
THE ROLE OF TEACHING, SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES, AND SERVICE ON TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT PAY DECISIONS: DEANS' PERSPECTIVES

Khaled A. Alshare, Emporia State University
James Wenger, Emporia State University
Donald Miller, Emporia State University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of scholarly activities, teaching, and service upon promotion, tenure, and merit-pay decisions for business faculty at both teaching and research colleges in the USA. A survey questionnaire, which requested opinions regarding the role scholarly activities have on promotion, tenure, and merit pay decisions, was sent to deans of business colleges at accredited or AACSB (The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) candidate schools. Additionally, information was collected regarding techniques utilized for nonproductive tenured faculty, primary purposes of scholarly activities, and the average number of scholarly contributions each year for total faculty. Results showed that there were significant differences regarding merit allocations between teaching and research institutions, accredited and AACSB candidate schools but not between public and private universities. The study also provided a benchmark for assigning appropriate weights for scholarly activities with respect to promotion, tenure, and merit-pay decisions.

INTRODUCTION

Faculty members assume academic roles for many reasons. Lindholm (2004) surveyed professors at a public university. She observed that they generally spoke somewhat passionately about their jobs and appreciated the personal freedom afforded by such employment. In practice, faculty members are appraised on a combination of teaching, research, and service activities. However, evaluation priorities reflect a variety of perspectives regarding institutional policies (Grant and Fogarty, 1998). Hanna et al., (2005) reported that faculty satisfaction or dissatisfaction toward promotion/tenure policies correlated quite highly with availability of research support systems.

For faculty, professional career success depends upon administrative decisions involving tenure/promotion and salary increases. The National Center for Postsecondary Improvement (2000) reported results from a cross-section sample of faculty at four-year Carnegie institutions. To them,

tenure was the most important reward/incentive factor with research activities perceived to be more relevant than teaching. Im and Hartman (1997) studied MIS faculty appraisal practices at AACSB schools and learned that research was a major factor used for annual evaluations by deans and chairs. In a sample of 233 professors at six regional state institutions in Tennessee, Tang and Chamberlain (2003) found that length of service, rather than rank and tenure, significantly influenced faculty attitudes toward research. Faculty with 20 or more years of teaching appeared to have the lowest orientation toward research.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Much has been written regarding research and scholarly activities at the university level. Little information can be found on the emphasis school of business deans give to scholarly activities, teaching, and service with reference to promotion, tenure, and merit pay. Comparisons of teaching vs. research, private vs. public, and accredited vs. AACSB candidate schools regarding these activities may provide some insight into how institutions differed in their decision-making approaches. The following specific research questions were formulated:

1. What is the current status of meritorious scholarly activities in schools of business with reference to promotion, tenure, and merit pay?
2. Is there a significant difference in scholarly, teaching, and service activities upon promotion, tenure, and merit pay decisions between teaching and research, public and private, and accredited and AACSB candidate schools?
3. What emphasis do school of business deans suggest be given to scholarly activities in promotion, tenure, and merit pay decisions?

BACKGROUND PERSPECTIVES

Educators are challenged to prepare students for professional careers in an increasingly complex business environment characterized by accelerated rates of change and greater uncertainty. Both faculty and graduates encounter many expectations on the part of stakeholders they serve, and institutions are frequently expected to produce more results with fewer resources. Assessment, productivity considerations, and a desire for quality outcomes are integral components in the arena of contemporary higher education.

Undergraduate and graduate business enrollments are anticipated to increase during the next decade (Doti and Tuggle, 2005). As might be expected, students experience a positive financial return from their investments in higher education (Daoust et al., 2006). Futrelle et al., (2005) observed that persons with baccalaureate degrees had lifetime incomes over 80 percent higher than high school graduates. Business educators play a vital role in preparing these students.

Consequently, their expectations and experiences in the academic environment are relevant. Milem et al., (2000) reported aggregated national survey data over a 20-year period and noted a trend toward growing similarities related to allocation of faculty time among institutions, especially time devoted to research activities.

For many, quality teaching is perceived as the ultimate criterion in higher education. Student and public expectations focus on learning that occurs within the academic framework. Marsh and Hattie (2002) noted that teaching effectiveness was dependent upon selection, retention, and promotion of faculty who were capable teachers. Fairweather (2002) emphasized that high levels of faculty productivity in both teaching and research were relatively uncommon among faculty. Comm and Mathaisel (1998) surveyed deans at AACSB schools and reported that over 60 percent rated student course evaluations as either important or very important in tenure and promotion decisions. Teaching was the top-ranked criteria for awarding tenure.

