2005). With international educational institutions facing reduced subsidies and funds from the state, and with tuitions insufficient, they will need to develop their philanthropic divisions to support research and attract students who are being courted by a global education market (Johnstone, 2005).

In the European Union, while government allocations to universities look to not increase drastically, there has been a growing emphasis on full pay international students from outside of the EU, much more so than in the US (Slaughter & Cantwell, 2012). While not all institutions in the EU have embraced the new managerialism that challenges shared governance in the US institutions, the pressure to be competitive in human capital development means the EU also runs the risk of uneven development as is seen in the US, with certain institutions that are already well resourced further benefiting from increased alternative revenue streams in technology transfers, applied research in STEM and business, and increased tuition fees, while others less resourced institutions languish (Slaughter & Cantwell, 2012). Could the EU universities exit from the university arms race and reinvent themselves as academic oases of study and academic inquiry to serve the public good? (Slaughter & Cantwell, 2012). Or will these same universities continue to compete in a crowded international field for the best resources, faculty, and research funds? The academic deans of business schools and other divisions could continue to be strongly impacted by the challenges brought by these effects of neo-liberal economic theory and academic capitalism in academia.

Theoretical Framework

While other studies on the roles of academic deans have made use of role theory (Biddle, 1986), (Montez et al., 2002), socialization theory (Del Favero, 2006), upper echelon theory (Bobe & Kober, 2018; Hambrick & Mason, 1984), and connoisseurship theory (Henk et al.,

2017), resource dependence theory will serve as the theoretical framework for this study, as it is appropriate to examine the internal and external environments that provide necessary resources for academic deans at Jesuit business schools to complete the tasks assigned to them (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). This theory is based on the concept that organizations and actors within these organizations must engage with other organizations and actors to procure necessary resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). As the purpose of this study is to determine whether the roles performed by US business school deans in Jesuit universities and their counterparts abroad are converging to a similar model, understanding the context within which the deans perform their roles would be important:

There are three core ideas of the theory: (1) social context matters; (2) organizations have strategies to enhance their autonomy and pursue interests; and (3) power (not just rationality or efficiency) is important for understanding internal and external actions of organizations. The emphasis on power, and a careful articulation of the explicit repertoires of tactics available to organizations, is a hallmark of resource dependence theory that distinguishes it from other approaches, such as transaction cost economics (Davis & Cobb, 2010, p.22).

These core ideas of resource dependence theory relate to the research questions for this study:

- 1) What roles do business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad find that particularly challenge them, and how have these roles changed and evolved over the past decade?
- 2) How do business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad experience role conflicts and role ambiguities?

3) How and to what extent have tensions between academic capitalism and educating for the common good influenced the responsibilities and decision-making of these US Jesuit business school deans and their counterparts abroad?

The social context in which the business school deans perform their roles, and the power dynamics at play within these roles in the business school and in the university will likely be highlighted in the constructs of this theory. Understanding the social context and the power dynamics of the organizations within which the business school deans perform their roles can help to comprehend how these deans are responding and adapting to their evolving work environments and thus to evolving resource dependencies.

Further supporting the applicability of resource dependence theory to this study, the business school deans must likely negotiate with and work with actors outside of the business school itself to obtain the necessary resources for the school's operation. This reliance on actors outside of the business school for resources may bring disadvantages and difficulties. For example, deans can be reliant upon upper level administrators, such as provosts, for permission to engage in faculty searches when particular faculty lines are open. The upper level administrators have power over the deans as these same upper level administrators can approve or deny these requests, potentially creating friction among the faculty and administrators at the business school who believe that they need the additional faculty members to staff courses for their students, as well as provide needed disciplinary expertise in the individual departments.

Resource dependence theory can also shed light on what other actors influence the deans in terms of resource allocation. For example, are the business schools heavily reliant on undergraduate enrollments for tuition fees, or more on graduate enrollments? What about research funding? Would the US Jesuit business school deans be distinct from the business

deans in other countries in regard to being reliant on government and state grants to support research, or on government subsidies for their students? Resource dependence theory holds that it is important to assess the critical resources are for the deans, and the magnitude of their dependence on these resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). These factors could motivate and inform the actions that the deans will take.

Nonetheless, for these academic deans, it would also be important to note who has power to allocate these crucial resources. Deans might not be in the position to determine allocation of all key resources, and the manner in which they are distributed to various constituencies in their respective divisions. “In an environment dense with organizations and interest groups with a variety of laws and norms, discretion is rarely absolute. More commonly, there are degrees of shared discretion” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978, p. 48). The discretion to determine how resources are distributed is therefore vested not only in the academic deans, but also in upper level administrators at the university.

Resource dependence theory posits that this discretion over use of a particular resource is an element of power and control (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Business school deans may be said therefore to have control over certain resources available to them in a limited fashion. For example, some business school deans may have control over certain financial resources such as revenue from certain types of programming. This revenue might come from certificate programs in executive education, for example. Nonetheless, in certain cases, the deans may not have control over revenues from tuition and fees for the majority of their programs. But if the deans have input into or obligations regarding fundraising, then they may have some control over the funds generated from these activities, too.

Regardless of whether they have a level of control over specific resources, business deans may not necessarily always have access to these resources. As an intermediary between their school and upper level academic administrators, the business dean may need to rely on these administrators such as provosts and chief financial officers, who may restrict access to certain resources. “It is possible to regulate access to a resource without owning it” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978, p. 48). For example, while there may be a need to hire faculty in certain departments to fulfill teaching needs, and certain faculty lines may be “open,” the provost may decline to permit the dean to begin a faculty search. Faculty lines represent key resources for a school that needs to sufficiently staff its departments so as to be able to teach needed courses, as well as increase departmental research output and specific knowledge expertise. In a like manner, provosts and chief financial officers can restrict access to needed support staff, such as administrative assistants, potentially impacting the academic dean’s ability to lead their division.

Academic deans can also control use of resources, as when they have discretion to distribute salary increases from a pre-determined pool of funds among their faculty and staff. For example, they may wish to retain star faculty with high research output and therefore give them a higher percentage raise than other faculty members. Academic deans may also have discretionary funds for travel and conference fees that they can allocate to different faculty members. On the other hand, upper level university administrators can also control use of university resources such as legal counsel that the academic deans may need for approval of course, certificate, and program proposals. This resource control by upper level administrators can strongly impact the business dean’s ability to create revenue generating programs by slowing down the procedures necessary for program approval. In addition, recruitment resources, including staff, funds, etc., for revenue generating programs may be controlled by upper level

administrators elsewhere in the university, such as directors of admissions, thus hindering the ability of the business dean to recruit successfully for revenue generating programs that have been prioritized by the upper level university administrators.

Resource dependence theory can be framed and shaped by academic capitalism in such a way as to shed light on the perceptions deans have of their abilities to fulfill their varied roles and obligations. In a study at a southern land grant institution, Jaeger and Thornton interviewed faculty to determine how public service obligations have evolved under the lenses of both resource dependence theory and academic capitalism (Jaeger & Thornton, 2005). They found that faculty felt compelled to find alternative resource streams as predicted by academic capitalism to fund their public service obligations, but at the same time these alternative sources of funds were not as available for public service obligations as they were for research endeavors (Jaeger & Thornton, 2005). The faculty also believed that while excellence in research and public service were stated missions of their particular land grant institution, there were substantial obstacles to procurement of sufficient internal resources to fulfill the public service mission (Jaeger & Thornton, 2005). In a like manner, business school deans in Jesuit institutions may find that there are substantial obstacles to obtainment of sufficient resources to fulfill their institutions' mission directed to the common good of society. "Our primary mission is the education and formation of our students for the sake of the kind of persons they become and their wide influence for good in society in their lives, professions, and service" (Presidents of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, 2010, p. 3).

"From a resource dependency perspective, if a university has more industry-based partnerships then greater internship opportunities are available for students" (Powell & Rey, 2015, p. 97). The authors in this study state that higher education and industry do not collaborate

sufficiently to produce students with sufficient preparation and skill sets to enter the workforce (Powell & Rey, 2015). Business schools may already have the advantage of professional degree programs that prepare students for work in industry, so further collaboration could potentially lead to additional resources in terms of growth in fundraising and internship opportunities for students in the future.

In another use of resource dependence theory, a researcher for one study interviewed academic deans in Finland, as Finnish higher education institutions had recently undergone substantial regulatory change (Kohtamäki, 2019):

In the interviews, first, leaders identified uncertainties concerning new hierarchical management frameworks, management systems and university practices. Second, they identified external uncertainties involving the market framework: competitive performance-based state-funding, the measurement culture and the need to obtain external research funding. These two categories of uncertainties—internal and external—required different actions. Academic leaders actively managed both internal and external uncertainties critical to their academic units (Kohtamäki, 2019, p. 81).

In a similar way, other European institutions of higher education may be acutely sensitive to where critical resources originate:

The more a university is dependent on the state, the more pressure can be applied by the state to realize changes; the less dependent a university is on the state, the more active this university will be in answering the suggested innovations provided by the Bologna Process (Lipnicka & Verhoeven, 2014, p. 26).

