Hospitality Review

1-1-2008

Faculty Hiring Criteria in Hospitality Education Programs

Robert H. Woods
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, robert.woods@unlv.edu

Seonghee Cho
University of Missouri, Columbia, null@null.edu

Raymond S. Schmidgall
Michigan State University, shbsirc@msu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/hospitalityreview

Recommended Citation

Woods, Robert H.; Cho, Seonghee; and Schmidgall, Raymond S. (2009) "Faculty Hiring Criteria in Hospitality Education Programs,"
Hospitality Review: Vol. 26: Iss. 1, Article 5.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/hospitalityreview/vol26/iss1/5

Faculty Hiring Criteria in Hospitality Education Programs

Abstract

This study examined criteria used in selecting faculty at I-CHRIE hospitality-management education programs in the United States. Results provide a baseline for consideration of faculty at all ranks. The three most important hiring criteria for assistant professors were a PhD or equivalent terminal degree, publication/research, and hospitality-industry work experience. For associate and full professors, the three most important factors were a PhD or equivalent terminal degree, publication/research, and college teaching experience. Results indicated that most programs use similar criteria in evaluating faculty applicants. This study also found that leadership ability is the most important factor in hiring department heads/directors. Results are useful to administrators and faculty evaluating applicants and to faculty interested in applying to hospitality-management education programs.

Faculty Hiring Criteria in
Hospitality Education Programs

By Robert H. Woods, SeongHee Cho and Raymond S. Schmidgall

This study examined criteria used in selecting faculty at I-CHRIE hospitality-management education programs in the United States. Results provide a baseline for consideration of faculty at all ranks. The three most important hiring criteria for assistant professors were a PhD or equivalent terminal degree, publication/research, and hospitality-industry work experience. For associate and full professors, the three most important factors were a PhD or equivalent terminal degree, publication/research, and college teaching experience. Results indicated that most programs use similar criteria in evaluating faculty applicants. This study also found that leadership ability is the most important factor in hiring department heads/directors. Results are useful to administrators and faculty evaluating applicants and to faculty interested in applying to hospitality-management education programs.

Many studies have been conducted on faculty evaluation and promotion, but few have shown how the selection process works in hospitality-management education (Park & Riggs, 1993). Faculty evaluation studies typically report on the use of teaching, research, and service as key criteria for promotion and tenure. The importance of these criteria has changed over time, in recent years shifting more rewards research (Street, Baril, & Benke, 1993). Moreover, while a few educators appear to be able to excel simultaneously in all three areas (teaching, research, and service), most find this very difficult. (Schmidgall & Woods, 1994). As a result, most educators concentrate on selectively chosen responsibilities in which they perform better or feel more comfortable. (Schmidgall & Woods). This scenario raises the question of how faculty candidates are evaluated for selection, and how they actually should be evaluated. Thus, this article addresses the selection question.

The United States has eleven schools with PhD programs in hospitality-management education. Most graduates of these programs take positions in college and university education. PhD students in these programs learn while in college that they will be evaluated on three criteria: teaching, research, and service. However, upon graduation many find it hard to succeed at all three.

Sheldon and Collison (1990) found that having a PhD in the field was the single most important factor in determining whether a candidate would be selected for interviews and hiring. While this study provided considerable useful information, it did not include work experience as a factor. This omission was due primarily to the fact that the authors examined only tourism programs. Such programs are much more likely to employ people without practical field experience and are, therefore, less likely to require field experience for selection. Some leaders in hospitality-management education have even identified industry work experience as the single most important factor in selection (Miller, 1988).

As a result of the conflicting findings in earlier studies, there is no clear picture of which factors are most important in the faculty-selection process. In this study we hoped to fill that void by (1) investigating which criteria are most important when hiring new faculty at all ranks in hospitality-management education programs and (2) establishing the minimum requirements for faculty selection used by I-CHRIE member schools.

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

The target population of this study consisted of administrators who held positions as deans, directors of departments, department heads, or program heads of hospitality programs at four-year colleges/universities in the United States. The sample population was chosen from the member directory of the International Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education (I-CHRIE). A self-administered questionnaire was mailed to a sample of 142 members of I-

CHRIE who held administrative positions. Fifty-nine members returned the questionnaire, representing a 41.55 % usable response rate.

Measures

The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section contained eight questions measuring hiring criteria for the tenure-track faculty positions of assistant, associate, and full professor. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each item on a 5-point scale, 1 representing *the most important* and 5 representing *the least important*. The other points were 2, *representing very important*; 3, *representing important*; and 4, *representing slightly important*.

