

# Management Educators’ Expectations for Professional Ethics Development

*Joseph A. Petrick*  
*Robert F. Scherer*

**ABSTRACT.** Professional associations, like the Academy of Management, exist to foster and promote scholarship, exchange among faculty, and an environment conducive to member professional ethics development. However, this last purpose of such organizations has received the least amount of attention. Moreover, previous research has demonstrated that there are differences in perceived needs for professional ethics development between tenured and untenured faculty. In the current research 260 Academy of Management members were surveyed. The research identified differences between tenured and untenured management faculty with respect to expectations for the Academy of Management to provide ethics education and research with respect to the professional code of conduct. Implications of the findings are discussed from a developmental perspective. Directions for future research are provided.

**KEY WORDS:** Ethical expectations, ethics development, ethics training, management professors, professional ethics

## Introduction

Professional associations, like the Academy of Management (“Academy”), use codes of conduct to clarify collegial behavioral norms for existing and new members and to satisfy public demands for academic managerial accountability (Brien, 1998; Fairweather, 1996; Gaumnitz and Lere, 2002; Zadek, 1998). The widespread recent occurrence of business management scandals at Enron, WorldCom, Adelpia and other firms, whose leaders received their management education at accredited U.S. business schools, has the public concerned about whether U.S. management educators have either become silent partners in corporate crime (Anand et al., 2004; Gioia, 2002; Swanson and Frederick, 2003) or are deprofessionalizing management education in ways that injure the public (Leicht and Fennell, 2001; Peterson and Ferrell, 2005; Trank and Rynes, 2003). Professional associations are facing both domestic and international pressures to demonstrate accountability for improving professional membership moral performance (Ingvarson, 1998; Rapkins, 1996). However, the growing marginalization of business ethics in accredited business school curricula has conveyed mixed messages about managerial professionalism to untenured faculty entering the profession (Windsor, 2002; Wood, 2002).

The Academy governing board appointed an “All-Academy Task Force on Ethics” in 1988 to investigate potential ethical codes or statements for its membership. The task force proposed a code of ethical conduct, the Academy of Management Code of Ethical Conduct (AMCEC) that was eventually approved in 1990 by the organization’s governing board and voting membership of the Academy.

---

*Joseph A. Petrick is a Professor of Management and Director of the Institute for Business Integrity in the Raj Sooin College of Business at Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio, USA. He received his Ph.D. from Pennsylvania State University. His research interests include business and professional ethics, strategic sustainable development, and international management.*

*Robert F. Scherer is a Professor of Management and Dean in the James J. Nance College of Business Administration at Cleveland State University in Cleveland, Ohio, USA. He received his Ph.D. in Business Administration from the University of Mississippi. His research interests include professional ethics, organizational development, and international management.*

Beyond this code, the task force recommended, in November 1990, certain educational and implementation/enforcement steps for the Academy to consider. Disagreement among board members concerning these recommendations led to the 1992 creation of a new task group, appointed by then Academy President Donald Hambrick, to study the strategic implications of a proactive stance toward ethics code implementation and enforcement as well as to make their recommendations to the board. This new task group of five Academy members, headed by John Slocum, set an April 1993 deadline for a report and recommendations to the Board of Governors, but the net result was the tabling of the enforcement emphasis at that time. Thus, the focus taken by the Academy has been on the educational and research dimensions of the AMCEC.

The AMCEC requires that members maintain a higher standard of conduct than that called for by law (Academy of Management Code of Ethical Conduct, 1991; Higgs-Kleyn and Kapelianis, 1999; Jamal and Bowie, 1995). The use of AMCEC assists the profession in its ongoing relationship with society, its desire for self-regulation, and its visible enunciation and endorsement of professional socialization norms (Dienhart, 1995; Payne and Brenner, 1990; Payne and Brenner, 1994). The AMCEC can also act as part of a supportive infrastructure system against improper demands and job burnout, and serve as a basis for adjudicating disputes and enhancing the social capital of professional association membership (Anderson and Buller, 1998; Frankel, 1989; Wimbush et al., 1997).

The AMCEC is one of the chief means through which the social capital of the Academy can be leveraged. Scholars have described social capital at the micro and macro levels. At the micro level, it is a relational attribute of individuals who realize advantages owing to their relative status (Useem and Karabel, 1986) or location (Burt, 1997) in a group. On a macro level, scholars have described social capital as an attribute of communities (Putnam, 1993), nations (Fukuyama, 1995), industry networks (Walker et al., 1997), and organizations (Leana and Van Buren, 1999; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). Professional association social capital, however, is realized through members' levels of collective goal orientation and shared trust, which create value by

facilitating collective professional action in accord with AMCEC standards.

According to Frankel (1989) and Kultgen (1988), there are three basic types of (and basic purposes for) ethical codes of conduct that a professional society might draft. *Aspirational* codes emphasize the ethical values or behaviors that professionals in the association endorse. Most codes also serve as a means for educating members (*educational* codes). Finally, these codes can have *disciplinary/enforcement* elements and purposes. It is to the educational dimensions of AMCEC that the current research turns, to enhance the prospects of professional association social capital.

However, while Academy officers and tenured and untenured management faculty members can wax eloquent on endorsing collegial professionalism, actual practice within university management departments often suggests values contrary to AMCEC norms (Bayles, 1993; Bennett, 1998; Hamilton, 2002; Leatherman, 2000). Consider the following non-collegial, non-communitarian norms in many management departments (Damrosch, 1995; Hamilton, 2002): (1) disciplinary segmentation and control to such an extent that tenured and untenured members in the same field are often regarded as unqualified to assess and evaluate each other's special accomplishments and competencies; (2) the insistent individualism of the tenured full professor or "star" researcher who behaves as though beyond any need to secure approval, evaluation, collaboration, or even comment by the untenured; (3) the fiercely combative, usually politicized, chronic tenured malcontents that are impossible to satisfy, who have mastered the rhetoric of polarization that leaves no room for collegial civility with untenured faculty; (4) the cranky tenured faculty curmudgeons who are so difficult to challenge that untenured colleagues have grown tired of trying since the offenders are oblivious to the discomfort they cause others; and (5) the administrative hierarchic structure in most universities that facilitates positional abuse of power (Vredenburg and Brender, 1998), adult bullying (Randall, 1997), and the "Dilbertizing" of untenured faculty.