While academic deans at Jesuit business schools may not necessarily face the pressures of competitive performance-based state funding, they may need to innovate as they experience the need to increasingly look to external funding sources for research and for other needs of their divisions. The business school deans may need to negotiate the demands of internal uncertainties in terms of power over and access to critical resources in their institutions as well as external uncertainties in terms of varying levels of support from external partners such as governments, local communities, businesses, and alumni.

Ultimately, resource dependence theory should highlight common themes in my interviews with the Jesuit business school deans regarding the environments in which they find themselves:

The three most elemental structural characteristics of environments are concentration, the extent to which power and authority in the environment is widely dispersed; munificence, or the availability or scarcity of critical resources, and interconnectedness, the number and pattern of linkages, or connections, among organizations (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978, p. 68).

The aforementioned three characteristics would determine the relationships between major players such as the academic deans and upper level administrators, and the conflict and dependence that exist among these individuals within the particular social system of the university (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Thus, through the theoretical lens of resource dependence theory the tensions inherent in the roles that Jesuit business school deans play will become clearer, highlighting the research participants' increased attention to resource dependencies in their positions.

CHAPTER 3

Research Design

The methodological approach that I used is a basic qualitative study, as I wished to interpret the work environment(s) as uniquely experienced by each of the deans selected to participate in the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Although the original intention was to include a robust document analysis along with a series of interviews with a goal to parse specific themes from the data, this data gathering involving document analysis was pursued in a much more limited fashion (as will be discussed later). I selected this methodology as the most appropriate for my study as the participants would be constructing their own perception of the reality of their own job demands and pressures as unique to them; in a sense, there would be multiple realities of perceptions of job roles that would be divulged through qualitative methods, likely highlighting the participants' awareness of and reflection upon resource dependencies.

Research Questions

My research questions, as noted previously, are the following:

- 1) What roles do business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad find that particularly challenge them, and how have these roles changed and evolved over the past decade?
- 2) How do business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad experience role conflicts and role ambiguities?

3) How and to what extent have tensions between academic capitalism and educating for the common good influenced the responsibilities and decision-making of these US business deans and their counterparts abroad?

Methods

Interviews

The primary method for data collection used for this research consisted of semi-structured interviews with participants chosen to take part in the study. Semi-structured interviews were “guided by a set of questions and issues to be explored, but neither the exact wording nor the order of questions is predetermined” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 136) and would allow for participants to shape their narratives to fit their interpretation of their own realities in terms of making sense of the challenges and roles that they found most acute in their professional lives. These semi-structured interviews and the subsequent narratives revealed would permit the participants to highlight in their own terms the evolving challenges that they experienced.

These interviews consisted of one initial interview with an individual for a duration of approximately one hour. The interviews were done via Zoom, enabling interviews to take place with deans across the US and in numerous different countries, where face to face in person interviews would prove impossible during the period of COVID-19 related travel restrictions, not to mention the cost of travel that would prove prohibitive under normal circumstances. While the potential exists with video conferencing platforms to not be able to recognize important physical and/or facial cues that might be more easily discerned with face to face interviews, current reality made face to face interviews improbable and impractical.

The interview protocol, as stated previously, was based on a semi-structured format, consisting of a series of roughly 15 questions. These questions were divided into three categories. The first one concerned background information regarding the participant's educational background, work experience, and years in their current position. The second concerned the participants' current job duties and responsibilities, how these duties corresponded with their original job description, which duties and responsibilities were the most challenging for them, and what duties and responsibilities gave the participants the most satisfaction. The third dealt with resource availability and perceived performance expectations and priorities of higher level administrators, and whether resources were sufficient for the participants to meet the performance expectations of these administrators (specific questions can be found in Appendix A).

From the answers to these interview questions I hoped to parse themes that would echo the topics highlighted in the research questions, such as the participants' potential experiences of role conflict and role ambiguity, possible shifts in job responsibilities, and the tensions inherent in driving development of revenue enhancing programming while at the same time remaining faithful to the school's mission. In addition, the responses could support or refute my chosen theoretical framework that interpreted the participants' motivation to act based on specific resource dependencies within and without the institution. The goal of these questions was to invite the participants to address and comment on their personal strengths and gaps in their educational and professional formation for their positions. The semi-structured construct would enable the interviewer to ask questions that probed more deeply into the highlighted concerns and potential conflicts that the dean participants might have raised during the interviews.

As the Executive Director of the International Association of Jesuit Business Schools (IAJBS), I have a worldwide network of business school deans whom I have met through annual

gatherings in different Jesuit higher education institutions around the world, and consider them my colleagues. Through my acquaintance with deans from around the world, I hoped to choose a representative group that is diverse in gender, culture, and nationality. In doing so, I attempted to account for certain gender, cultural, and national biases in the answers provided by the participants, to avoid unduly giving emphasis to certain identified themes and topics derived from particular responses, and not extrapolating to generalize these themes for all participant data.

While the vast majority of Jesuit business school deans in the US and abroad are men, there are roughly seven women deans of Jesuit business schools in the US and abroad, so I hoped to be able to interview at least three of these women, with one from the US, one from Latin America, and one from the Pacific region. To further regional diversity and representation, I would have liked to interview at least two business school deans from Europe, and two from India (this, however, did not come to fruition, as will be seen later in the analysis of the findings in the following chapter). As the US comprises the region with the most Jesuit business schools (26 in total), I wanted to interview a variety of US Jesuit business school deans, particularly as the US Jesuit business schools vary greatly in size of the student body. Unfortunately, there are no Jesuit business schools in Africa currently, so I was not able to select a participant from that continent. Therefore, I wanted to interview at minimum a total of three deans from US Jesuit business schools, two deans from European Jesuit business schools, two deans from Asia, one dean from the Pacific, and two from Latin America. In doing so, the numbers of interviews in each region would have been proportionate to the number of Jesuit business schools in each of these designated regions. The total number of interviews would have been therefore between 11 and 16, assuring a sufficient amount of data to achieve saturation (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). In terms of gender, I sought to have 70% of the participants who identified as men, and 30% as women, which

would actually reflect a higher percentage of women than would be the case in overall membership in the IAJBS (the final percentage of participants who identified as women was a bit lower, at approximately 26%). Participant anonymity was assured through the removal of personally identifiable information in the analysis of the data.

Document Analysis

In addition, I had initially wanted to make use of document analysis to supplement and to flesh out the data gleaned in the interviews (Bowen, 2009). In document analysis, specific documents are examined to reveal themes that derive from and run throughout the data (Bowen, 2009). Document analysis should complement and confirm the data uncovered in the semi-structured interviews (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). “[W]hat documents are deemed relevant will depend on the disciplinary theoretical framework of the study” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, pp. 24-25). The use of resource dependence theory as my theoretical framework would inform the use of document analysis to assess the following: strategic plans and job descriptions. I believed that examining the strategic plans (if they existed) of the corresponding business schools might have helped to see whether elements of the plans were highlighted in the major roles and demands that the deans themselves pointed out in their interviews as occupying a substantial percentage of their time on the job. If objectives in the strategic plans were reinforced by data from the interviews, these objectives might have indicated specific resource dependencies for the deans. I believed that it might also be illustrative to ask the deans if they would have been willing to share their job descriptions as presented to them when they were hired. It would have been helpful for the analysis of how much the various job descriptions among the deans were the same, or how much they differed, and to determine what constituent parties the deans were beholden to for resources, and what constituents held power over and access to these resources. It would have also been insightful

to inquire if the deans' current job duties diverged from the ones that are described in their original job descriptions, as potential role ambiguities and role conflicts might have emerged from an analysis of these data points.

As it turned out, I did not find that document analysis was needed to reinforce and interpret the themes that emerged from the interviews. In the case of written job descriptions, a number of the deans commented that their job descriptions were not static, and were inclusive of a variety of roles, and that as needs of the institution and school evolved, their roles would in turn evolve organically. In terms of strategic plans, while all the deans mentioned that both their home institutions and their schools either had or were in the process of developing strategic plans, their descriptions of these plans tended to reinforce common mission themes held by Jesuit institutions across the globe, such as forming conscientious, academically trained, and service oriented students who would have a positive impact on their communities around the world. These common mission related themes were emphasized by many of the deans in their answers to the questions posed, so further document analysis was deemed to not be necessary.

Plan for Data Analysis

I analyzed the data by utilizing immersion strategies, where categories are not prefigured, and where I relied more on my interpretative capacities (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). I made use of deductive coding in analyzing my data, by "focusing on patterns and insights related to [my] purpose and questions and guided by [my] theoretical frame" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 208). While I was able to extrapolate common themes from these interviews, such as the one expressed in the purpose of my study (i.e., that deans both in the US and abroad experience similar pressures from academic capitalism in their institutions), the interview method would still divulge details and aspects that would be unique to each dean's institution, and therefore be a part of the construct

of each one's own unique reality. Therefore, while the coding would primarily make use of a deductive approach, using codes derived from the theoretical framework of resource dependence theory (such as "access" or "control"), some codes were also derived from an inductive approach where the codes would be generated organically from the data in the interviews themselves. The use of inductive or In Vivo coding would honor and prioritize the voices of the interview participants by letting the participants frame the interpretation of the phrases and terms used in the interviews (Saldaña, 2013). The relevant codes in certain cases were then permitted to emerge organically from the data gathering itself, and subsequently be revised through the data analysis (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). Codes were then combined to form specific categories that would then tie in with overarching themes and concepts that would derive from the theory applied (Saldaña, 2013). Resource dependence theory was expected to tease out the conflicting demands and pressures that the deans have in the complex environment(s) from which they drew needed resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). To assist in organizing the codes to reveal relevant themes and concepts, I made use of a recommended proprietary software platform, MAXQDA. The interview audio recordings were transcribed by an outside firm, TRINT.