Various studies have addressed different components of academic performance (Roller et al., 2003; Hindi and Miller, 2000; Pastore, 1989; Kren et al., 1993; Kimmel et al., 1998). In a national study of information systems faculty, Hu and Gill (2000) learned that tenure, academic rank, type of school, and field related employment were not significant indicators of productivity in research. Interestingly, administrators have found differences in publication output in various academic disciplines. Swanson (2004) observed that doctoral faculty in fields other than accounting were from 1.4 to 2.4 times more likely to publish in major journals. In a study of doctorally-qualified accounting professors, Zivney et al., (1995) reported that fewer than 10 percent of faculty who publish averaged one article a year with the typical faculty member averaging an article every three years, based upon a review of 66 journals.

Faculty service encompasses a wide range of activities involving departmental and university endeavors, such as participation at community events or work with various types of professional organizations. A survey of deans/chairs at AACSB schools concluded that the most important activities were perceived to be on-going professional service and providing measured university benefits. For nonprofessional activities, university-related committee work was considered to be the most important. In a national study of small business development and management assistance centers, researchers found that lack of academic recognition was a primary reason hindering faculty interest and participation (Udell, 1990). Ehie and Karathanos (1994) completed a national survey of business-school deans and found that service to the institution was the most important service component, followed by service to professional organizations and community service.

Faculty can engage in a wide variety of activities that enhance their professional abilities. These include attendance at conferences, workshops, and seminars; consulting; review of professional manuscripts; and editorial initiatives. According to Fay et al., (1993), a key consideration was how well various activities enhance performance of instructional responsibilities. Badri and Abdulla (2004) recognized the value of workshops and seminars in improving classroom

performance. Hunt (2004) surveyed new management faculty and reported that availability of travel funds to attend meetings was among the most important factors regarding employment decisions.

Some persons tend to differentiate faculty performance expectations on the basis of whether or not a business school is accredited by AACSB. Englebrecht et al., (1994) examined publication records of newly-promoted accounting professors and noted that associate and full professors at AACSB schools did publish to a greater extent than faculty at non-accredited schools. Whitman et al., (1999) conducted a nationwide study of AACSB and non-AACSB schools. These researchers found differences in practices related to promotion, tenure, and awarding of merit. Compared to faculty at nonaccredited schools, Murrey et al., (1994) discovered a significantly higher likelihood that risk and insurance faculty at AACSB schools were more apt to perform research for the purpose of getting a publication for their record of professional accomplishments. Srinivasan et al., (2000) conducted a survey of business school deans and discovered that there were differences in perceptions among various aspects of scholarship between AACSB accredited and unaccredited schools. Scholarship of application, paid consulting, scholarship of discovery, and publishing in top journals were of more significance at AACSB schools. However, interacting with students, service to the business school, and service to the community were significantly more important at non-AACSB institutions.

RESEARCH METHODS

Survey Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire was developed and pilot tested in cooperation with administrative colleagues. The survey questionnaire was then reviewed for content, as well as readability, and modified accordingly. The questionnaire requested general information, such as total enrollment, total number of faculty, highest degree offered, AACSB accreditation status, and the primary mission (teaching or research) of the colleges of business. In part two of the questionnaire, participants were asked to answer questions regarding issues concerning scholarly activities.

Sample, Data Collection, and Statistical Techniques

Data were obtained from a survey questionnaire, which was sent during the summer of 2005 to deans of business colleges that were either accredited or AACSB candidate schools. The questionnaire was distributed to 600 deans of business colleges listed in the April 2005 AACSB membership directory. SPSS statistical software was used to compute frequencies, means, and percentages. The t-test was employed to examine differences in means of participants' responses.

DATA ANALYSIS

One hundred and thirty deans returned completed surveys, which represented a response rate of 21.7 percent. A summary of frequency distributions for key variables is presented in Table 1.