Given the disparity between the rhetoric and the reality of professional ethics development among tenured and untenured management faculty in educational contexts, the authors decided to conduct research that would empirically document the pro-

professional ethics development expectation differences between tenured and untenured management faculty and provide recommendations for improvement. The order of this article, therefore, is as follows: (1) literature review and research rationale; (2) methodology; (3) findings; (4) discussion of findings and recommendations; (5) directions for future research; and (6) a summary.

### Literature review and research rationale

There are a number of factors in the literature that led the authors to focus on the relationship between management tenure status and concerns about professional ethics development: (1) the absence of Academy prioritization of the AMCEC role in professional socialization of new untenured management faculty; (2) the new cost-containment recruitment policies that exacerbate the different professional socialization experiences and professional ethics expectations of current tenured and untenured management faculty; (3) the threat of future tenure denial for lack of professional standard compliance or contextual performance that haunts untenured faculty in probationary positions; (4) the differential levels of professional network and institutional embeddedness of tenured and untenured faculty might incline the latter to desire more clarification than the former about professional standard compliance and contextual performance in order to have access to key resources for job security; and (5) the conflicting research results about the relationship between managerial organizational tenure status and lowered levels of principled reasoning.

First, prior to assuming a faculty position in a management department, new untenured faculty usually experience professional socialization problems in part because of a lack of graduate school focus on the role of the AMCEC in providing professional ethics development guidance (Loeb, 1994; Rezaee et al., 2001). Inadequate treatment of the AMCEC-based, relational professional ethical norms in graduate management education often ill prepares technical academic specialists or hard-charging management practitioners to conduct themselves in a professionally accountable manner as collaborative colleagues or co-researchers with tenured faculty members (Granitz and Ward, 2001).

Lack of recognition at the international, national, and regional levels of tenured and untenured management faculty, who individually and collectively, adhere to AMCEC standards and exemplify high levels of research productivity and departmental collegial support is another contributing factor (James, 2000; Wiley, 2000). Documented, measured, and benchmarked activities, such as mentoring or co-authoring research or shared computer literacy skills that highlight the relational aspects of the AMCEC-based standards are not accorded professional priority and, accordingly, are taken for granted or nonexistent.

Second, new university-level cost-containment faculty recruitment policy changes have exacerbated the different professional socialization experiences of current tenured and untenured management faculty (Finkelstein et al., 1998; Tierney, 1997). For one thing, many more part-time faculty are being hired relative to full-timers – nearly double the proportion, from about 22% of all faculty in the early 1970s to at least 42% at present (Finkelstein et al., 1998). Moreover, the pattern of full-time appointments is changing markedly. More recent appointments of full-time faculty are often made outside the traditional tenured and tenure track realm (Gappa and Leslie, 1993). These differences between tenured and untenured management faculty recruitment circumstances likely impact their senses of professional identity and expectations for professional ethics development (Gappa, 1996; Tierney and Bensimon, 1996).

Third, while many ordinary temporary employees or adjunct faculty may have a short term commitment to their work organization or co-workers and, consequently, are not highly rewarded for superior performance or harshly penalized for substandard performance, tenure-earning faculty members in academia will put in more effort to perform well because they strive for tenure (i.e., to obtain that delayed gratification and seal of professional approval; Foote and Folta, 2002; Poole and Bornholt, 1998). Performing well for tenure-earning faculty involves both compliance performance (i.e., in-role behavior that fulfills all the tasks that are described in the formal job descriptions of incumbents; Tyler, 1998) and contextual performance (i.e., volunteering for professional development activities beyond formal job expectations; Arvey and Murphy, 1998; Caligiuri and

Day, 2000). In many management departments, however, the exact prioritized mixture of compliance and contextual performance expectations for earning tenure remains ambiguous, and informal professional socialization processes, including detailed awareness of AMCEC standards, are often presumed to provide additional performance guidance for untenured faculty (Motowildo et al., 1997). Accordingly, while the threat of tenure denial can discourage opportunistic behavior, but an insufficient guidance to elicit appropriate compliance and contextual performance, untenured management faculty may be more concerned than tenured management faculty about professional ethics development expectations (Moorman and Harland, 2002).

Fourth, the successful development of professional network embeddedness and specific institutional embeddedness are of critical importance in academic work environments (Van Emmerik and Sanders, 2004; Van Emmerik and Euwema, 2001). Tenured management faculty have presumably achieved both forms of embeddedness (i.e., they have published refereed articles with a number of professional colleagues and they have met their host institution standards for tenure). Untenured faculty, on the other hand, still have to develop their professional expertise and institutional identity and are, therefore, often dependent on tenured management faculty to gain access to valued professional network and institutional status resources (Lai et al., 1998). One significant way for untenured faculty to enhance their prospects for professional network and institutional status embeddedness is to obtain additional information about professional ethics development expectations with regard to compliance and contextual performance within the discipline and within the host institution (Premeaux and Mondy, 2002; Van Emmerik and Sanders, 2004). This would seem to imply that tenure status might differentially affect concerns about professional ethics development depending on faculty levels of professional network and institutional embeddedness.