Trustworthiness

In order to enhance validity of the findings, I used thick description, which consists of providing enough background information to assist in analyzing the deeper meanings within the social contexts within which the deans work to sufficiently contextualize the findings for the readers of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). This included researching the corresponding universities' websites for mission statements and strategic plans, if accessible and available. Each of these categories of documents would provide deeper context for the responses of the participants. Key terms and phrases from mission statements and strategic plans (which were

similar across the universities in the Jesuit network worldwide) confirmed and supported the themes and topics that emerged from the codes used in data analysis. “Today, when rich, thick description is used as a strategy to enable transferability, it refers to a description of the setting and participants of the study, as well as a detailed description of the findings with adequate evidence presented in the form of quotes from participant interviews, field notes, and documents” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 257).

In my review of the findings in the initial series of interviews, I found it necessary to evaluate myself on a regular basis to check and to acknowledge my own personal biases and preconceptions which could influence the interpretation of the participants’ answers to my questions. This critical self-reflection on a continual basis would be essential for my work in this study, as I needed to identify and to challenge my presumptions about interpretation of the data, given my own personal experiences of work within Jesuit business schools.

The written transcripts were reviewed and checked with the audio recordings, to verify that the transcripts of the interviews were as accurate as possible, and faithful to the wording used by the participants.

Positionality/Researcher Reflexivity Statement

There are a number of subjectivities of which I needed to be cognizant as I pursued research in my chosen topic. I am an administrator and professor in a business school at a Jesuit sponsored university, and as the participants in my research were business school deans at Jesuit sponsored universities, I needed to take care to acknowledge that I might be tempted to frame the statements that the deans made in such a way as to reveal my own biases and presumptions regarding leadership of business schools. Familiarity with the realities of business school

education at a certain level might have tempted me to extrapolate from own experiences to influence how I framed the experiences of the business school deans.

In addition, as the Executive Director of the International Association of Jesuit Business Schools (IAJBS), the organization of Jesuit business schools with business school deans as members, I am lucky to personally know the members and to be well acquainted with a number of them as my colleagues. It is from this group that I planned to choose participants for my research. While familiarity might make them more at ease with me in terms of discussing the issues and concerns that they had, my position as Executive Director of the organization (and frankly, the fact that I am a Jesuit priest), may have made some of them reticent to be completely honest in their assessment of their jobs and their schools, given my position(s) of perceived authority. On the other hand, some may have been tempted to approach the interviews in more of a “confessional” construct, and open up to me more fully, therefore impacting the findings that I had. This made me ever more conscious of doing my very best to assure confidentiality while still reaffirming their agency to only disclose that with which they were comfortable.

I am fluent in Spanish, so that would have been an asset and a benefit in interviewing Jesuit business school deans in Latin America and Spain, putting them at ease that I could understand them in their native language, and therefore potentially helping them to provide more robust and detailed descriptions. That being said, those participants who were native Spanish speakers who participated spoke English in the interviews. However, I also needed to remember language is constructed not just of words, but also by the cultures in which it evolves and develops. I therefore needed to remind myself continually of the fact that I come from the US, where the institutions of higher education have different hierarchical structures and expectations in terms of position in the organization than do institutions in countries in Latin America and

Europe. These hierarchical structures and expectations would be reflected in the language and the communication styles that the interview participants used in discussions with me. Respect and deference may have been more of an issue in my discussions with deans from institutions in Latin America and Europe; this may well have contributed to framing and shaping how these deans answer any queries on my part, and therefore influence the findings. In general, though, I found the participants to be at ease with me during the interviews, and eager to answer all questions posed.

While I have had decades of experience working in Jesuit business schools, I needed to take care to acknowledge that I might be tempted to put an interpretive gloss on the data that I reviewed from my interviews with business school deans that reflected my own personal experience of administration in the Jesuit business schools where I have been employed. This would also be necessary to counter my own tendency to be cynical in my assessment of the current environment in US higher education. For example, as one of my research questions addresses the tension between the effects of academic capitalism and the desire to promote curricular development that emphasizes the common good, I might have tended to overestimate the influence of prioritization of revenue enhancing programming, and underestimate the influence of curricular development for transformative academic programs that promote global citizenship and awareness of the effects of business on all levels of society. I made use of detailed memos maintained throughout the period of data gathering and data analysis to reflect upon and analyze my reactions to participants and my interpretations of the data.

CHAPTER 4

Summary of Findings

Ultimately, I was able to interview 19 deans of Jesuit business schools, a mixture of domestic and international. A total of 13 deans were from institutions in the U.S., and the remaining six were from institutions in Europe, North America, South America, and Asia/Pacific. Four of the deans identified as women, and 15 identified as men. All showed themselves to welcome the opportunity to discuss their work, and the accompanying challenges and triumphs that come from their jobs. The deans in general found that their roles were multivariate, and required them to devote more time to external stakeholders and external sources of funds and revenues, and in many cases the deans wished to devote more time to these external duties, which in turn would provide more revenues for their schools. As one US dean pointed out:

I'd rather spend more time outside focusing on alumni relations and engage our students are placed well, that sort of thing. That's what I'd like to spend more time on. And then the pressure has been from central administration to create new programs. Like I said, I think we've done a good job of that in the last two years, though at this point we need to digest that and see where that takes us (US Dean).

An international dean also pointed out the multiple duties, internally and externally directed, that they were tasked with:

So my general rule falls for me to be the academic leader and chief operating officer of the school. And my main duties and responsibilities are clustered around five groups, the first

group is called the bylaw functions, which includes the overall description of my being the academic leader and chief operating officer of the school, as well as overseeing the budget and the facilities. The second one, would be school plans and identity. And this involves mission, vision, strategy, curriculum development, organizational plans and marketing. Part C would be school policies administration. So it's really execution of the goals and the policies as well as, you know, overseeing all of the committees and appointing members to the committees for administration, Part D is school partnership and the representation. So that involves representing the school externally and, well, letter e is just the let's say catch all cluster that says performs other duties as may be required, so those are five sets of duties (International Dean).

This would support much of what has been seen in the literature regarding the roles of deans in general, that they are not simply dealing with internal issues and concerns with faculty, students, and budgets, but also increasingly being asked to address external stakeholders. These external stakeholders would include, depending on whether the deans were at US or at international business schools, potential donors, potential employers for their graduates, and potential advocates for their institutions in the communities in which they find themselves. As one US dean commented:

I think, you know, I'm really busy building revenue and building the reputation of the school and that revenue is in tuition revenue, but also donations and then building the reputation of the school. So being out there, telling our story and really trying to articulate what makes our school different (US Dean).

What stood out, in particular was that the majority of the participants in the study, including those from international institutions, mentioned that program development is a major concern for them in their roles as leaders in their institutions. Engagement with external

stakeholders such as potential employers for their graduates is also an element that contributes to program development, but faculty still drive the development of programs and degrees. The first research question of this study addressed issues regarding what the business school deans find challenging and how these roles have evolved, and program development and finding sufficient time to engage with external stakeholders proved to be challenging for the majority of the US deans interviewed in this study.

Program development was prioritized for a majority of the deans, domestic and international, and enrollment concerns proved to be an issue to which most of these deans were paying close attention. As deans of colleges of business at private institutions, a number of them, both domestic and international, emphasized that their schools were currently competing for students in a very competitive environment. This would be another element of an answer to the first research question which inquired about what roles were particularly challenging for the deans. Particularly in the U.S., tuition charges for Jesuit institutions of higher education were much higher than tuition and fees in public institutions, so attention to the demands of the market by developing programs that would attract students and provide employment for them was a concern for the majority of these deans.

An additional concern for the majority of the deans interviewed, international and U.S. based, is linked to the obligations and requirements of accreditation. The AACSB (Association of American Collegiate Schools of Business) is currently the gold standard of accreditation for collegiate business schools in the U.S., and is increasingly becoming more coveted as a signal of quality for international business schools. Each of the six international Jesuit business deans raised the issue of accreditation, and each of their schools is in a different stage of accreditation, whether that be from AACSB, or from another agency or accrediting body. Accreditation has

many advantages; it is a seal of approval that signals to potential students and faculty members that the institution adheres to high levels of quality in its scholarship, service, and programming. This is increasingly important as a number of the deans interviewed in the US and abroad noted that they were conscious of the need to broaden their recruitment efforts to different regions around the world due to decreasing student age populations in their own countries. Only one of the six deans of international schools in this study did not mention the need to pay attention to student recruitment as a major concern for them.