In the second section, respondents were asked to rate the importance of hiring criteria for a position of department head/director based on a 5-point scale, 1 representing *the most important* and 5 representing *the least important*. Four criteria were added for hiring a department head/director: academic administration experience, familiarity with constituencies, fund-raising abilities, and leadership skills.

The third section of the questionnaire contained questions about the minimum requirements for assistant, associate, and full professor, and dean/director/department head positions. Six questions included in this section addressed educational level, industry experience, teaching experience, refereed publication/research record, non-refereed publication record, and presentation record. The fourth section of the survey was designed to collect demographic information, including faculty position, location of the hospitality unit, faculty rank, and degrees granted by the program.

Data Analysis

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine differences in hiring criteria among assistant, associate, and full professors. MANOVA was preferred for analyzing the differences in hiring criteria among the three faculty positions over a univariate analysis, such as one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), because MANOVA overcomes two drawbacks of ANOVA. They are (1) "excessive inflation of experiment wise Type I and Type II error" and (2) "correlations among dependent variables" (Haase & Ellis, 1987, pp.404-405). Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) suggested that the choice of using MANOVA over ANOVA should be based on correlations among dependent variables. Tabachnick and Fidell noted that MANOVA should be used for highly negatively correlated dependent variables or for moderately correlated dependent variables (around 0.6) (p.357). Because all three correlation coefficients of the dependent variables were higher than 0.6 and significant at the 0.01 level, MANOVA was appropriate to examine significant differences in the selection criteria. Following multivariate tests, univariate analysis of variance was employed to assess which selection criteria were significantly different from others. The importance of hiring criteria for a department heads/directors was examined by univariate analysis of variance, followed by a Tukey's Post Hoc Test.

Chi-square analysis was employed to examine significant differences in educational level among the faculty positions because educational level was measured in a categorical format: PhD degree, master's degree, and bachelor's degree. Analysis of variance was used to examine significant differences among the faculty positions for industry experience, teaching experience, and number of refereed publications, non-refereed publications, and presentations. To avoid inflating Type I and II errors by conducting five ANOVAs, Bonferroni correction was applied for the significance level.

RESULTS

Demographic Profile of Respondents

As shown in Table 1, 21% of the respondents were deans, 23% directors, 25% department heads, and 23% program heads. The majority of respondents were full professors (47%), followed by associate professors (30%), and assistant professors (18%). Thirty-eight percent of the hospitality programs were part of a department; 37 % were independent departments; and 21% were college-level programs. Some 17.5% granted PhD degrees, while 46% granted master's degrees.

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Respondents

	n	%
Position		
Dean	12	21.4
Director	13	23.2
Department Head	14	25.0
Program Head	13	23.2
Other	4	7.2
Faculty Rank		
Assistant professor	10	18.2
Associate professor	17	30.9
Full professor	27	49.1
Other	1	1.8
Level of Hospitality Unit		
College	12	21.4
Department	22	39.3
Program with a department	21	37.5
Other	1	1.8
Location of Hospitality Education Program		
Business college	15	26.8
Human Ecology college	16	28.6
Separate college	14	25.0
Other	11	19.6
Master's Degree		
Yes	26	46.4
No	30	53.6
PhD Degree		
Yes	10	17.9
No	46	82.1
Institution		
Public	38	67.9
Private	18	32.1

Differences in Selection Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty Positions

Before conducting multivariate statistics, we examined the assumptions of MANOVA. Since the groups were of approximately equal size, homogeneity of variance was assumed (Hair et al., 1998). Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was used to test the appropriateness of the multivariate

statistics. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity showed significance, indicating that dependent variables were significantly correlated, and MANOVA was appropriate to examine multivariate differences among the dependent variables. Results of multivariate variance analysis showed that there were significant differences in the eight hiring criteria among three faculty positions, (Wilks' lambda = .80, F-value = 6.58, p < .001).

Hiring Assistant Professors

A univariate analysis and a Tukey's Post Hoc Test were employed to determine which criterion was significantly more important than others. Results of the analysis and comparisons using Tukey's Post Hoc Test are shown in Table 2. For hiring an assistant professor, four factors were perceived as most important, very important, or important (receiving a mean score of less than 2.50). They were a PhD or equivalent terminal degree (M=1.85), publication/research records (M=2.18), hospitality-industry work experience (M=2.22), and college-teaching experience (M=2.25). These four criteria were significantly more important than a university service record (M=3.19) and a hospitality-industry service record (M=3.20). However, there was no significant difference among the four factors. Among the four items, a PhD or equivalent terminal degree was determined to be a "very important factor" in making a selection decision (M=1.85). The top four factors (a PhD or equivalent terminal degree, publication/research, hospitality-industry work experience, and college teaching experience) were considered significantly more important than a university service record and a hospitality-industry service record.