Fifth and finally, there are conflicting research results about the relationship between managerial organizational tenure status and lowered levels of principled reasoning that might parallel differences between tenured and untenured management faculty. The research findings of the Pennino (2002) study of managers, for example, suggests that as the number of years of orga-

nizational tenure increase, principled reasoning scores decline. This finding is important, as managers with the most tenure within organizations are usually part of the upper ranks of the managerial pyramid and tend, therefore, to be responsible for setting both the cultural and ethical tones of their organizations, as is the case with tenured management faculty in management departments. The results of the Pennino study are in contrast to the results of the studies conducted by Harris (1990), and Kelly et al. (1990), who found that longer tenured individuals demonstrated higher moral reasoning. However, they support the research conducted by Forte (2004), Latif (2001), Elm and Nichols (1990, 1993), Dunkelberg and Robin (1998), and Bigel (1998, unpublished, 2000), who found that longer tenure was associated with lower levels of ethical orientation. Among the explanations offered for these findings are that managers with workplace tenure may have survived layoffs, but suffered more disappointments in their work careers (e.g., experienced discrepancies between rewards provided for professional managerial service as compared with incentives for taking ethical shortcuts and either could not leave for a more professional work environment or simply regressed in terms of moral cognitive acquiescence; Forte, 2004; Latif, 2001).

Given these five trends affecting the professional ethics development expectations of management faculty members, as they become more mobile, diverse and stratified by tenure status, the standards for professional conduct require ongoing clarification and refinement (Donaldson, 2000; Koehn, 1994; Petrick, 1992). Lapses in moral professional conduct can be addressed by professional associations' regular solicitation of membership perceived ethics development needs and ensuring that appropriate training is provided (Koehn, 1994; Rapkins, 1996). Against this backdrop of the need for training in professional ethics by management faculty, the following research question was posed:

RQ: "Does tenure status affect concerns about professional ethics development of management professors?"

## Methodology

### *Participants*

Individuals participating in this study were 260 (69 women and 191 men) Academy of Management

members who teach undergraduate and graduate management courses in the United States. The percentage of males and females in the current study was similar to the overall AOM membership. Participants were distributed among the five U.S. regional academy organizations including western (19.3%), southwestern (15.0%), midwestern (23.5%), southern (16.9%), and eastern (25.3%). The majority of participants (64.6%) had been employed by their current institution more than seven years in departments with more than 10 full-time management faculty (60.4%). These participants were primarily employed in public universities (64.2%) with enrollments greater than 10,000 students (62.3%). While the primary Academy of Management professional division of the respondents was either organizational behavior (20.8%) or business policy and strategy (23.5%), the sample included representatives of all the divisions.

Participants were grouped according to their tenure status. Based upon the distribution, assignment of participants was made to either the tenured ( $n = 155$ ) or untenured ( $n = 105$ ) groups. The percentage of tenured to untenured management faculty in the current study was similar to the percentage of professors nationwide estimated to be tenured (Mooney, 1993) as well as to the percentage of males and females.

#### *Professional ethics expectations measure*

A ten-item instrument was developed to measure expectations for education on and research about the AMCEC. The survey instrument was operationalized from an updated measure originally discussed in Payne (1988). The ten-item instrument was then reviewed and critiqued by a focus group of ten management faculty members who were AOM members both tenured and untenured.

The items were developed to gauge the educational and research expectations of the membership with regard to AMCEC. The balance of education and research expectation questions reflected several factors: (1) most management faculty are exposed to formal and informal guidance on research expectations during their graduate education, but not as much on ethics development education expectations; (2) the management faculty focus group

overwhelmingly indicated a preference for more questions on education than research; and (3) the structure of AMCEC allowed more focus on educational rather than research expectations. In light of the sensitivity with regard to AMCEC enforcement, the focus of the instrument was on professional ethics educational expectations and expectations from the Academy to encourage research on issues related to professional ethics rather than regulatory procedures. Participants rated each of the 10 items using a six-point scale ranging from: 1 = "Strongly Disagree" to 6 = "Strongly Agree." A copy of the instrument is contained in Appendix A. Table I provides descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) and correlations for all pairs of the 10 items included in the instrument. Correlations were all positive and significant.

To assess the dimensionality of the instrument a factor analysis was performed on the 10 items (see Table II). Two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 were extracted. These two factors accounted for a total of 69.10% of the variance. No item loaded less than 0.65 on a primary factor. Given this structure, two clearly distinguishable factors emerged. Factor I was labeled "Expectations (from the Academy) for Professional Ethics Education" (7 items) and Factor II was labeled "Expectations (from the Academy) for Professional Ethics Research" (3 items). Thus, the dual dimensionality of the instrument was confirmed.

Reliability for each factor was judged to be strong enough to construct separate scales (Factor I:  $\alpha = 0.90$ ; Factor II:  $\alpha = 0.86$ ). Two professional ethics expectations scales were constructed by summing primary loading items for each factor. The correlation between the two scales of 0.58 ( $p < 0.01$ ) was moderate and indicated that, while overlapping somewhat, each scale represented a relatively unique aspect of professional ethics expectations.

#### *Analytic approach*

Investigation of the research question, which sought to identify differences between tenured and untenured management faculty on professional ethics expectations from the Academy, was approached using a two-tiered (holistic) approach (Tabachnick

TABLE I  
Descriptive statistics and correlations for professional ethics development items

Variable	Mean	SD	Correlations <sup>a</sup>												
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)			
1. National conference general meeting	4.88	1.33													
2. Doctoral consortia and junior faculty workshops	4.58	1.37	0.70												
3. Membership awareness of professional responsibilities	4.61	1.64	0.53	0.53											
4. Professional ethics development track (national)	4.12	1.41	0.66	0.68	0.46										
5. Professional ethics development track (regional)	3.62	1.50	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47									
6. Professional ethics education in management doctoral programs	3.50	1.46	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52								
7. Ethical climate development for management department chairs	4.22	1.37	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40							
8. Professional ethics to competition for tenure, promotion, and merit increases	4.23	1.51	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.39						
9. Conflict among personal, organizational, and professional ethics	4.58	1.34	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46					
10. Refrain from fulfilling professional responsibilities due to lack of institutional support	4.18	1.56	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44				

<sup>a</sup>For all correlations  $p < 0.01$ .