Recurring Findings and Themes

Issues of Innovation/Entrepreneurship

In varying ways, the majority of deans domestically and several of the international deans mentioned the need to be innovative in academic programming development and in academic program delivery. “I can be entrepreneurial at the graduate level and at the executive level. So that entrepreneurial ability provides me with a lot of empowerment to build cool things” (US Dean). In a similar way, an international dean pointed out:

I took the responsibility of leading our businesses and conducting also different projects on a collaborative basis, like new degree or marketing, but in that case has been developed with European business schools perfectly... [a]lso, another important point is developing to reinforce the entrepreneurial spirit...we have what we call we create a platform, which is a factory that tries to be a platform, an incubator, an accelerator for startups...[b]ut they need also the support network of people from the management, the school students at the undergraduate level, as well as at the master level, to work together and to provide the support to develop the business plan and so on (International Dean).

Another US dean referred to his role as an innovator this way:

Again, I think the responsibility to be entrepreneurial has really come to the forefront, and that's in the programs that you develop, in the incentive packages that you put together, as well as in the fund raising. Right. So you really have to be very entrepreneurial, very agile. And, you know, I think when I first started, there was less of a need for that. There was more stability and the. The demands and demands maybe is too strong, the expectations of our students really have shifted, right? I think students are expecting a lot more from the institution and as a result, we're having to do a lot more (US Dean).

An additional US dean emphasized the importance of innovation with the following statement:

I don't think that we can do things in higher end the way we've been doing them. I think it's time to really change our perspective. I think it's going to be a tough job for someone. So I'm also looking for somebody who's got a lot of experience in going in where they don't know a lot and they're not afraid to give us ideas that are completely out of the box (US Dean).

One more US dean interviewed stated the following in regard to their role as entrepreneur:

The [d]ean's job to me is the best job in the world. It is the best job because you run your own business, right, so you get to be entrepreneur and CEO. I mean, yeah, there's some constraints in the university, but, you know, at the end of the day, you know, that's part of the job. You know, you should have to manage problems and personnel. That's part of the job. It is the best job. I only have to build my community and make us happy and then make it easy for the university to see us in a good place (US Dean).

An international dean also addressed the importance of innovation in their role:

And dealing with students in an organized way in organizing comparative initiatives in collaboration was very interesting for me and very amusing in a way. I really enjoyed doing that. And then the second one is...contact with faculty, especially faculty, innovating programs, innovating courses, having innovative initiatives. That's, that's also a very motivating activity for me. It still is where we are innovating a number of programs now to respond to the challenges of technology and the new ways of conceiving, considering business, business activities, business processes, business functions with the use of high technology (International Dean).

At least one of the US deans also mentioned the need to address the fact that the traditional school year with its 15/16 week semester may no longer serve the needs of the increasing number of non-traditional students who may desire a shorter timeframe for their degrees, in addition to traditional students who may wish for a more flexible timetable towards their credentials: “Now we're looking at any type of way of getting to our mission, getting to different types of students and the willingness to try and do other things that are just very different than standard out of the box, bachelor's degree, standard out of the box, master's degree. The willingness to look at those things and the removal of the institutional barriers I've seen change dramatically...” (US Dean). For example, certifications may be more appealing than traditional degree programs to certain classes of students, and these can be appealing sources of revenue for the schools. “Now, what I'd rather see, though, is that smaller credentials stack two degrees. So not to run away from degrees or negate them in any way, but to find ways for them to be more modular” (US Dean).

A number of the deans mentioned the need to be more innovative and entrepreneurial in response to the changing needs of the job market, which for many of the interviewed deans is a

major concern. As one US dean pointed out: “I’m a fairly strong proponent that if we do develop our programs and teach in isolation, we’re not serving anybody, especially not our students. And so I encourage faculty to make connections to people in industry, because if you want to know if your curriculum is preparing your graduates to get jobs, you’ve got to talk to the people who are hiring. And so I use my connections to help with that” (International Dean).

However, some of the domestic participants in the study did note that the nature of academia is such that it takes a great deal of time to create, approve, and promote new programming, such that by the time that a program is approved, the market may no longer be as strong for the product. This is another example presented by one of the study participants of the tensions present in academic capitalism, which drives them as leaders to develop and promote programming that is responsive to and driven by the needs and demands of the job market and potential employers for their students. In this manner, the theory of resource dependency is also evident as the deans may prioritize this kind of academic programming with a view to increasing the resources and funds available to them.

Some of the deans did mention that faculty, who have primary control over new academic programming, welcomed input and advice from external stakeholders, in particular potential employers, donors, and alumni. However, some of these deans also mentioned that the needs, desires, and input into programming from these external stakeholders needed to be balanced with the mission of the institution and the resources and capacities that the institution currently had. As one US dean pointed out:

Because what you don't want is to receive resources for something that the donor is passionate about but doesn't align with the school strategy. Hmm. Because then it's just a forced fit and, you know, you're adding things that really don't make sense. So, you know,

it's something you have to be disciplined, right? You can't just accept any gift for anything (US Dean).

This would be an example of an ongoing tensions between the pressures of academic capitalism in academic programming and the desires to focus on the mission-based strategies of the schools, which in Jesuit schools would generally reference service to the community, and attention paid to contributing to the common good. This tension between programming that is faithful to the school's mission and programming that is attractive to potential students is an element of what the second research question attempted to discern regarding the potential role conflicts that business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad experience. This tension would also represent a response to the concerns raised in the third research question, which inquired as to what extent have tensions between academic capitalism and educating for the common good influenced the responsibilities and decision-making of US business deans and their counterparts abroad.

COVID and its Influence

A minority of the deans mentioned COVID as a major driver in terms of emphasis on new programming or concern for enrollment. One dean framed it this way: “You know, I'm basically a builder and innovator, but because especially covid absorbs so much time and it's not making the trains run on time as much as coordinating” (US Dean). Another US dean pointed out: “[b]ut I don't agree with is layers of bureaucracy and which prevents good units and people from actually making good things happen for the students. So covid brought down a bit of that. But having said that, you know, overall, I think we have collaborative good teams” (US Dean). However, the majority of deans did mention being sensitive to the changes in the market in terms of potential students, so that the need to develop new, innovative, flexible, and attractive

programming had been ongoing before COVID, and would continue into the future. As the deans in this study were exclusively from private institutions, and therefore from schools in general dependent on tuition for the bulk of their revenue, it might be fair to predict that the pressures will persist for these schools to compete for students by providing attractive programming that would be “worth” the investment. As a result of this, for a number of the deans interviewed, employment is a major outcome for their students that concerned them.

Potential Shortcomings of Job Descriptions

While some of the deans did have job descriptions, a number did not. Several of the deans interviewed also mentioned that the job descriptions were not inclusive, as they did not include all of the myriad duties that they were tasked with. Several of them pointed out that this would be unrealistic to expect from any job description; ultimately, different duties may develop as in any high level position and the administrators would need to take these on to be effective leaders. As one US dean pointed out:

So in some ways, the job descriptions, while providing guidance over what how a job was designed to have overall authority for running undergraduate, graduate and executive programs for business school...at the same time, I don't want to say they're laughable, but, you know, we do what needs to be done to keep the school progressing on its strategic plan and its strategic goals. And for me, that's an umbrella over everything (US Dean).

Another US dean emphasized: “My sense is that any of the job descriptions or profile only capture the main part of any position, that I won't be exactly comprehensive, accurate as the reality is. So they come close to it and it captures the main things” (US Dean).

Team Development: Building Teams that Advance the Institution

Several of the deans highlighted what they believed to be key roles that they played in terms of encouraging and promoting the development of and support for their own leadership teams in their own leadership roles:

I'm a builder. I love creating effective teams. I love finding the talent that's needed to execute on a particular vision and then just letting people do their thing and being able to say, look what we brought together and build. I'm a builder. I mean, as a kid, I love building Legos. I mean, I'm still playing with Legos. You know, there's lots of I just I love managing people, identifying talent and letting them just grow. You know, my job is to enable others. It's not to put barriers in the way. And if you've got a great idea and we've got buy in on that idea, my job is to get out of the way and to remove things that are to prevent you from doing your best work, whether you're a faculty member, teaching a class and want to do something creative with industry, whether it's creating a new executive education program, whether it's tweaking the curriculum. My job is to be the enabler (US Dean).

An international dean stated the following regarding the importance of teams to his work, and that of the school:

I think my team my office has...has one, two, three people helping me, one of them is in charge of a student's affairs. And then there is my executive assistant. And then there are a professor who is a professor who usually do things related, like an assistant dean for education. This is key. I mean, these resources are very important for everything to do his or her job in a convenient manner. So you're very sure it's a very good team in your

office. And then it is very obvious, but I'm going to say it, you need a good budget. Yeah, you need a good budget. You need you need to make sure that you have the financial resources to support initiatives for to innovate programs. To support innovation initiatives by professors like developing new materials for courses, videos, podcast, whatever do they need (International Dean).