Variable	Teaching N1 = 101	Research N2 = 29	Total N = 130
Total Enrollment	9121 (Avg)	18878 (Avg)	11297 (Avg)
Total # of Faculty	44 (Avg)	77 (Avg)	52.00 (Avg)
Business Enrollment	1550 (Avg)	2700 (Avg)	1807 (Avg)
Highest Degree			
Doctorate	6.92 %	48.27 %	16.2 %
Master	73.26 %	51.73 %	68.5 %
Baccalaureate	19.82 %	0 %	15.4 %
School Classification			
Public	67.33 %	82.76 %	70.77 %
Private	32.67 %	17.24 %	29.23 %
Status of School of Business			
AACSB Candidate	19.80 %	0 %	15.38 %
Accredited by AACSB	80.20 %	100 %	84.62 %
Mission of School of Business			
Teaching	--	--	77.69 %
Research	--	--	22.31 %

Teaching was the primary mission at 78 percent of the colleges of business, compared to research at 22 percent of the surveyed institutions. Some 67 percent of teaching schools were public, and 33 percent were private, while 83 percent of research institutions were public and 17 percent were classified as private. The average total enrollment at teaching schools was 9,121 students, compared to 18,878 students at research institutions. The average total number of students in colleges of business at teaching schools was 1,550 compared to 2,700 at research institutions. The average number of faculty members in colleges of business at teaching schools was 44, compared to 77 at research institutions. Eighty percent of colleges of business at teaching schools was accredited by AACSB, compared to 100 percent at research institutions. Twenty percent of colleges of business at teaching schools was AACSB candidates, compared to none at research institutions.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

In this section, we reported deans' responses to questions on the questionnaire. Participant opinions regarding the effect scholarly, teaching, and service activities should have on promotion, tenure, and merit salary were discussed. Additionally, deans' recommendations for percentages assigned to scholarly activities were also reported.

Deans' Responses

As shown in Table 2, approximately 40 percent of deans at teaching schools, compared to 52 percent at research institutions, reported that they hosted face-to-face professional academic conferences. Less than four percent of all institutions hosted video-based conferences. Approximately one percent of teaching schools, compared to none of the research institutions, indicated that they hosted Internet-based conferences.

Variable	Teaching N1 = 101	Research N2 = 29	Total N = 130
Hosting Professional Academic Conference			
Internet based	0.9 %	0 %	0.7 %
Face-to-face based	39.60 %	51.72 %	42.31 %
Video Conferencing based	2.97 %	6.89 %	3.8 %
Number of Full/Partial Reimbursed Conference/Year			
1 Conference	32.35 %	4.54 %	17.69 %
2 or More Conferences	67.65 %	95.46 %	36.92 %
Average Percentage of Total Expenses Reimbursed			
National (based on \$1200)	95.51 %	97.93 %	96.03 % [20% - 100%]
International (based on \$2500)	72.83 %	82.50 %	75.41 % [0% - 100%]
Must be Published in a Journal			
Yes	82.00 %	100.00 %	84.61 %
No	18.00 %	0 %	15.39 %
Must be Prestigious Journal			
Yes	20.00 %	85.18 %	36.92 %
No	80.00 %	14.82 %	63.08 %
Primary Purpose for Scholarly Activity			
Promotion/Tenure	57.29 %	58.33 %	55.38 %

Table 2: A Summary of Deans' Responses

Variable	Teaching N1 = 101	Research N2 = 29	Total N = 130
Accreditation	29.47 %	17.39 %	24.61 %
Instructional Development	20.00 %	17.39 %	16.92 %
Merit Salary	7.59 %	12.5 %	6.9 %
Techniques for Decrease in Scholarly Activity			
Award no Merit Pay	63.15 %	89.65 %	66.20 %
Do Nothing	14.73 %	0 %	10.80 %
Recommend Faculty Development	64.21 %	55.17 %	59.20 %
Reassign Activity	50.52 %	68.97 %	52.30 %
Terminate (Formal Process)	5.26 %	0 %	3.80 %
Implement Mentor/Counseling	43.15 %	17.24 %	35.40 %
Average of Total Faculty Scholarly Contributions/Year			
Journal			
0 – 10	82.97 %	72.75 %	85.00 %
> 10	17.03 %	27.25 %	15.00 %
Published Proceedings			
0 – 10	82.60 %	90.47 %	84.10 %
> 10	17.40 %	9.53 %	15.90 %
Presentation at Conferences			
0 – 10	79.35 %	90.90 %	81.60 %
> 10	20.65 %	9.10 %	18.40 %

Sixty-eight percent of teaching schools, compared to 95 percent of research institutions, reimbursed faculty members fully or partially for attending two or more professional conferences per year. On average, teaching schools reimbursed 96 percent of the total expenses of attending a national conference and 73 percent of the total expenses of attending an international conference. On the other hand, the average reimbursement at research institutions was 98 percent of the total expenses to attend a national conference and 83 percent to attend an international conference.