TABLE II  
Factor analysis for professional ethics development items

Factor/Item	Loadings <sup>a</sup>		Reliability ( $\alpha$ )
	Factor I	Factor II	
I. Expectations for professional ethics education			0.90
1. National conference general meeting	0.83	0.22	
2. Doctoral consortia and junior faculty workshops	0.80	0.16	
3. Membership awareness of professional responsibilities	0.79	0.24	
4. Professional ethics development track(national)	0.76	0.28	
5. Professional ethics development track(regional)	0.74	0.30	
6. Professional ethics education in management doctoral programs	0.65	0.30	
7. Ethical climate development for management department chairs	0.65	0.47	
II. Expectations for professional ethics research			0.86
8. Professional ethics to competition for tenure, promotion, and merit increases	0.28	0.84	
9. Conflict among personal, organizational, and professional ethics	0.31	0.84	
10. Refrain from fulfilling professional responsibilities due to lack of institutional support	0.22	0.84	
Eigenvalue	5.69	1.21	
% of variance	56.90	12.20	

<sup>a</sup>Primary loadings are underlined.

and Fidell, 2001). First, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if differences existed between the tenured and untenured groups on the set of two professional ethics expectations variables. Given a significant tenure status effect, a review of the underlying structure would be performed by assessing the individual contributions of expectations for professional ethics education and research. This evaluation looks at the canonical discriminate loadings (correlations) of each of the two variables with the underlying composite variable.

For analysis at the second tier the focus shifted to the individual level. Univariate *F*-tests were performed on each of the expectation for professional ethics variables by tenure status. After a significant difference was observed between tenured and untenured management faculty, the magnitude and direction of those differences was reviewed by inspecting the group means for each of the two scales and each of the ten individual items.

## Findings

Two preliminary analyses were conducted to verify underlying assumptions of using both multivariate

and univariate analyses of variance. First, since the tenure status groups were of unequal size, homogeneity of variance tests were performed to ensure the robustness of the significance tests to be performed in investigating the research question. The result at the multivariate level for the set of expectations for professional ethics variables was non-significant ( $p > 0.10$ ). At the univariate level results were non-significant for expectations for professional ethics education and research ( $p > 0.10$  for both variables). Taken collectively, these results indicated that no heterogeneity of variance problems existed and the null hypothesis of equal variances between tenure status groups was accepted.

The second preliminary test sought to determine if MANOVA was an appropriate analytic strategy. Specifically addressed was whether the two variables could be analyzed as a set. Bartlett's test of sphericity was performed and indicated ( $p < 0.01$ ) that using the two expectations for professional ethics variables as a set was warranted, thus strengthening the credibility of the two-tiered MANOVA approach.

With confirmation from the preliminary analyses an investigation of whether tenure status had an effect on expectations for professional ethics was conducted. The MANOVA analysis revealed a

TABLE III  
Descriptive statistics and univariate analyses between tenure groups

Variable	Group <sup>a</sup>				<i>F</i> <sup>b</sup>	<i>p</i>	Loadings <sup>c</sup>
	Tenured		Untenured				
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>			
Expectations for Professional Ethics Education	28.67	7.95	30.76	7.92	4.34	0.04	0.70
Expectations for Professional Ethics Research	12.42	3.88	13.85	3.83	8.58	0.00	0.99

<sup>a</sup>Tenured ( $n = 155$ ); Untenured ( $n = 105$ ).

<sup>b</sup>All *F* tests performed with 1 and 258 degrees of freedom.

<sup>c</sup>Canonical discriminant loadings (correlations) for Expectations for Professional Ethics Education and Expectations for Professional Ethics Research with the composite Expectations for Professional Ethics Development variable.

significant tenure status effect ( $F = 4.38$ ;  $df = 2$  and  $257$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). Further inspection of the results showed that untenured faculty (centroid = 0.22) had higher overall expectations for professional ethics development than tenured faculty (centroid = -0.15). As evidenced by the canonical discriminate loadings, expectations for professional ethics research contributed most strongly to the set (see Table III). Expectations for professional ethics education contributed moderately to defining the combined two-variable set. The finding is instructive, but not unexpected. Perhaps the greatest concern of untenured faculty lies in the area of research and publication, thus explaining the importance of expectations for professional ethics research in defining the underlying dimensionality of the combined two-variable set. In addition, many untenured faculty have limited employment experience, and the dual pressures for rapid demonstration of technical proficiency in publication and rapid organizational adjustment to distinctive work cultures stretches the hardest of personalities (Boice, 1992). Furthermore, the realities of status competition and demanding academic performance expectations in different institutions require ongoing "reality checks" of internal competence and external accomplishment at the most vulnerable time in an academic's career (Loch et al., 1998).

At the univariate level the authors evaluated differences between the two tenure status groups on

the individual expectation variables (see Table III). Both *F*-tests revealed significant differences between the groups ( $p < 0.05$ ). Untenured management faculty had higher expectations for professional ethics education and higher expectations for professional ethics research than their tenured management faculty counterparts. In light of the different employment situations of untenured and tenured faculty, and the relative lack of experience in the profession, it is not surprising that the untenured faculty need and want more professional direction regarding acceptable conduct.

A univariate analysis was conducted on each of the 10 individual professional ethics expectations variables (see Table IV). Significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) between tenure groups were revealed on five of the 10 individual variables. The five variables, on which tenured faculty had lower means than untenured faculty, were national conference general meeting and doctoral consortia/junior faculty workshops, regional professional ethics development track (three variables from the expectations for professional ethics education set) and competition for tenure, promotion, and merit increases and conflict among personal, professional, and organizational ethics (two variables from the expectations for professional ethics research set). The greater degree of professional network and institutional status embeddedness of tenured management faculty would account for the relatively lower mean scores among these five variables.