And one US dean highlighted importance of team building to the dean's effectiveness in their role:

Leaders in general, particularly deans it's the ability to select people and put together good teams, right? And because I can't imagine doing anything we try to do. Here without having great people. Who are at times part of great teams, and if you don't have that knack or insight or capacity as a leader. You're not going to be very good. And, you know, it's the same old thing, right, that we all learn through our experiences in our education, you know, that the best salesperson doesn't necessarily make the best sales manager, the best three point shooter isn't necessarily the best college coach (US Dean).

One dean described the role of their associate deans as being particularly important, with an "all hands on deck" philosophy that would have each member of the leadership team tasked with stepping up to accomplish whatever tasks were needed to advance the school. Team building would also be essential, according to these same interview participants, in order to encourage and to develop the innovative entrepreneurship skills needed to meet the challenges of the market for students and for businesses and potential employers.

Program Development Is Key

Across the board, for virtually all the deans interviewed, both domestic and international, a key role highlighted as a priority for them was program development. These programs would be in response to recruitment of potential students (a concern for the majority of deans, both domestic and international) and for programming that would respond to the needs of the job market, and thus provide employment for their schools' graduates (a concern in particular for a number of the U.S. deans, and for some of the international deans interviewed). As one of the international deans pointed out:

We also develop new academic programs, new initiatives, the internationalization, of course, and accreditation rankings. So more or less, I can summarize to my nature, of course, faculty to provide the support for research, to participate, of course, very actively in the strategic plan for every three, four years. So these yeah, those are the main points that should be expected to cover by the by the dean and of course, working with the rest of the team (International Dean).

For most of the deans, increased enrollments and attractive new programming would also increase revenue, which is a major concern for these deans of private institutions that are in general reliant primarily on tuition for a large percentage of their income (certainly the case for the international institutions, and less for the U.S. institutions that have been able to rely upon philanthropy for a portion of their revenues). In addition, tuition revenues are major sources of revenues for Jesuit business schools as their institutions rely less upon their endowments, as in general, as their endowments tend to be modest.

Concerns with Contributions to University Overhead: Restrictions on Available Resources

An unexpected comment from several of the U.S. deans, as well as one of the international deans, was the dissatisfaction and/or concern with the percentage of revenues earned by the business schools that was expected to be turned over their respective universities to cover overhead. As the business schools tended to be the divisions that had profitable programs, and brought in more revenue than other schools at these universities, the burden of overhead fell disproportionately to the business schools to cover financial shortfalls from other divisions. The resentment resulting from this financial obligation meant that financial resources that could be used to support more faculty, staff, or other funds for faculty development and other business school needs were not available. It became an issue of justice for some of the deans. In addition, it raised the issue of potentially disincentivizing business schools to develop new, innovative programming that would attract growing enrollments if such a high percentage of the revenues would not remain with the division in which they originated.

Jesuit Mission: Similarities between Institutions, with Varying Emphases

While mission was stated as being a top priority for deans in the U.S. and internationally, the mission was interpreted in different ways. Many of the deans mentioned service to the community, and the need for the business programs in their schools to train ethically motivated and morally aware graduates that would be sensitive to the needs of their communities. As one US dean noted:

And then we also say we need to develop opportunities for students who will understand what I mean, being socially responsible, how they can see the impact of their socially responsible action will bring with an impact. So we develop certain learning courses. So

it's a learning course that students are doing nonprofit projects for our neighboring communities (US dean).

Many deans spoke of the need for training new leaders for a globalized world, with the need to form these future leaders with sensitivities to the needs of a multicultural environment. While the wording of the mission statements may differ, many stated the common elements of Jesuit university mission statements such as service to communities in need and acknowledgement of the realities of marginalized populations in their local communities and in the broader world. As one US dean stated:

So what can we do to train our students to be change agents, for example? What kind of businesses do they want to go to work for? What kind of employers do they want? Do they do they look for a brand promise, a relevancy to social consciousness in the employers that they choose to work for? So we see that employers are becoming very conscious of their brand promise to their customers. We can offer opportunities and we do here for our students to engage with minority business owners in the community to hear from them directly, challenges that they face, perhaps in raising capital, perhaps, and affording the I.T. talent and resources that they need to be the consultants that they cannot afford, that other companies can. So these are, you know, on the ground. In the weeds, opportunities for our students [so they] may be change agents (US Dean).

One US dean pointed out specifically how new programming, while being responsive to and sensitive to the needs of the market by building skill sets needed by employers, also needed to remain faithful to the goals of the mission. Some of the international deans mentioned the importance of cultural artefacts in the mission, highlighting the importance of making faculty, students, and staff aware of the cultural and spiritual heritage derived from the historical

influence on the institution of the founder of the Jesuit order, Ignatius of Loyola. But most of the deans did not speak of their schools' mission in terms of this cultural and spiritual heritage of St. Ignatius; they spoke of the general context of their mission statements in terms of service to the community, however defined on a local and international level, and of preparing students to serve in a business world within a global context and forming them to be ethically aware members of the business community with skill sets that meet the demands of the job marketplace today and in the future.

Accreditation Pressures in Addition to Enrollment Pressures

More than one of the deans pointed out that accreditation requirements from AACSB also required that the schools divulge the metrics that they use to evaluate and assess how they are carrying out their missions. Recent changes to the accreditation standards of AACSB also highlight the importance of a clear statement of mission for business schools; these requirements rely upon a set of metrics to accurately measure how the institutions are living up to the commitments stated in the mission statements. As stated previously, AACSB accreditation is an important standard of quality that sends signals to prospective students, faculty, and staff, so AACSB accreditation might help to alleviate some of the enrollment concerns that a number of the deans in the study have pointed out as a high priority in their jobs due to the fact that these private institutions are heavily dependent on tuition revenues.

One dean also mentioned the drawbacks that accreditation could bring in the case of restricting or slowing down the implementation of innovative programming:

That's also the accrediting body's constraint. I'll give you another example if I may. Just again, where you see some of this these pieces are going to be innovative. We, we took in

an executive ed model. To a company and decided to do the training, it's our classes that are already approved, it's our curriculum, it's already approved, it's our faculty that's already approved. But the company said, we would like you to come and deliver this in our conference room or at our place. That makes sense. Our accrediting body [...] says if you do more than 50 percent of your curriculum off of your chairs, you own and do them and chairs somebody else's. So we need to come out and do an accreditation site visit.

Well, that's ridiculous, that's ridiculous (US Dean).

Resources Are Key: But not Always Sufficient to Support Programming Initiatives

All deans mentioned that resources, particularly human resources and human capital, as well as financial resources, are crucial to supporting key aspects of their roles, such as supporting new program initiatives. Many of the deans pointed out that human resources include not just faculty, but also staff support for programs. Many deans pointed out that they were operating with minimal staffing, and that they could use more faculty and staff. However, given the demands on the resources available to them now, they knew that they could not develop the curricular and co-curricular initiatives that could be successful and lead to increased enrollments for their schools. Nonetheless, a few of the deans did point out that they had the staffing that they needed, but these deans were in the minority. One international dean mentioned the importance of human capital from their perspective:

Of course, faculty and staff with faculty being the most important resource. And because of the requirements for business, schools are becoming more stringent, the steps we're going through accreditation, how the you know, the let's say the accomplishments of the faculty, the credentials of the faculty are becoming more stringent and therefore fewer

qualified right away. So we have to both, you know, determine how to hire more with the right profile and how to develop the current ones we have (International Dean).

In terms of financial resources, a number of deans expressed a desire to have more funds for faculty scholarship and faculty course buyouts so that faculty could develop new and innovative programs that would contribute to the future growth of their institutions. In terms of the importance of faculty research in their search for external sources of funds, one US dean made the following comment:

Yeah, I would love to have an endowment that provides unlimited research support for my faculty who really are active researchers. So that's definitely a priority in fundraising when those resources are there. I always want to look for ways to say yes. So when faculty comes to me with their hand out and they all do, I want to be able to say, if you do X, Y and Z, I can get you this or so. So I'm building a foundation for that. And we're really trying to make the case for why research is so important to support. But I get very little from the university on that. There're some individual grants, my centers. I'm getting them to write [for] grants so that they can offer more grants. So we're looking at lots of different ways to for faculty to be supported in the research (US Dean).

One US dean also highlighted the importance of targeting and using resources wisely, taking into consideration the capacities of the institution:

Both human capital and financial resources, both human capital and financial resources, we have some you know, we are identifying key areas. We can't be everything to everybody. Nobody can... then you are kind of average everywhere. So identifying our key, key competencies, making sure that we are data driven, we make data driven decisions, making sure we invest resources in key areas. So my job as Dean is to ensure

that we have access to financial resources and that we bring in the talent that we need to execute. Those are really connecting those dots and working with my development team on the aspect of financial resources and working with the data that we have with my with my leadership (US Dean).

The US deans also mentioned frequently how important fundraising with external stakeholders, alumni and businesses, was to their roles. However, they mentioned that given the way the fundraising division was structured in their institutions they frequently did not have the support staff needed to fulfill this duty. In most of the institutions of the deans interviewed (including the international ones), fundraising is centralized in one university department. A number of the US deans mentioned the need to have more fundraising staff dedicated to raising funds for the business school, who would be charged with working directly with the deans themselves to identify, court, and develop relationships with potential donors.