Eighty-two percent of deans from schools that focused on teaching, compared to 100 percent at research institutions, indicated that scholarly contributions must be published in a journal to be considered meritorious for promotion, tenure, or merit pay decisions. Additionally, 20 percent of deans at teaching schools, compared to 85 percent at research institutions, required the journal to be prestigious. Deans at 17 percent of teaching schools, compared to 27 percent of research institutions, reported that their total faculty members averaged ten or more journal articles per academic year. Seventeen percent of faculty at teaching schools, compared to 10 percent at research institutions, published ten or more articles at conference proceedings per year. Twenty-one percent of faculty at teaching schools, compared to nine percent at research institutions, made ten or more

presentations at academic conferences each year. When the deans were asked to rank the primary purpose of scholarly activities, promotion/tenure was ranked first at both teaching and research institutions, followed by accreditation and instructional development.

Table 3 shows the trends in scholarly activities for tenured faculty after they became tenured. There were no significant differences in mean percentages for tenured faculty with respect to the trend in their scholarly activities between teaching and research institutions, public and private schools, and accredited and AACSB candidate schools. However, as shown in Table 3, a higher percentage of tenured faculty at research institutions showed an increase in their scholarly activities compared to tenured faculty at teaching schools. On the other hand, 23 percent of tenured faculty at teaching schools, compared to 16 percent of those at research institutions, showed a decrease in their scholarly activities. More than 50 percent of tenured faculty at both teaching and research institutions reported no change in their scholarly activities.

Similarly, a higher percentage of tenured faculty at accredited schools showed an increase in their scholarly activities, compared to tenured faculty at AACSB candidate schools. Twenty-five percent of tenured faculty at candidate schools, compared to 16 percent of tenured faculty at accredited colleges, reported a decrease in their scholarly activities. On the other hand, tenured faculty at both public and private institutions showed similar percentages for their scholarly activities.

Table 3: The Trends in Scholarly Activities for Tenured Faculty

Trends of Scholarly Activities	Mean Percentages of Tenured Faculty		T (p-value)
	Teaching Institutions	Research Institutions	
Increase	21.74	32.18	-1.333 (0.191)
No change	55.40	51.60	1.126 (0.267)
Decrease	22.86	16.22	1.382 (0.172)
	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	
Increase	24.44	23.84	-0.284 (0.778)
No change	55.36	56.89	-1.054 (0.295)
Decrease	20.20	19.27	0.295 (0.769)
	Accredited Institutions	Candidate Institutions	
Increase	25.94	14.58	1.453 (0.125)
No change	58.30	60.63	1.646 (0.112)
Decrease	15.76	24.79	-1.229 (0.229)

When participants were asked about techniques used to encourage scholarly productivity for faculty members who had achieved tenure but showed a decrease in scholarly activities, different approaches were noticeable. Sixty-four percent of teaching schools, compared to 55 percent of research institutions, used “recommended faculty development.” Some 90 percent of research institutions, compared to 63 percent of teaching schools, awarded no merit pay. Fifty-one percent of teaching schools, compared to 69 percent of research institutions, utilized a “reassign activity” approach. Another technique used was “implementing mentor/counsel” (43 percent of teaching compared to 17 percent of research institutions). The final technique “terminate (formal process)” was used by five percent of teaching schools, compared to none of research institutions.

Promotion-Tenure Decisions

As shown in Table 4, there were significant differences in means of assigned weights for research, teaching, and service activities regarding promotion/tenure decisions between teaching and research institutions. With reference to promotion decisions, deans at teaching schools, on average, assigned 47 percent, 43 percent, and 10 percent to teaching, scholarly, and service activities and assigned 48 percent, 42 percent, and 10 percent for tenure decisions. On the other hand, deans at research institutions assigned 57 percent, 32 percent, and 11 percent to scholarly, teaching, and service activities for promotion decisions, and assigned 59 percent, 33 percent, and 8 percent for tenure decisions.