TABLE IV

Descriptive statistics and univariate analyses between tenure groups on individual expectations for professional ethics development variables

Variable	Group <sup>a</sup>				F <sup>b</sup>	p
	Tenured		Untenured			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1. National conference general meeting	4.75	1.38	5.08	1.25	3.82	0.05
2. Doctoral consortia and junior faculty Workshops	4.43	1.43	4.79	1.24	4.36	0.04
3. Membership awareness of professional Responsibilities	4.52	1.66	4.75	1.62	1.29	0.26
4. Professional ethics development track (national)	4.05	1.41	4.23	1.42	1.05	0.30
5. Professional ethics development track (regional)	3.43	1.48	3.89	1.50	5.84	0.02
6. Professional ethics education in managementdoctoral programs	3.36	1.45	3.70	1.46	3.29	0.07
7. Ethical climate development for management department chairs	4.14	1.38	4.33	1.36	1.30	0.26
8. Professional ethics to competition for tenure, promotion, and merit increases	3.99	1.49	4.60	1.47	10.73	0.00
9. Conflict among personal, organizational, and professional ethics	4.36	1.32	4.90	1.31	10.63	0.00
10. Refrain from fulfilling professional responsibilities due to lack of institutional support	4.07	1.57	4.34	1.54	1.91	0.17

<sup>a</sup>Tenured ( $n = 155$ ); Untenured ( $n = 105$ ).

<sup>b</sup>All  $F$  tests performed with 1 and 258 degrees of freedom.

### Discussion of findings and recommendations

In the current investigation the objective was to determine if tenure status of management faculty had an affect on expectations for professional ethics development education and encouragement for research on the AMCEC. Results showed there were differences at both the multi- and univariate levels. Two dimensions of expectations for professional ethics development were identified in a factor analysis (education and research). When taken as a set, untenured faculty had higher overall expectations for professional ethics development from the Academy with the research dimension making the stronger contribution to the set. Additionally, differences between the two groups were observed on expectations for professional ethics education and research (combined variable scales) and five of the individual variables from the 10 item instrument (three expectations for professional ethics education and two expectations for professional ethics research). Untenured faculty

had higher expectations for professional ethics on both the education and research dimensions.

Several caveats about the limitations of this study deserve mention before further interpretation and discussion of these results. First, only two dimensions of expectations for professional ethics development by the Academy of Management were measured and assessed. While the information about differences between tenured and untenured management faculty is instructive, the set of indicators is not exhaustive. Other aspects of expectations for professional ethics development may also be affected by tenure status. For this reason only generalizations with respect to education and research expectations can be made. Second, the current study was conducted with participants who were members of the Academy of Management and does not address tenure status effects for management professors who are not Academy members or who belong to other academic or professional organizations. Third, results of this study should not be interpreted in terms of causal rela-

tionships among variables. Factors other than tenure status may have an effect on expectations for professional ethics development. Only conclusions about descriptive differences between the two groups can be made. Given these limitations explanations for the results and implications of the research are provided below.

The findings indicated that among the combined multivariate variables dealing with tenured and untenured management faculty expectations for professional ethics education and research, that tenured faculty had statistically significant lower means on five variables. These lower means of the tenured faculty for the five variables of education and research expectations are a function of the greater degree of professional network and institutional status embeddedness of tenured management faculty (Van Emmerik and Sanders, 2004).

The findings point toward theoretical and practical recommendations. First, to counterbalance the theoretical model of insistent individualism that currently underlies the expectations of the tenured, autonomous management professional, it is recommended that doctoral programs and the Academy begin to train new and existing faculty in the relational model of managerial professionalism that is embedded in the AMCEC. Concern for accountability and enhancement of teaching performance relationships, scholarly productivity relationships, and on-campus/off-campus service relationships is interwoven throughout the AMCEC (Molander, 1987). The relative lack of appreciation of the relational context within which managerial professionalism emerges and the underemphasis of relationship development as a key professional responsibility, however, are at the root of the erosion of departmental collegiality and professional association social capital (Lin et al., 2001). The hunger for the relational guidance of a code-driven, professional community is more pronounced in the untenured faculty because they are in the early rhythms of their academic careers looking for professional models for earning tenure, but it is also apparent in the rhythms of renewal appropriate to tenured faculty (Frost and Taylor, 1996).

The recognition and celebration of management faculty, individually and collectively, at regional, national, and international conferences who exemplify adherence to the AMCEC standards and regularly demonstrate departmental collegial relations

would further enhance the visibility and role model impact for both tenured and untenured faculty. The Academy needs to consider offering a departmental recognition award for a collaborative group of management faculty that exhibit professional, supportive regard between and among tenured and untenured faculty, (i.e., ongoing mentoring of untenured faculty by tenured faculty; untenured faculty sharing new research and technological skills with tenured faculty). Furthermore, benchmarking activities that demonstrate relational behavior would be another means of internally and externally demonstrating that being a professional management educator carries with it certain citizenship obligations that supercede individual productivity (Bennett, 1998).

Moreover, in practice the Academy could begin to offer, at every annual regional, national, and international meeting, workshops on, and papers relating to improving professionalism through enhanced understanding and application of the AMCEC. In addition, the specific training programs for department chairpersons on how to assess and improve the ethical climate of a management department would highlight the role responsibility of chairs to model and support processes that make AMCEC viable at the local level of faculty performance (Wimbush and Shepard, 1994). For example, there could be a seminar session on how several management departments handle professional ethics issues and what processes they have in place to enhance the professional citizenship of their faculty members.