Exploring New Partnerships with Business Organizations

A number of the U.S. deans and some of the international deans mentioned partnerships with businesses. This could be for development of certain dedicated programming, or simply having them in an advisory capacity for to programming development, with an acknowledgement of the importance of connecting the school's graduates with businesses that would provide them with job opportunities:

I'd like to spend more time in the business community creating relationships and networking, because I can bring that directly back to my business school. We have an industry leaders program where business leaders teach with our faculty. We've been able to do that in two divisions. I'd like to be able to have that happening in every department and I'd like to be able to navigate that those business relationships in a way that build

strong advisory councils for each of the disciplines so that my disciplines can ensure that they are being up to date and really just in time curricular change and adaptation (US Dean).

This outreach on the part of the deans appeared to be more frequent among the deans of US institutions interviewed, but some international deans who participated in the study did point out the value that programming and research options with links to businesses in their countries could provide for the educational experience of their students, faculty and staff. For example, one international dean mentioned the following:

One is I want that industry is present in our rules, in our classrooms by trying to explain the case studies. We have very good relationships with our alumni association, which is in charge of the first employment. We have very, very high rate of employment... So, yeah. So it's very, very important that the high rates of employment and we work a lot with industry and also for internships, which are compulsory in our budget programs and also in our transfer of knowledge projects, that we develop faculty with certain industry. And that would be the main creative relationships that we have with industry. We have also conferences which each month we [have] with the alumni association... faculty and alumni are invited to go (International Dean).

A US dean noted the following regarding the importance of relationship building with external stakeholders:

We're building new programs, new delivery formats, some of them with partners, which require a lot of relationship building, partner communication, all good, but all very time consuming, I would say. And then also, I think one of my areas that I like best about being in a role is building a corporate foundation, relationships that directly benefit our

students. So there's always like a ton of moving parts, but like sort of that idea stage where you figure out what you can do together and then building something that's meaningful and impactful for all parties involved (US dean).

Least Enjoyable Aspects of Roles Regarding Personnel Obligations

The majority of U.S. deans, and some international deans, pointed out that the aspects of their roles that they found least appealing involved dealing with personnel issues, particularly conflicts within their faculty and staff. As one US dean pointed out: “Yeah, I hate friction among faculty members and conflict between departments that I, I can't solve. And a lot of times it's personality issues and I'm sure, like more experienced hands, like just deal with it. And, you know, they leave work and they go to bed at night. It's not a big deal. Meanwhile, like, I'm worried about it all night” (US Dean). Another US dean mentioned the following:

If you if you have the 80, 20 rule, 80 percent of the people are fine, it's dealing with the 20 and learning how to deal with that, because again, back when you're a faculty, you just bark right back. Well, now I have to I have to use very different language than I did. And so that's harder to do. You need to be the diplomacy of your language. And so it is extremely important as it's harder to do. And it would just be easier if people were not so ingrained in in what they do and how they do things (US Dean).

An international dean noted the following in their perception of their role as intervening in personnel issues, particularly those involving concerns regarding students and professors:

I think I would, I would choose to go to situations or problems that I see that are becoming more and more difficult. One, if the relationship between the students and professors. And more precisely in the relationship since the pandemic. When you have

the students in a classroom, you know them in a different way than when you have them in a screen (International Dean).

Some also mentioned they felt that the amount of time spent in meetings and on personnel conflicts and problems drew them away from some of the more urgent external stakeholder engagement that they found crucial for them to pursue. A number of the deans commented that conflict resolution was not a part of their academic and professional training, and as a result this left them perhaps with a skill deficit as they were called upon to address these kinds of human resource concerns.

Fundraising and Donations as Key to US Deans' Roles

As expected, the vast majority of US deans interviewed stated that fundraising and securing external donations representation a major expectation of their roles from upper administration, and this expectation became even more acute as other financial resources from their institutions were not sufficient for their needs, such as faculty hiring, faculty support, student support, and program development. As one US dean pointed out regarding this key role:

So raising money so that we can support faculty as they develop new courses. New modules surround scholarships for both graduate undergraduate PhD students. It's around faculty research in operational budgets. There's really not enough to support the research efforts of our faculty...[a]nd we're even raising money for career support. Again, one of the really important elements of the business school is its career placement. So, again, the operational budgets are challenged. So we look to...this fundraising piece to provide extra support to the student (US Dean).

Interestingly enough, while the six international Jesuit school deans did mention that they were also reliant primarily upon tuition revenues, most did not state worries about sufficient financial resources were major concerns for them. Some did mention, however, that they did have concerns about hiring faculty who were sufficiently up to accreditation standards, and in some cases, this would take more financial resources than their institutions were accustomed to in the past, as accreditation standards would require higher percentages of faculty with doctoral degrees in business subjects (who would command much higher salaries than those who didn't have these degrees). Nonetheless, for the international universities represented in this study, fundraising still is centered in a university division apart from the business schools, and the business schools deans who participated in this study did not have specific fundraising obligations. However, engagement with outside stakeholders such as businesses was a part of their roles, as this would enable these stakeholders to contribute to suggestions for new, market responsive programs, as well as research opportunities for faculty, and research and job opportunities for students. I did not expect this to be the case, given the enrollment pressures that private institutions around the world in Jesuit higher education are experiencing (and their reliance upon tuition and fees for the bulk of their revenues); I would have presumed that the deans of international business schools would be tasked with being more proactive and involved in fundraising for their schools, as they, like the deans of US business schools, would be faced with increasing demands on the financial resources currently available to them.

Donors, Alumni, and Growing Expectations concerning External Roles

All the U.S. deans mentioned high expectations around external activities, interacting with potential donors, alumni, and businesses. Almost all of them highlighted that they would

like to be able to spend more time working with these external stakeholders, but given the other demands of their jobs, they did not have the time. Some of the U.S. deans also mentioned the heightened responsibility that they shoulder for the overall university regarding their affinity with and potential to have access to large money donors and leaders in the business community. Therefore, while the business deans had to deal with having a relatively high percentage of their revenues turned over to cover the general operating expenses and overhead of the university, these deans also had access to major sources of funds in the business community given the subject matter taught in the business schools, and from the connections established between the alumni and professors engaged in the various professional business disciplines such as accounting, finance, management, and marketing.

Concerns with the Need to Request Permissions from Higher Administrators

Several US deans, and one of the international deans interviewed in the study, mentioned their concern with having to ask permission from higher authorities to hire and to spend funds. They mentioned that this seemed to limit their autonomy, and keep them out of the highest level of authority and influence in the university. One even mentioned the concern that by not being on the president's cabinet, the most important, influential decision making was out of their hands, and this in turn impacted their own ability to charter and to steer the future of the business school:

But an individual college leader is certainly in a business school where I feel like I'm the CEO of my college. It's frustrating to not be able to be in a cabinet level position. So I really do define my job operationally as one that some high level middle manager, but it's middle management...I think [upper level university administrators] believe that the

deans are true academic leaders, and we are. But do they have the same role in impacting university policy (US Dean)?

This aspect of the dean's role, as a leader without explicit authority to make major decisions that impact their school, might be considered an element of the role ambiguity in the dean's position that the second research question addressed. This would impact the availability of resources for program development, faculty research and development, which would potentially produce programs that would be attractive enough for new students, and take into consideration the input of the external stakeholders from the business community, including potential donors (more of an issue for U.S. deans), and potential employers for graduates of the institution and sources of research for faculty and students.

Chapter 5

Summary

In conclusion, the roles that business school deans at Jesuit affiliated schools of business play are varied. The theoretical framework of this study, resource dependence theory, shone light on the reliance that many of the deans (US based deans in particular) on upper level university administration for the financial and human resources needed to develop, promote, and support key programming initiatives that would enhance enrollment and address the needs and concerns of stakeholders such as students, faculty, alumni, and members of the business community. Academic capitalism, an additional theoretical construct, helped to clarify the obligations that many of the deans found that they had regarding promotion of academic programs that would enhance enrollment and therefore increase revenue.

The first research question of this study sought to examine the roles that business deans at Jesuit universities in the US and abroad find that particularly challenge them, and how these roles may have evolved and changed. Many of these deans, US and international, highlighted the importance of external engagement with stakeholders such as businesses, alumni, etc. While US Jesuit business school deans who participated in the study mentioned that fundraising has been and remains a major role for them, the international deans who participated in the study did not mention this as a priority or a large role for them. However, almost all of the US and international deans who participated in the study mentioned that program development was a major concern

and responsibility that they have, with the express purpose and expectation that creating these programs would lead to growing enrollments in their schools.