When comparing responses of deans at public and private schools, there were significant differences in means of assigned weights for scholarly and teaching activities regarding tenure decisions. While deans at public schools assigned more weight for scholarly activities regarding promotion and tenure decisions, deans at private schools did the opposite.

There were significant differences in means of assigned weights for scholarly and teaching activities involving promotion and tenure decisions between accredited and AACSB candidate schools. For promotion and tenure decisions, deans at accredited schools, compared to deans at candidate schools, assigned significantly higher weight to scholarly activities. On the other hand, deans at candidate schools assigned significantly more weight to teaching activities for promotion and tenure decisions.

To get a better understanding of the distribution of weights assigned for teaching, scholarly, and service activities regarding promotion and tenure decisions, we grouped the weights assigned for these activities into two categories: (1) 50 percent or less and (2) greater than 50 percent and computed respondents’ percentages according to each category, as shown in Table 5.

Table 4: Average of Weights Assigned for Scholarly/Teaching/Service for Promotion/Tenure Decisions			
Decisions	Means (%)		T (p-value)
	Teaching Institutions	Research Institutions	
Promotion:			
Scholarly	43.47	57.22	-3.567 (0.000)
Teaching	47.03	32.07	5.35 (0.000)
Service	9.50	10.71	1.823 (0.073)
Tenure:			
Scholarly	41.90	59.41	-4.737 (0.000)
Teaching	48.22	32.93	5.195 (0.000)
Service	9.88	7.66	2.522 (0.014)
Decisions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	T (p-value)
Promotion:			
Scholarly	47.55	44.06	1.084 (0.282)
Teaching	42.64	46.42	-1.292 (0.201)
Service	9.81	9.52	-0.061 (0.951)
Tenure:			
Scholarly	48.01	41.23	2.293 (0.024)
Teaching	43.30	48.51	-1.925 (0.058)
Service	8.69	10.26	0.569 (0.571)
Decisions	Accredited Institutions	Candidate Institutions	T (p-value)
Promotion:			
Scholarly	47.88	38.67	-2.336 (0.028)
Teaching	42.29	52.28	2.609 (0.016)
Service	9.83	9.05	0.586 (0.563)
Tenure:			
Scholarly	47.61	35.81	-2.668 (0.014)
Teaching	43.42	53.94	2.775 (0.012)
Service	8.97	10.25	0.039 (0.969)

Some 18 percent of deans at teaching schools assigned weight of more than 50 percent for scholarly activities to their promotion decisions, and 22 percent assigned weight of more than 50 percent for teaching. Some 44 percent of deans at research institutions assigned weights higher than 50 percent for scholarly activities to their promotion decisions. Fourteen percent, 24 percent, and one percent of deans at teaching schools indicated that they assigned weights greater than 50 percent to tenure decisions for scholarly, teaching, and service activities, respectively. On the other hand, 48 percent, zero percent, and zero percent of deans at research institutions indicated that they assigned weights higher than 50 percent for tenure decisions related to scholarly, teaching, and service activities, respectively.

At research institutions, no weight above 50 percent was assigned for teaching or service activities involving promotion or tenure decisions. However, they assigned weights above 50 percent to scholarly activities, for these decisions, on the other hand, teaching schools assigned weights above 50 percent for teaching, research, or service activities. Additionally, a higher percentage of teaching schools assigned more weight (>50%) to scholarly activities for decisions involving promotion than for tenure decisions (17.90% vs. 13.98%). A higher percentage of teaching schools assigned more weight (>50%) to teaching activities for tenure than promotion (24.47% vs. 21.88%) decisions. On the other hand, research institutions did exactly the opposite.

Promotion/ Tenure	Teaching Institutions			Research Institutions			Total		
	Scholarly Activity	Teaching	Services	Scholarly Activity	Teaching	Service	Scholarly Activity	Teaching	Service
Assigned Weight for Promotion Decision									
<= 50 %	82.10 %	78.12 %	98.91 %	55.56 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	76.20%	82.90%	100%
> 50 %	17.90 %	21.88 %	1.09 %	44.44 %	0 %	0 %	23.8%	17.10%	0%
Assigned Weight for Tenure Decision									
<= 50 %	86.02 %	75.53 %	98.89 %	51.72 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	77.90%	81.00%	100%
> 50 %	13.98 %	24.47 %	1.11 %	48.28 %	0 %	0 %	22.10%	19.00%	0%