The Academy itself, through research, could begin to measure its activities that enhance social capital as a professional organization and begin benchmarking itself with other business and non-business professional organizations in terms of code education and research to both share and learn from other professional associations with respect to growing its social capital and integrity capacity (Petrick and Quinn, 2000; Ulrich and Lake, 1990). Since Academy conferences are already productive occasions for renewing research colleague relations, the extension of that collegial exchange into AMCEC-related departmental infrastructure enhancement would help to create a more professionally nurturing "home away from home" for both tenured and untenured faculty.

In effect, the distinctive significance this research resides in the following three results: (1) it empirically documents the specific, prioritized AMCEC professional ethics education and research needs of untenured faculty; (2) it explains the important role of temporal, network and institutional embeddedness in the professional socialization expectation differences between tenured and untenured management faculty; and (3) it provides new concrete recommendations for improving AMCEC-related services at the national, regional, and local departmental levels.

### Future research directions

A number of areas of future research suggest themselves for consideration. First, research with members of other professional organizations, both within and outside of the business field, to confirm or disconfirm the findings with respect to differences of expectations between tenured and untenured faculty would be useful to determine the broader scope of the research needed. Second, the influence of AMCEC application training in doctoral programs on differences in expectations would serve to determine the relative impact of professional ethics exposure prior to full-time employment demands. Third, research on the department faculty perceptions of management department chairpersons' positive influence on the ethical climate of the department prior to and subsequent to formal, sustained training to AMCEC applications would afford additional understanding. Fourth, other factors, such as age, sex, type of institution, discipline, or country of institutional location may also be variables which influence expectations and are worth future investigation. Fifth, a larger domain of expectations for

professional ethics development should be tested to expand understanding of how these differ between tenured and untenured faculty. Finally, department chairpersons' and other administrator perceptions of management faculty actual behavior prior to and subsequent to training and development efforts with respect to applying AMCEC standards to professional ethics education and research expectations would serve as a developmental benchmark against which behavioral change could be gauged.

### Summary

The current investigation has demonstrated that tenure status among management faculty members does indeed affect concerns about professional ethics development. While both tenured and untenured faculty were interested in more educational efforts related to the AMCEC, untenured management faculty had higher expectations for professional ethics education and higher expectations for professional ethics research guidance from the Academy of Management than their tenured management faculty counterparts. The need to address these training and development concerns at the national, regional, and local department levels has been demonstrated and recommendations for improving future AMCEC-related educational services were provided. Pursuit and implementation of the recommendations would assist in the AMCEC becoming more fully integrated and viable. As a result of these efforts the social capital of the Academy and the professional socialization of tenured and untenured faculty members in management departments would likely show marked improvements.

## APPENDIX A

### Membership Expectations Questions Regarding AMCEC Education and Research Efforts

- 
1. The Academy *should continue* to annually hold an educational session on professional ethics, specifically treating the Academic Management Code of Ethical Conduct (AMCEC), in its doctoral consortia and junior faculty workshops
  2. The Academy *should increase* its current educational efforts to enhance the *membership awareness of specific professional responsibilities* entailed in adherence to the AMCEC.
  3. The Academy *should recommend* that all accredited U.S. management doctoral programs include formal training in managerial professional ethics..
-

## APPENDIX A

Continued

- 
4. The Academy *should hold* annual educational session(s) on professional ethics, specifically treating the AMCEC, in its national conference general membership meetings.
  5. The Academy *should recommend* that a professional ethics development track be a part of the Call for Papers at each *annual national* meeting of the Academy.
  6. The Academy *should recommend* that a professional ethics development track be a part of the Call for Papers at each *annual regional* meeting of the Academy.
  7. The Academy *should encourage* the offering of workshops for management department chairpersons on assessing and developing the professional ethical climate of their organizational units.
  8. The Academy *should encourage* research on the extent to which faculty competition for tenure, promotion, and merit increases detracts from fulfilling managerial professional ethical responsibilities.
  9. The Academy *should encourage* research on the nature and extent of conflict experienced by members when personal, organizational, and professional ethical obligations are incongruent.
  10. The Academy *should encourage* research on the extent to which members refrain from fulfilling professional responsibilities because of the lack of financial and/or non-financial support from their institutions.
- 

**References**

- Academy of Management Code of Ethical Conduct: 1991, *Academy of Management Journal* **34**, 995–1002.
- Anand, V., B., Ashforth and M. Joshi: 2004, 'Business as Usual: The Acceptance and Perpetuation of Corruption in Organizations,' *Academy of Management Executive* **18**(2), 39–53.
- Anderson, K. and P. Buller: 1998, 'Ethical Climate, Ethical Congruence, and Burnout: A Synthesis', *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the International Association for Business and Society* (Kona, Hawaii), pp. 25–27.
- Arvey, R. D. and K. R. Murphy: 1998, 'Performance Evaluation in Work Settings', *Annual Review of Psychology* **49**(1), 141–168.
- Bayles, M.: 1993, 'Professional Power and Self-regulation', *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* **5**(2), 26–46.
- Bennett, J.: 1998, *Collegial Professionalism: The Academy, Individualism, and the Common Good* (American Council on Education and Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ).
- Bennett, J. and D. Figuli (eds): 1993, *Enhancing Departmental Leadership* (American Council on Education and Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ).
- Bigel, K. S.: 2000, 'The Ethical Orientation of Financial Planners Who are Engaged in Investment Activities: A Comparison of United States Practitioners Based on Professionalization and Compensation Sources', *Journal of Business Ethics* **40**, 323–337.
- Boice, R.: 1992, *The New Faculty Member: Supporting and Fostering Professional Development* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco).
- Brien, A.: 1998, 'Professional Ethics and the Culture of Trust', *Journal of Business Ethics* **17**, 391–409.
- Burt, R.: 1997, 'The Contingent Value of Social Capital', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **42**, 339–365.
- Caligiuri, P. M. and D. V. Day: 2000, 'Effects of Self-Monitoring on Technical, Contextual, and Assignment-Specific Performance', *Group and Organization Management* **25**(2), 154–174.
- Damrosch, D.: 1995, *We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).
- Dienhart, J.: 1995, 'Rationality, Ethical Codes, and an Egalitarian Justification of Ethical Expertise: Implications for Professions and Organizations', *Business Ethics Quarterly* **5**, 419–450.
- Donaldson, T.: 2000, 'Are Business Managers "professionals?"', *Business Ethics Quarterly* **10**(1), 83–94.
- Dunkelberg, J. and D. P. Robin: 1998, 'The Anatomy of Fraudulent Behavior', *Business Horizons* **41**(6), 77–89.
- Elm, D. R. and M. L. Nichols: 1990, 'Influences on the Moral Reasoning of Managers', Discussion Paper Number 139, Strategic Management Research Center (University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN).
- Elm, D. R. and M. L. Nichols: 1993, 'An Investigation of the Moral Reasoning of Managers', *Journal of Business Ethics* **19**, 817–838.
- Fairweather, J.: 1996, *Faculty Work and Public Trust: Restoring the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life* (Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA).
- Finkelstein, M., R., Seal and J. Schuster: 1998, *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transformation* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD).