Hiring Associate Professors

Results (see Table 2) for hiring associate professors indicated that six hiring criteria were either very important or important (receiving a mean score of less than 2.50). They were a PhD or equivalent terminal degree (M=1.72), publication/research records (M=1.75), college teaching experience (M=1.90), a presentation record (M=2.26), hospitality-industry work experience (M=2.33), and a PhD in hospitality management (M=2.41). Two items (a PhD or equivalent terminal degree and publication/research records) were perceived to be significantly more important than a university service record and a hospitality-industry service record. An interesting finding was that the respondents indicated that college teaching experience was more important than a hospitality-industry service record.

Hiring Full Professors

Results (see Table 2) for hiring full professors showed that five factors were considered either very important or important (receiving a mean score of less than 2.50). They were a PhD or equivalent terminal degree (M=1.67), publication/research records (M=1.73), college teaching experience (M=1.80), presentation record (M=2.14), and hospitality-industry work experience (M=2.40). For full professors only, a hospitality industry service record (M=2.64) was significantly less important than the top three hiring factors: a PhD or equivalent terminal degree, publication/research record, and college teaching experience.

Table 2

Post Hoc test for the Hiring Faculty Criteria

Selecting Criteria	Faculty Position					
	Assistant		Associate		Full	
	Rank	*M*	Rank	*M*	Rank	*M*
PhD or equivalent terminal degree	1	1.85[a]	1	1.72[a,c]	1	1.67[a]
Publication/research	2	2.18[a,c]	2	1.75[a,c]	2	1.73[a,c]
Hospitality industry work experience	3	2.22[a,c]	5	2.33	5	2.40
College teaching experience	4	2.25[a,c]	3	1.90[c,d]	3	1.80[a,c]
PhD in hospitality management	5	2.52	6	2.41	6 tied	2.52
Presentation record	6	2.65[c,b]	4	2.26	4	2.14
University service record	7	3.19[b]	7	2.67[b,d]	6 tied	2.52
Hospitality industry service record	8	3.20[b]	8	2.84[b]	8	2.64[b]
F-value		7.34		5.02		4.38
Univariate Significant level		.000		.000		.000

Note: Means with a different superscripted letter (a,b,c) are significantly different at .05; 1 indicating *the most important*, and 5 indicating *the least important*, attribute.

Differences in Selection Criteria for Department Heads/Directors

Univariate analysis of variance showed that there was a significant difference in the 12 hiring criteria, ($F_{11, 574} = 2.377$, $p = .083$). As Table 3 shows, 11 hiring criteria received a mean importance score of less than 2.5. Only PhDs in hospitality management received an average score of greater than 2.5. For the department head/director positions, leadership ability was the most important factor (M=1.60), followed by a PhD or equivalent terminal degree (M=1.75) and academic administrative experience (M=1.78). Leadership ability was also considered significantly more important than hospitality-industry work experience (M=2.35), hospitality- industry service record (M=2.49), and a PhD in hospitality management (M=2.78).

Table 3

Post Hoc test of Importance of Hiring Department Head/Director Criteria

Hiring Criteria	Rank	Mean of Importance*
Leadership ability	1	1.60[a]
PhD or equivalent terminal degree	2	1.75[a,c]
Academia administrative experience	3	1.78[a,c]
Familiarity with constituencies	4	1.86[a,c]
College teaching experience	5	1.90[a,c]
Fund raising abilities	6	1.99[a,c]
Publication/research	7	2.19
Presentation record	8	2.29
University, college, and program service record	8	2.29
Hospitality industry work experience	10	2.35[c,d]
Hospitality industry service record	11	2.49[c,d]
PhD in hospitality management	12	2.78[b,d]

* Means with a different superscripted letter (a,b,c,d) are significantly different at .05 level.
** The mean scores were computed from the questions of rating the twelve attributes of hiring a department head; 1 indicated the most important and 5 indicating the least important attribute.

Minimum Requirements for Hiring Faculty

Table 4 shows results of analysis of the minimum requirements when hiring faculty. A significant difference was found between faculty positions with a minimum required educational level, $\chi2 = 13.31$, p-value = .038. More than 60% of the respondents indicated that a candidate should have the minimum of a PhD degree for all four positions: assistant, associate, full professor, and dean/program director/department head. When hiring a full professor, 92 % of the respondents reported that a PhD degree was required. On the other hand, only 73% of the respondents reported that a PhD degree was required for a candidate for the position of dean/program director/department head.