Deans' Recommendations for Percentages Assigned to Scholarly Activities

The statistical t-test was used to examine differences in means for recommended percentages assigned to scholarly activities between teaching and research institutions, public vs. private, and accredited vs. AACSB candidate schools. As shown in Table 6, deans at teaching and research institutions suggested that the highest percentage for promotion, tenure, and merit salary decisions should be assigned to a journal publication, followed by writing a book. Percentages ranged from five to 13 percent for proceedings publications and writing chapters in books. Conference attendance was the least recognized activity. According to t-test results, there were significant differences in means of the assigned percentages for all scholarly activities between teaching and research institutions with exception of writing a chapter in a book. While research institutions, compared to teaching schools, assigned a higher percentage for a journal publication, teaching schools assigned higher percentages for attending conferences, giving professional presentations, proceedings publications, writing a book, and writing a chapter in a book.

Table 6 shows a comparison between responses of public and private institutions. Deans at private schools assigned a higher percentage to all scholarly activities (with the exception of journal publications and professional presentations) for promotion, tenure, and merit salary decisions. There

were no significant differences in means of the assigned percentages for all scholarly activities between the two groups. On the other hand, there were significant differences in means of the assigned percentages for some scholarly activities between accredited and AACSB candidate schools. For example, candidate institutions, compared to AACSB-accredited schools, assigned more weight to giving presentations (means: 11.55% vs. 6.90%, $t=2.362$, $p=0.034$) and proceedings publications (16.82% vs. 10.46%, $t=2.925$, $p=0.01$) for merit decisions. Additionally, candidate schools assigned greater weight to giving presentations (11.47% vs. 6.18%, $t=2.512$, $p=0.022$) and proceedings publications (16.00% vs. 10.15%, $t=3.553$, $p=0.001$) for promotion decisions. Moreover, candidate schools assigned more weight to proceedings publications (17.00% vs. 10.74%, $t=3.192$, $p=0.004$) for tenure decisions. On the other hand, accredited institutions assigned a greater weight to journal publications for promotion decisions (51.02% vs. 38.82%, $t=-2.171$, $p=0.041$) and tenure decisions (51.80% vs. 39.38%, $t=-2.376$, $p=0.026$).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study attempted to explore the role scholarly activities, teaching, and service have on promotion, tenure, and merit pay decisions for faculty members at AACSB and candidate schools of business. Results revealed that deans at both teaching and research institutions supported scholarly activities conducted by faculty members. This was evident by the fact that more than 95 percent of teaching and research institutions supported their faculty by reimbursing them for attending national academic conferences. Additionally, deans at both teaching and research institutions assigned weights of 42 percent and 59 percent to scholarly activities for promotion and tenure decisions.

While teaching, private, and AACSB candidate schools, on average, assigned more weight to teaching activities involving decisions related to promotion and tenure; research, public, and accredited institutions emphasized research. All institutions, on average, assigned an approximate 10 percent weight for service activities to promotion and tenure decisions. Based on the results, one might say that the remaining 90 percent could be divided between scholarly and teaching activities in a range of 40-50 percent for each activity. It was interesting to note that the average assigned weight for scholarly activity was never reported below 40 or above 60 percent, while the average assigned weight for teaching activities was reported below 40 percent. It should be noted that the overall averages for scholarly, teaching, and service activities were 46.52 percent, 43.75 percent, and 9.73 percent regarding promotion decisions and were 46.07 percent, 44.81 percent, and 9.12 percent respectively for tenure decisions.

A commonly practiced assignment for the three professional activities (40-50 percent for teaching, 30-40 percent for scholarly, and 10-20 percent for service) may not be found among the majority of teaching schools. Perhaps, there appears to be a new trend for distribution of weight for faculty professional accomplishments. This new trend supports more weight for scholarly activities

with less emphasis on the weight of either teaching or service activities. Further analysis is needed to understand the reasons behind this trend.