The second research question in the study looked at potential role conflicts and ambiguities in the roles of the deans. Some key conflicts in their roles, as expressed by some of the U.S. deans, include the large percentage of the revenues that some of them have had to turn over to the upper administration of their institutions; this would be a potential conflict and area of concern for them as they are charged with increasing revenues for their divisions, yet such a large percentage of this income does not stay within the schools of business. One international dean did mention this as a concern in their school, too, but other than that one example, only US deans raised this as a concern. Many, particularly in the US, mentioned the restrictions that they operate under, particularly with staffing, when it comes to developing, promoting, and staffing academic programs. Funds for faculty and support staff lines were not without limit, and while many US deans who participated in the study expressed that they would have liked to spend more time in external fundraising to help alleviate these funding concerns, other duties within their schools have a claim on their time. As one US dean pointed out, procuring additional resources should be a key aspect of their role:

To providing more support staff, more faculty. You know, I'd love to have faculty teach less so that they could devote more time to student advising and more time to, you know, presenting papers and have a more balanced...I definitely think we need more support here for the teams. New courses, you know, oftentimes I'd love to run a course with just a few people just as a pilot, but because resources are constrained, you can't have to think about what does that do (US Dean).

In particular, a number of the deans, both U.S. and international, mentioned their roles in resolving personnel issues as taking crucial time away from pursuing other important duties. Two deans did mention specifically having to ask higher administrators for permission to make decisions that they felt that they should have completed without seeking upper level approval. This hindered efficiency in program development, and interfered with moving forward with procuring sufficient staffing and faculty for these programs. One US dean mentioned the concern with the long period of time needed to plan, develop, and implement academic programs, and that by the time that the programs are brought to fruition they may no longer serve current market needs. And two deans, one from the US and one international, mentioned that there was a tension at times between developing and implementing academic programs that are faithful to the mission while at the same time responsive to changing needs of the marketplace. Therefore, we might state that while the roles of the deans are multivariate, including both internal and external obligations, the time demands for program development and future student enrollment may put them in conflict with other duties. However, it is important to note that most of the U.S. deans did state that they wanted to spend more time on external engagement with stakeholders such as members of the local and national business communities, alumni, and potential employers for their school's graduates.

Lastly, the third research question in the study looked at the extent that tensions between academic capitalism and educating for the common good influenced the responsibilities and decision-making of these US business deans and their counterparts abroad, and the US and the international deans for the most part expressed their desire to serve both, creating academic programs that would bring in students and revenue based on market demands (academic capitalism), and also making sure that these programs supported the missions of their schools. It was in the mission statements of these schools, all drawing from a Jesuit tradition of service to

others, including service to the marginalized in societies, that the service of the common good would be expressed. The international deans, like the US deans, highlighted the service aspect of their programs as being key; service to society was considered a crucial aspect of the programs that the schools developed, all while being very much aware that as private institutions their schools needed to attract students to programs that would provide these students with the skill sets to find employment once they graduated.

Recommendations for Practice

As a number of the deans mentioned that access to sufficient resources was important to fulfillment of the numerous roles, internal and external, that they had, it could be considered key to have their voices heard on a regular basis in meetings of the highest level of administration at their institutions. One dean in particular mentioned the dilemma inherent in working with the provost, or chief academic officer, to procure key resources for their school. Provosts work with and assess the needs of all academic divisions, so that individual deans may not find their particular voices heard to the extent that they would like. Having the dean on the university president's cabinet would bring the deans' voices to a higher level of administration. Business school deans traditionally at domestic and international universities are frequently called upon to connect with their alumni and their monied supporters in the local business communities for the purpose of overall university support, so inviting them to participate on a cabinet level advisory level would enable their voices to be heard at levels where resource distribution decisions are influenced and made.

Not bringing the voices of the deans to this higher level of university administration, and not addressing the challenges of the multiple roles that the deans are asked to undertake, could lead to job dissatisfaction and desire to leave their positions and seek employment elsewhere.

This could lead to further shortening of their tenure as leaders of their schools, given the potential for rising levels of frustration at not procuring sufficient resources to accomplish the myriad of internal and external roles and obligations. Encouraging the deans to persist and continue in their positions would add a level of consistency and continuity to development of strategic goals such as building relationships with alumni and local businesses in order to provide support and input for academic programs that would appeal to the market.

As the study has demonstrated that external fundraising continues to be a major role expectation for the majority of the US business school deans at Jesuit affiliated universities, sufficient resources in terms of personnel would be important for these deans to fulfill this role. A number of the deans had pointed out the need for additional, dedicated support staff to assist in accomplishing the tasks associated in building long term, mutually supportive relationships with potential donors. This additional staff would enable the deans to prioritize the kinds of engagement with potential donors that would ensure the greatest return on the deans' investment of time and effort. The staff could help with leveraging the deans' engagement with alumni by assisting with expanding the level of participation on deans' advisory boards and enhancing the business schools' and the deans' involvement with local and regional business communities. Enhancing the fundraising resources available to the business school deans would not only assist with resource enhancement for the business school itself, but would also help in raising the profile of the overall institution itself.

The deans could also make use of the human resources divisions of their institutions to perform a position analysis on the administrative positions within their schools. This would aid in establishing optimal allocation of school resources for administration. For example, associate deans could be tasked with more of the internal roles of personnel management and conflict

resolution among faculty, and even a broader share of responsibility for program development, leaving the academic deans to devote more time to the external facing roles of community engagement, relationships with local businesses, and fundraising. This would expand and develop the administrative skill sets of the associate deans, while at the same time increasing the amount of time that the deans could devote to resource development from outside sources.

Conclusion

Again, this study only interviewed 19 deans of Jesuit affiliated business schools, and six of them were international. A more robust study would be needed in the future to verify and further support these findings, particularly the ones that point to potential commonality between the US and the international deans in their focus on program development and student enrollment, and the possibility of a converging model of business school deanship common to US and international institutions. Post COVID, it would be informative to research whether pressures to develop new programs and increase enrollments will be felt even more intensely by the domestic and international deans. These deans face the challenge of a world with ever increasing competition between educational providers, with institutions in many developed countries faced with a decreasing number of traditional students, forcing them to broaden the market in which they compete for students. Future studies should examine how these US and international deans of Jesuit affiliated business schools are addressing the challenges of the marketplace with programs that appeal to students while at the same time forming these students to be leaders in the business world that are ethical in their behaviors and sensitive to the needs of the marginalized in the world, and willing to engage in service to others in this common home of Earth.

REFERENCES

- Alajoutsijärvi, K. & Kettunen, K. (2016). The “dean’s squeeze” revisited: a contextual approach. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(3), 326-340. DOI 10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0017
- Altbach, P.G. and Welch, A. (2011) The perils of commercialism: Australia’s example. *International Higher Education*, 62(Winter), 21-23.
- Arntzen, E. (2016). The changing role of deans in higher education – from leader to manager. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(9), 2068–2075.
<https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040918>
- Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU). (2020, August 14). *28 Schools, 1 shared mission*. www.ajcunet.edu/institutions
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1), 67–92. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.12.080186.000435>
- Bobe, B. J., & Kober, R. (2018). University dean personal characteristics and use of management control systems and performance measures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1504911>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/qjrj0902027>
- Bradshaw, D. (2015, April 26). Short tenure of dean signals a leadership void. *Financial Times*.
<https://www.ft.com/content/8af77ab4-e442-11e4-9039-00144feab7de>

- Bray, N. J. (2008). Proscriptive norms for academic deans: Comparing faculty expectations across institutional and disciplinary boundaries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(6), 692–721. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25144704>
- Butin, D. (2016, January 13). So you want to be a dean? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/So-You-Want-to-Be-a-Dean-/234900>
- Bystydzienski, J., Thomas, N., Howe, S., & Desai, A. (2016). The leadership role of college deans and department chairs in academic culture change. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(12), 2301–2315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1152464>
- Clarke, B. R. (2004). *Sustaining change in universities: Continuities in case studies and concepts*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Coll, K. M., Niles, S. G., Coll, K. A., Ruch, C. P., & Stewart, R. A. (2019). Academic deans: Perceptions of effort-reward imbalance, over-commitment, hardiness, and burnout. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(4), 124–135. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n4p124>
- de Boer, H., & Goedegebuure, L. (2009). The changing nature of the academic deanship. *Leadership*, 5(3), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715009337765>
- Davis, G. F., & Cobb, J. (2010). Resource dependence theory: Past and future. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 28, 21–42. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X\(2010\)0000028006](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X(2010)0000028006)
- Del Favero, M. (2005). The social dimension of academic discipline as a discriminator of academic deans' administrative behaviors. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(1), 69–96. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2005.0066>

- Del Favero, M. (2006). Disciplinary variation in preparation for the academic dean role. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 25(3), 277–292.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360600793069>
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51–59.
- Eisner, E. (2003). Educational connoisseurship and educational criticism: An Arts-based approach to educational evaluation. *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation*, 153–166. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0309-4_11
- Gallos, J.V. (2002). The dean's squeeze: The myths and realities of academic leadership in the middle. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1(2), 174-184.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? *Field Methods*. 18(1), 59–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822x05279903>
- Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193–206.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628>
- Hearn, J.C. (2003). Diversifying campus revenue streams; Opportunities and risks. *Informed Practice: Syntheses of Higher Education Research for Campus Leaders*. American Council of Education Center for Policy Analysis. 1-39.
- Hearn, J.C., Warshaw, J.B., & Ciarimboli, E.B. (2018). Privatization and accountability trends and policies in U.S. public higher education. *Education and Science*, 41(184), 1-26.