- Footo, D. A. and T. B. Folta: 2002, 'Temporary Workers as Real Options', *Human Resource Management Review* **12**(4), 579–597.
- Forté, A.: 2004, 'Business Ethics: A Study of the Moral Reasoning of Selected Business Managers and the Influence of Organizational Ethical Climate', *Journal of Business Ethics* **51**, 167–173.
- Frankel, M.: 1989, 'Professional Codes: Why, How, and With What Impact?', *Journal of Business Ethics* **8**, 109–115.
- Frost, P. and S. Taylor: 1996, *Rhythms of Academic Life* (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA).
- Fukuyama, F.: 1995, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. (Free Press, New York).
- Gappa, J. and D. Leslie: 1993, *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-timers in Higher Education* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA).
- Gappa, J.: 1996, Off the Tenure Track: Six Models for Full-time, Non-tenurable Appointments, *American Association for Higher Education Faculty Roles and Rewards Working Papers* (Washington, DC).
- Gaumnitz, R. and J. Lere: 2002, 'Contents of Codes of Ethics of Professional Business Organizations in the United States', *Journal of Business Ethics* **35**, 35–49.
- Gioia, D.: 2002, 'Business Education's Role in the Crisis of Corporate Confidence', *Academy of Management Executive* **16**, 142–144.
- Granitz, N. and J. Ward: 2001, 'Actual and Perceived Sharing of Ethical Reasoning and Moral Intent Among In-Group and Out-group Members', *Journal of Business Ethics* **33**, 299–322.
- Hamilton, N.: 2002, *Academic Ethics: Problems and Materials on Professional Conduct and Shared Governance* (Oryx, New York).
- Harris, J. R.: 1990, 'Ethical Values of Individuals at Different Levels in the Organizational Hierarchy of a Single Firm', *Journal of Business Ethics* **9**, 741–750.
- Higgs-Kleyn, N. and D. Kapelians: 1999, 'The Role of Professional Codes in Regulating Ethical Conduct', *Journal of Business Ethics* **19**, 363–374.
- Ingvarson, L.: 1998, 'Professional Developments in the Pursuit of Professional Standards: The Standards-Based Professional Development System', *Teaching and Teacher Education* **14**, 127–140.
- Jamal, K. and N. Bowie: 1995, 'Theoretical Considerations for a Meaningful Code of Professional Ethics', *Journal of Business Ethics* **14**, 703–714.
- James, H.: 2000, 'Reinforcing Ethical Decision Making Through Organizational Structure', *Journal of Business Ethics* **28**, 43–58.
- Kelly, S. W., O. C. Ferrell and S. J. Skinner: 1990, 'Ethical Behavior Among Marketing Researchers: An Assessment of Selected Demographic Characteristics', *Journal of Business Ethics* **9**, 681–688.
- Koehn, D.: 1994, *The Ground of Professional Ethics* (Routledge, London, England).
- Kultgen, J.: 1988, *Ethics and Professionalism* (University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA).
- Lai, G., N., Lin and S. Y. Leung: 1998, 'Network Resources, Contact Resources, and Status Attainment', *Social Networks*, **20**(2), 159–178.
- Latif, D.: 2001, The Relationship Between Pharmacists' Tenure in the Community Setting and Moral Reasoning', *Journal of Business Ethics* **31**, 131–141.
- Leana, C. and H. Van Buren: 1999, 'Organizational Social Capital and Employment Practices', *Academy of Management Review* **24**, 538–555.
- Leatherman, C.: 2000, 'A Crusade Against Cronyism or a Breach of Collegiality?', *The Chronicle of Higher Education* **46**(44), A12–A14.
- Leicht, K. and M. Fennell: 2001, *Professional Work: A Sociological Approach* (Blackwell, Malden, MA).
- Lin, N., K., Cook and R. Burt, eds.: 2001, *Social Capital: Theory and Research* (Aldine De Gruyter, New York).
- Loch, C., S. Stout and B. Huberman: 1998, 'Status Competition and Performance in Work Groups', *INSEAD Working Paper Series* (Fontainebleau, France).
- Loeb, S.: 1994, 'Ethics and Accounting Doctoral Education', *Journal of Business Ethics* **13**, 817–828.
- Molander, E.: 1987, 'A Paradigm for Design, Promulgation and Enforcement of Ethical Codes', *Journal of Business Ethics* **6**, 619–631.
- Mooney, C.: 1993, 'Tenured Faculty Members are Spared in Latest Round of Belt Tightening', *Chronicle of Higher Education* **32**, A17–18.
- Moorman, R. H. and L. K. Harland: 2002, 'Temporary Employees as Good Citizens: Factors Influencing Their OCB Performance', *Journal of Business Psychology* **17**(2), 171–187.
- Motowildo, S., W. Borman and M. Schmit: 1997, 'A Theory of Individual Differences in Task and Contextual Performance', *Human Performance* **10**(2), 71–83.
- Nahapiet, J. and S. Ghoshal: 1998, 'Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage', *Academy of Management Review* **23**, 242–266.
- Payne, S.: 1988, 'Values and Ethics-Related Measures for Management Education', *Journal of Business Ethics* **7**(4), 273–280.
- Payne, S. and S. Brenner: 1990, 'Doctoral Programs in Business and Management: Investigation of Criticisms and Reforms', *Journal of Management Education* **14**, 1–13.
- Payne, S. and S. Brenner: 1994, 'Ethics Code Implementation/Enforcement: The Challenge Facing the