Table 6: T-test Results of Deans' Recommendations for Percentages Assigned to Scholarly Activities

Activity	Merit salary			Promotion			Tenure		
	Means		T (p-value)	Means		T (p-value)	Means		T (p-value)
	Teaching	Research		Teaching	Research		Teaching	Research	
Attending a Conference	2.27	1.00	1.983 (.052)	2.27	0.95	2.113 (.039)	2.23	1.00	1.849 (.069)
Giving a professional presentation	8.32	4.74	2.762 (.008)	7.90	4.13	3.227 (.002)	8.71	4.74	2.902 (.005)
A proceedings publication	12.31	7.74	1.872 (.071)	12.75	5.13	5.462 (.000)	13.35	5.96	5.010 (.000)
A journal publication	44.36	61.12	-3.667 (.001)	44.39	64.46	-4.333 (.000)	44.95	66.00	-4.505 (.000)
Writing a book	20.85	15.5	2.054 (.045)	22.09	14.58	2.693 (.010)	20.79	12.61	3.232 (.002)
Write a chapter in a book	9.81	7.17	1.392 (.171)	10.66	6.39	2.313 (.026)	10.53	6.45	2.177 (.035)
Activity	Merit salary			Promotion			Tenure		
	Means		T (p-value)	Means		T (p-value)	Means		T (p-value)
	Public	Private		Public	Private		Public	Private	
Attending a Conference	1.73	2.54	-.805 (.427)	1.57	2.91	-1.321 (.196)	1.57	2.94	-1.153 (.259)
Giving a professional presentation	7.22	8.08	-.531 (.598)	7.28	6.19	.786 (.435)	8.01	7.08	.568 (.572)
A proceedings publication	10.84	12.20	-.792 (.431)	10.31	12.76	-1.475 (.145)	11.07	13.21	-1.262 (.212)
A journal publication	49.64	46.04	.756 (.453)	50.25	46.17	.868 (.389)	50.71	47.93	.567 (.573)
Writing a book	18.36	22.72	-1.510 (.138)	19.57	22.50	-1.091 (.280)	18.27	20.74	-.869 (.390)
Write a chapter in a book	8.67	10.40	-.911 (.367)	9.15	10.96	-1.009 (.317)	9.37	10.26	-.500 (.619)

Results indicated that the majority of tenured faculty, regardless of their school classifications, showed no change in their scholarly activities after they became tenured. The results

also revealed that more than 16 percent of tenured faculty showed a decline in their scholarly activities after receiving tenure. As a result, different techniques were used by schools of business to address this issue. For example, “award no merit pay” was the most popular technique used by research institutions to encourage scholarly activities for nonproductive faculty, while “recommended faculty development” was most popular at teaching schools. “Terminate” was used by only five percent of teaching and none of the research institutions. Institutions should consider the best techniques for encouraging faculty members to be involved in scholarly activities that are appropriate for institutional cultures with consideration given to individual differences.

Research institutions, compared to teaching schools, assigned a higher percentage to scholarly activities for journal publications. On the other hand, teaching schools, compared to research institutions, assigned a higher percentage to attending conferences, professional presentations, proceedings publications, and writing a chapter in a book. It seems that research and teaching institutions continue to assign more weight to a journal publication than to all other scholarly activities combined. One might ask “Is it the time to reconsider the current distribution of assigned weights among the scholarly activities?”

More than 50 percent of research institutions hosted “face-to-face academic conferences.” Less than four percent of all surveyed schools hosted “video conferences,” while “Internet-based conferences” were not supported by any of the research institutions. Both research and teaching institutions did not make use of information technology in hosting academic conferences. Due to budget constraints, the use of video conferencing and Internet-based media could be an attractive option for hosting academic conferences.

The results provided valuable information for deans at colleges of business with respect to the average and range of percentages to use when making merit decisions. Additionally, this study provided insight into the role scholarly activities have on tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions. Moreover, these results provided deans with potential benchmarks of appropriate weights for scholarly, teaching, and service activities related to tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The limitations of this study included a relatively small sample size (especially among the private schools). Also, the sample included only accredited or AACSB candidate schools and used self-reported information. Future research could include a comparison between deans and instructors’ responses and AACSB-accredited versus unaccredited schools. Another direction of future research might be conducting a cross-cultural study that includes schools from different countries with various cultural backgrounds.