Henk, B., Wepner, S., Lovell, S., & Melnick, S. (2017). Education deans' beliefs about essential ways of thinking, being, and acting: A national survey. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 32, 195–213. https://epublications.marquette.edu/edu_fac/428/

International Association of Jesuit Universities. An inspirational paradigm for Jesuit business education. (June 2020). 1-7.

file:///C:/Users/mosta/AppData/Local/Temp/An%20Inspirational%20Paradigm%20for%20Jesuit%20Business%20Education%20June%202020-1.pdf

Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2005). Moving toward the market and away from public service? Effects of resource dependency and academic capitalism. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 10(3), 53-67.

Johnstone, Bruce. (2005). A political culture of giving and the philanthropic support of higher education in international perspective. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 5(3), 256-264.

Johnstone, Bruce. (2002). Challenges of financial austerity: Imperatives and limitations of revenue diversification in higher education. *The Welsh Journal of Higher Education*, 11(1), 18-36.

June, A. W. (2014, November 24). It all comes down to the dean. How to be a dean. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-to-Be-a-Dean/150203/?cid=inline-promo>

Kambil, A., & Budnik, S. (2013, May 1). Taking the reins as a business school dean. *Deloitte Insights*. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/talent/taking-the-reins-as-a-business-school-dean.html>

Kehm, Barbara. (2014). Neo-liberalism: Higher education in Europe and the global public

- good. In P. Gibbs & R. Barnett (Eds.), *Thinking about Higher Education* (pp. 91-108). Springer.
- Kohtamäki, V. (2019). Academic leadership and university reform-guided management changes in Finland. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 41(1), 70-85.
- Lipnicka, M. & Verhoeven, J.C. (2014). The application of institutionalism and the resource dependence theory for study changes in universities within Europe. *Annals of Social Sciences*, 4, 7-30.
- Loyola University of Chicago. Jesuit Community at Loyola University Chicago. Biography of St. Ignatius Loyola. (2020, August 15).
<https://www.luc.edu/mission/archivedjesuitpages/jesuitcommunityatloyolauniversitychicago/biographyofstignatiusloyola/>
- McBride, S. A. (2000). Academic Economics: The academic dean and financial management. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2000(109), 51–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.10907>
- McClure, K. R., & Teitelbaum, K. (2016). Leading schools of education in the context of academic capitalism: Deans’ responses to state policy changes. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(6), 793–809. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316653690>
- Mangan, K. (2014, November 24). Business schools are hiring a new kind of dean. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-to-Be-a-Dean/150203/?cid=inline-promo>
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research*. Sage, Cop.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research : A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass, Cop.

- Montez, J. M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). The roles and challenges of deans. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0034>
- Morris, T. L., & Laipple, J.S. (2015). Leadership challenges: Perceptions of effectiveness of deans and chairs. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 30(1), 110-118.
- Newsweek Educational Insight. When you look for the best in business education, look for AACSB accreditation. Retrieved September 28, 2020, from <https://www.newsweek.com/insights/aacsb-accredited-universities-2016>
- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G.R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row.
- Powell, K. K. & Rey, M. P. (2015). Exploring a resource dependency perspective as an organizational strategy for building resource capacity. *Management in Education*, 29(3), 94–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020615586805>
- Presidents of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities. (2010). *The Jesuit, Catholic mission of U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities*. Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities. https://www.xavier.edu/jesuitresource/online-resources/documents/TheJesuitCatholicMissionofJesuitCollegesandUniversities_PDF.pdf
- Pusser, B. (2014). Forces in tension: The state, civil society and market in the future of the university. In P. Gibbs & R. Barnett (Eds.), *Thinking about Higher Education* (pp. 71-88). Springer. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-03254-2
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486>

- Rosser, V. J., Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(1), 1–25. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3648262>
- Rubins, I. (2007). Risks and rewards of academic capitalism and the effects of presidential leadership in the entrepreneurial university. *Perspectives in Public Affairs*. Spring, 3-18.
- Saldaña, Johnny. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage Press.
- Slaughter, S., and Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S. & Cantwell, B. (2012). Transatlantic moves to the market: The United States and the European Union. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63, 583–606.
DOI 10.1007/s10734-011-9460-9
- Strathe, M. I., & Wilson, V. W. (2006). Academic leadership: The pathway to and from. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2006(134), 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.212>
- Thomas, H., & Thomas, L. (2011). Perspectives on leadership in business schools. *Journal of Management Development*, 30(5), 526-540.
- Xavier University. (2020, August 14). *12 Characteristics of Jesuit education* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CVQDR5TfHTQ>
- Weiler, H.N. (2000). States, markets and university funding: new paradigms for the reform of higher education in Europe. *Compare*, 30(3), 333-39.
- Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Gmelch, W. H. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70(1), 80-106. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2649119>

Wolverton, M., & Poch, S. (2000). The nexus between academic deans and corporate CEOs: An opportunity in the making. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 122–132.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190000700309>

Wolverton, M. (2009). The academic deanship: Direction versus reflection: Building the academic deanship: Strategies for success. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(3), 354–

356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11779018>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

I: Welcome/Introduction

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate in this study. As I mentioned earlier in my communication with you, I am conducting research on the roles that Jesuit business school deans perform in institutions around the world. The questions will address the various roles and obligations that you have in your current position. The interview should take between 45 and 60 minutes. I would like to record our conversation and then procure a verbatim transcript of the conversation. I will then verify the transcript checking by reviewing the recording, after which the recording will be deleted. The transcripts will be maintained on a secure server for only the length of time required by the University of Georgia's Internal Research Review Board.

May I record our conversation?

Confidentiality is important, so I can assure you that I will do my best by taking reasonable precautions in order to keep your identity secret. Any findings from this research that are made public will not include identifiers that can be specifically linked to you personally. If you have any further questions at any time about confidentiality, please let me know.

If at any time you wish to end our conversation, please let me know.

May we begin now?

II: Interview Questions

A. Job Background/Previous Experience:

1. What is your title/how long have you been in your position at this institution/what positions have you held before/where have you held them?
2. Can you tell me about your educational background?

B. Questions Addressing Possible Role Conflict/Role Ambiguity, Challenges on the Job:

3. If you were given a detailed job description when you applied/were hired for this position, does it describe your current job priorities/duties accurately? If not, what are the differences? Are there responsibilities that you have taken on that you did not anticipate when you began your job?
4. What about your job has changed since you have taken on the position?
5. Can you describe any shift in expectations from university administration over the years that you have been in the job?
6. What do you find particularly challenging about your role as dean?
7. What aspects of your role do you enjoy the most?
8. What aspects of your role do you enjoy the least?
9. How has your educational and professional background prepared you for the demands of your job?

C. Questions Concerning Available Resources:

10. What aspects of your role would you like to devote more of your time to, but you feel you cannot due to external/ internal pressures of the job? What are these external/internal pressures?

11. What kinds of resources do you find to be most important to fulfill your job responsibilities? Can you talk more about how your access to these resources?

D. Questions Concerning University/School Mission, Strategic Plan, and Resource Availability for Fulfillment of Mission and Strategic Plan:

12. Tell me about your university's and your school's mission statement. How have you been able to implement the school's mission as described in the mission statement in your work?

13. Does your school and/or university have a strategic plan? If so, how do the strategic plans intersect with the school's/the university's mission statement?

14. What kinds of resources do you feel you need to be able to support and carry out these strategic plans and mission statement?

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

Dear _____;

Greetings! I hope this message finds you well. You may already know that in addition to my duties at the Quinlan School of Business at Loyola University Chicago, and my role in the International Association of Jesuit Business School Deans, I am currently enrolled in an EdD program at the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. As such, I am undertaking, under the direction of Dr. Jim Hearn (jhearn@uga.edu), a comparative study of Jesuit business school deans in the United States and abroad. I would be honored if you would be willing to take time out of your busy schedule to participate in this study.

I would ask between 45 and 60 minutes of your time to answer a series of questions regarding your responsibilities and duties in your role as dean. The interview would be done by Zoom, and would be recorded. A verbatim transcript would then be produced, and verified for accuracy against the video recording. The recording would then be erased.

I will take the utmost care in protecting your identity. The data will only be accessible to me, and I will encrypt the transcript and the codes linking you to the data, and maintain them on a secure server and on my personal locked computer in my secured residence. This data will then be destroyed after a period of time as determined by the Internal Research Review Board (IRB)

of the University of Georgia. In the study itself, individuals will only be identified by generic descriptors, such as “US dean,” or “international dean.”

Your participation is completely voluntary, and should you choose to participate, you may stop and withdraw at any time without any penalty or negative repercussion. I would then use the materials and data from our discussion up to the point of withdrawal, unless you would prefer I do not, and you submit a written request to that effect.

There are no known risks at the present resulting from participation in this study. Should you have any questions in this regard, please feel free to contact me at flarocca1@luc.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant in this study, please feel free to contact The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 629 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411. Tel: (706) 542-3199. Email: IRB@uga.edu.

I do hope that you will accept my invitation to participate in this study. I know that your input would be an immeasurable contribution. But please remember that I would understand completely if you would rather not participate.

I will follow up with you in another week to discuss your potential availability for the study.

With gratitude for your consideration,

Frank LaRocca, SJ