

■ SCOTT M. SHAFER, Feature Editor, Babcock Graduate School of Management, Wake Forest University

Preliminary Results of First Web-Based Membership Survey

Scott M. Shafer, Feature Editor



Scott M. Shafer

is an associate professor of operations management at the Babcock Graduate School of Management at Wake Forest University. His current research interests are in the areas of cellular manufacturing, operations strategy, business process design, and information technology. Dr. Shafer is the current member services coordinator of the Decision Sciences Institute, a former member of the Board of Advisors of SOLE-The International Society of Logistics, and is certified in Production and Inventory Management (CPIM) by the American Production and Inventory Control Society.

The results are in! Without a doubt, the Institute's first Web-based membership survey was an overwhelming success with 454 usable responses received. This is more than three times the number of responses received from the survey distributed at the annual meeting two years ago. Furthermore, it includes responses from both members that attended the annual meeting and those that did not. While I am still in the process of analyzing the data, I would like to take this opportunity to report to you some of my preliminary results.

I assume that most of you are more interested in respondent perceptions related to how well the Institute is meeting the needs of its members and accomplishing its objectives, and less interested in the demographic data of the respondents. Therefore, the demographic data will be only briefly summarized here.

Faculty members made up 88% of the respondents followed by doctoral students (6%) and academic administrators (4%). Approximately 64% of the faculty members/administrators reported being tenured and 90% of the respondents reported

	Level of Importance		How Well DSI Is Performing		
	Score	<i>n</i>	Score	<i>n</i>	# Indicating Not Important To Them
Opportunity to interact with colleagues in your field	6.1	450	5.8	435	9
To learn about innovative teaching techniques	5.1	449	5.3	430	32
To present/obtain feedback on a research paper	5.2	448	5.0	434	9
Opportunity to interact with industry professionals	3.7	448	3.5	431	61
Desirable meeting locations	4.7	450	5.6	434	42
Presentations by noted scholars	4.8	446	4.7	428	35
Opportunity to interact with colleagues in other fields	4.4	449	5.0	435	41
To learn about curriculum changes at other institutions	4.6	449	5.2	433	49
To participate as a session chair or discussant	3.7	450	5.6	431	81
Opportunity to interact with international scholars	4.3	448	4.6	426	59
Learn how to obtain external funding	3.5	448	3.3	427	111
General professional development	5.0	448	4.9	429	25
Opportunity to view book and software exhibits	4.7	449	5.8	428	30
Job placement center	4.4	443	5.9	428	73
Participate in curriculum issue mini-conferences (undergraduate, MBA, PhD, academic administrator)	4.3	445	5.5	427	76
Tutorial and professional development sessions	4.5	447	5.2	423	46
New Faculty Development Consortium	3.4	446	5.4	415	154
Doctoral Student Consortium	3.5	446	5.5	420	141

Note: 1 = Very little importance (very poorly), 7 = Very high importance (very well), and X = Not important to respondent.

Table 1: Importance of meeting characteristics.

having a Ph.D./DBA. Over half (56%) of the respondents indicated that they were at schools with doctoral programs. Approximately 44% indicated they teach an even mix of graduates and undergraduates, 41% teach primarily undergraduates, and 15% primarily graduate students.

Now for some of the good stuff. Approximately 31% of the respondents were opposed to eliminating the hard copy of the proceedings. Consistent with this result, 89% indicated that replacing the hard copy of the proceedings would not impact their ability to receive funding. Table 1 summarizes how the respondents ranked a number of characteristics in terms of their importance for successful meetings and

how well DSI is performing on these characteristics [1 = very little importance (very poorly), 7 = very high importance (very well), and X = not important to respondent].

Table 2 summarizes the extent of agreement/disagreement respondents had with a number of statements related to the benefits of DSI membership [1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree].

Table 3 summarizes the respondents' perceptions of the Institute's performance on the goals adopted by Board of Directors (1 = very poorly, 7 = very well, and X = goal not important to respondent).

In closing, I would like to thank all those members who took the time to complete our first Web-based membership sur-

vey. I would also like to thank the 70 or so of you that volunteered to participate in a follow-up phone survey. I will use future columns to keep you updated on additional survey analyses and how the Institute is using this information. ■

Scott M. Shafer

Babcock Graduate School of Management

Wake Forest University

P.O. Box 7659

Winston-Salem, N.C. 27109-7659

336.758.3687

fax: 336.758.4514

email: scott.shafer@mba.wfu.edu

www.mba.wfu.edu/faculty/shafer

Statement	Score	n
My membership in DSI provides good value.	5.4	438
The DSI Annual Meeting is a good value.	5.3	434
The <i>Decision Sciences</i> journal is a valuable membership benefit.	5.1	438
The <i>Decision Line</i> news publication provides useful professional information.	5.2	433
DSI is my preferred professional society.	4.7	436
DSI international meetings are well organized and provide additional opportunities for international professional development.	4.8	344

Note: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree.

Table 2: Agreement/disagreement with statements related to benefits of DSI membership.

Goal	Score	n	# Indicating Goal Is Not Important To Them
Improve dissemination of innovation in teaching, curriculum, and scholarship.	5.3	435	17
Enhance member services at the international and regional levels.	4.8	430	75
Increase the number and variety of professional development activities.	5.0	432	37
Increase membership and participation of all disciplines.	4.7	429	41
Promote the development and dissemination of research having educational and practical importance.	5.1	435	10
Increase globalization of the Institute.	5.2	433	57
Expand interdisciplinary activities.	4.9	429	29

Note: 1 = Very poorly, 7 = Very well, and X = Goal not important to respondent.

Table 3: Perceptions of Institute's performance on goals adopted by Board of Directors.