REFERENCES

- Badri, M. & Abdulla, M. (2004). Awards of excellence in institutions of higher education: an AHP approach. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18, 224-242.
- Comm, C. & Mathaisel, D. (1998). Evaluating teaching effectiveness in America's business schools: implications for service marketers. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 16, 163-170.
- Daoust, M., Wehmeyer, W. & Eubank, E. (2006, January). Valuing an MBA: authentic outcome measurement made easy. *Proceedings of International Academy of Business and Public Administration Disciplines*, Orlando, Florida, 3-6.
- Doti, J. & Tuggle, F. (2005, July-August). Doing the math. *BizEd*, 4, 46-50.
- Ehie, I. & Karathanos, D. (1994, May). Business faculty performance evaluation based on the new AACSB accreditation standards. *Journal of Education for Business*, 69, 257-262.
- Englebrecht, T., Iyer, G. & Patterson, D. (1994, March). An empirical investigation of the publication productivity of promoted accounting faculty. *Accounting Horizons*, 8, 45-68.
- Fairweather, J. (2002, January). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 26-49.
- Fay, J., Ferrara, W. & Stryker, J. (1993, December). The quest for quality in business schools. *Management Accounting*, 75, 48-51.
- Futrelle, D., Birger, J. & Regnier, P. (2005, May). Getting rich in America. *Money*, 34, 98-104.
- Grant, J. & Fogarty, T. (1998). Faculty evaluation as a social dilemma: a game theoretic approach. *Accounting Education*, 7, 225-248.
- Hanna, N., Haug, R. & Krabbenhoft, A. (2005, September). The self-fulfilling prophesy of the tenure/promotion policies at business colleges and schools. *Journal of the American Academy of Business*, 7, 53-58.
- Hindi, N. & Miller, D. (2000, Winter). A survey of assessment practices in schools of business. *Central Business Review*, 19, 13-18.
- Hu, Q. & Gill, G. (2000, April-June). IS faculty research productivity: Influential factors and implications. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 13, 15-25.
- Hunt, S. (2004, Spring). Business faculty job selection: factors affecting the choice of an initial position. *Journal of Business and Management*, 10, 53-72.
- Im., J. & Hartman, S. (1997, Spring). The role of research in MIS faculty performance evaluation: an exploratory study. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 38, 37-40.

- Kimmell, S., Marquette, P. & Olsen, D. (1998, November). Outcomes assessment programs: historical perspective and state of the art. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 13, 851-868.
- Kren, L., Tatum, K. & Phillips, L. (1993, Fall). Separate accreditation of accounting programs: an empirical investigation. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 8, 260-272.
- Lindholm, J. (2004, November-December). Pathways to the professoriate: the role of self, others, and the environment in shaping academic career aspirations. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 603-635.
- Marsh, H. & Hattie, J. (2002, September-October). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: complementary, antagonistic, or independent constructs? *Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 603-638.
- Milem, J., Berger, J. & Dey, E. (2000, July-August). Faculty time allocation: a study of change over twenty years. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 454-475.
- Murrey, J., Taylor, R., Hollman, K. & Hayes, R. (1994, September). Risk and insurance faculty attitudes toward research and publishing. *CPCU Journal*, 47, 162-172.
- National Center for Postsecondary Improvement. (2000, March-April). Why is research the rule? the impact of incentive systems on faculty behavior. *Change*, 32, 53-56.
- Pastore, J. (1989, May). Developing an academic accreditation process relevant to the accounting profession. *CPA Journal*, 59, 18-22.
- Roller, R., Andrews, B. & Bovee, S. (2003, March-April). Specialized accreditation of business schools: a comparison of alternative costs, benefits, and motivations. *Journal of Education for Business*, 78, 197-204.
- Srinivasan, S., Kemelgor, B. & Johnson, S. (2000, November-December). The future of business school scholarship: An empirical assessment of the boyer framework by U.S. deans. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76, 75-80.
- Swanson, E. (2004, Spring). Publishing in the majors: a comparison of accounting, finance, management, and marketing. *Contemporary accounting research*, 21, 223-253.
- Tang, T. & chamberlain, M. (2003, November-December). Effects of rank, tenure, length of service, and institution on faculty attitudes toward research and teaching: the case of regional state universities. *Journal of Education for Business*. 79, 103-110.
- Udell, G. (1990, March-April). Academe and the goose that lays its golden egg. *Business Horizons*, 33, 29-38.
- Whitman, M., Hendrikson, A. & Townsend, A. (1999, June). Research commentary. academic Rewards for teaching, research, and service: data and discourse. *Information Systems Research*, 10, 99-108.
- Zivney, T., Bertin, W. & Gavin, T. (1995, Spring). A comprehensive examination of accounting faculty publishing. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 10, 1-25.