- Academy of Management', Symposium presented at the Academy of Management Meeting (Atlanta, GA).
- Pennino, C.: 2002, 'Does Tenure Impact Upon the Principled Reasoning of Managers?' *Journal of Business Ethics* **40**, 219–226.
- Peterson, R. and O. C. Ferrell, eds.: 2005, *Business Ethics: New Challenges for Business Schools and Corporate Leaders* (M.E. Sharpe: Armonk, NY).
- Petrick, J.: 1992, 'Organizational Ethics Development and the Human Resource Professional', *Journal of Career Planning and Employment* **14**, 71–76.
- Petrick, J. and J. Quinn: 2000, 'The Integrity Capacity Construct and Moral Progress in Business', *Journal of Business Ethics* **23**, 3–18.
- Poole, M. and L. Bornholt: 1998, 'Career Development of Academics: Cross-cultural and Lifespan Factors', *International Journal of Behavioral Development* **22**(1), 103–126.
- Premeaux, S. and R.W. Mondy: 2002, 'Perspectives on Tenure: Tenured Versus Nontenured Tenure-track Faculty', *Journal of Education for Business* **77**(5), 335–339.
- Putnam, R.: 1993, 'The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life', *The American Prospect* **13**, 35–42.
- Randall, P.: 1997, *Adult Bullying: Perpetrators and Victims* (Routledge, London, England).
- Rapkins, C.: 1996, 'Best Practices for Continuing Professional Development: Professional Bodies Facing the Challenge,' in I. Woodward (ed.), *Continuing Professional Development: Issues in Design and Delivery* (Cassell, London, England), pp. 216–225.
- Rezaee, Z., R. Elmore and J. Szendi: 2001, 'Ethical Behavior in Higher Educational Institutions: The Role of the Code of Conduct', *Journal of Business Ethics* **30**, 171–183.
- Swanson, D. and W. Frederick: 2003, 'Are Business Schools Silent Partners in Corporate Crime?', *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* **3**, 24–27.
- Tabachnick, B. and L. Fidell: 2001, *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 4th Edition (Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, MA).
- Tierney, W.: 1997, 'Tenure and Community in Academe', *Educational Researcher* **26**, 17–23.
- Tierney, W. and E. Bensimon: 1996, *Promotion and Tenure: Community Socialization in Academe* (State University of New York Press, Albany, NY).
- Trank, C. and C. Rynes: 2003, 'Who Moved Our Cheese? Reclaiming Professionalism in Business Education', *Academy of Management Learning and Education* **2**(2), 189–205.
- Tyler, T. R.: 1998, 'Why People Cooperate with Organizations: An Identity-based Perspective.' in R. I. Sutton and M. Staw (eds), *Research and Organizational Behavior*, (Greenwich, CT, JAI Press), pp. 57–68.
- Ulrich, D. and D. Lake: 1990, *Organizational Capability* (John Wiley, New York).
- Useem M. and Karabel, J.: 1986, 'Pathways to Top Corporate Management', *American Sociological Review* **44**, 184–200.
- Van Emmerik, H. and K. Sanders: 2004, 'Social Embeddedness and Job Performance of Tenured and Non-tenured Professionals', *Human Resource Management Journal* **14**(1), 1–14.
- Van Emmerik, I. J. H. and M. C. Euwema: 2001, 'At Risk of Burnout: Gender and Faculty Differences Within Academia.' in J. De Jonge, P. Vlerick, A. Bussing and W. B. Schaufeli (eds), *Organizational Psychology and Health Care at the Start of a New Millennium*, 117–128.
- Vredenburg, D. and Y. Brender: 1998, 'The Hierarchical Abuse of Power in Work Organizations', *Journal of Business Ethics* **17**, 1337–1347.
- Walker, G., B. Kogut and W. Shan: 1997, 'Social Capital, Structural Holes, and the Formation of an Industry Network', *Organizational Science* **8**, 109–125.
- Wiley, C.: 2000, 'Ethical Standards for Human Resource Management Professionals: A Comparative Analysis of Five Major Codes', *Journal of Business Ethics* **25**, 93–114.
- Wimbush, J., J. Shepard and S. Markham: 1997, 'An Empirical Examination of the Relationship Between Ethical Climate and Ethical Behavior From Multiple Levels of Analysis', *Journal of Business Ethics* **16**, 1705–1716.
- Windsor, D.: 2002, An Open Letter on Business School Responsibility: To the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Blue Ribbon Committee on Accreditation (October 9).
- Wood, D.: 2002, Personal Endorsement of Windsor's Open Letter to the AACSB Blue Ribbon Committee on Accreditation Quality (October 14).
- Zadek, S.: 1998, 'Balancing Performance, Ethics, and Accountability', *Journal of Business Ethics* **17**, 1421–1441.

Joseph A. Petrick  
Raj Soin College of Business,  
Wright State University,  
Dayton, Ohio  
U.S.A.

Robert F. Scherer  
Nance College of Business Administration,  
Cleveland State University,  
2121 Euclid Ave. BU420,  
Cleveland, OH 44115-2214,  
U.S.A.  
E-mail: r.scherer@csuohio.edu