Univariate analysis was conducted to examine whether the minimum requirements vary between the four faculty positions. As shown in Table 4, full professors (M=8.00) and deans/directors/heads of departments (M=6.90) were expected to have more teaching experience than assistant professors (M=1.33) and associate professors (M=4.91). The refereed publication records were significantly different among the faculty positions: Candidates applying for a full professor position were expected to have about 12.22 publications, associate professors 6.61, and assistant professors 1.38. The presentation requirement was also significantly different among the faculty positions. Candidates applying for full professor were expected to have about 10.59 presentations, for associate professor about 6.06, and for assistant professor about 1.58 presentations.

Table 4

Minimum Requirements for Hiring Faculty

	Assistant	Associate	Full	Dean/Dir/ Dept.Head	Statistics**	Sig. level
Education level					13.31	.038
PhD	64.0%*	77.6%	92.0%	73.9%		
Master's	34.0%	22.4%	8.0%	26.1%		
Bachelor	2.0%	0	0	0		
Industry experience (years)					1.57	.199
Mean	3.64	4.26	4.59	4.89		
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Maximum	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00		
Teaching experience (years)					52.62	.000
Mean	1.33^a	4.91^b	8.00^c	6.90^c		
Minimum	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00		
Maximum	7.00	10.00	5.00	15.00		
Number of publications records						
Refereed Publications					24.35	.000
Mean	1.38^a	6.61^{b,d}	12.22^{c,e}	9.76^{d,e}		
Minimum	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00		
Maximum	6.00	20.00	40.00	40.00		
Non-refereed publications					10.14	.000
Mean	1.50^a	4.58^{b,c,d}	7.69^{c,d}	6.87^d		
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Maximum	6.00	12.00	20.00	20.00		
Number of presentations					22.11	.000
Mean	1.58^a	6.06^{b,d}	10.59^{c,e}	8.72^{d,e}		
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Maximum	5.00	12.00	24.00	20.00		

Note: Means with a different superscripted letter (a,b,c,d,e) are significantly different at .05 level. For example, teaching experience for assistant professors (M=1.33), which has "a," is significantly different than teaching experience for associate professors (M=4.91). "The associate professor" has a letter of "b, which is different from "a." But, there is no difference between full professor and dean; thus both have "c."

* Percentage of the respondents indicated as a minimum requirement for Education Level.

** Chi-square was used to test Education Level and F test by one-way ANOVA was used for all others.

Conclusion

Results of this study provide a baseline for consideration of faculty at all ranks in hospitality-management education programs. As noted throughout the paper, most programs use somewhat similar rankings in consideration of various faculty applicants. This study reported both the means, useful in determining what is most important to others overall, and statistical analyses, which demonstrate significant differences among programs, faculty ranks, and so on. The results of this study indicated that those wanting to apply for an assistant professor position need to focus on research (publication and presentation), teaching, and hospitality-industry work experience. Sheldon and Collison had found that a PhD in the field was the single most important factor; however, this study showed that a PhD in hospitality management is ranked fifth in importance among eight factors. Thus, this study disconfirmed Sheldon and Collison's finding. In addition, this study demonstrated that hospitality-industry work experience

is an important factor of selection, but not more than a PhD or equivalent terminal degree, publication/research, and college teaching experience. Therefore, the results of this study are different than Miller's (1988).

For all three faculty positions, the PhD or equivalent terminal degree was considered the most important factor, followed by publication/research. While industry work experience was ranked at number three for assistant professors, college teaching experience was considered the third most important criterion for associate and full professors.

The respondents indicated that leadership ability is the most important factor in selecting a department head/director. It would be interesting and valuable to know which criteria programs use to evaluate the leadership abilities of candidates for department head/director.

This information should be useful to those planning to interview faculty and/or administrators in hospitality management education programs. Without this information, there is no point of comparison among programs, and faculty are forced to operate in isolation from one another.

Many aspects of this topic have not been investigated herein. We felt it our responsibility to establish a baseline, since none existed. Future researchers will want to concentrate on more specific differences among hospitality-management education programs and perhaps compare these results with programs outside hospitality.

References

Haase, R.F., & Ellis, M.V. (1987). Multivariate analysis of variance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*(4), 404-413.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.).Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Miller, D.T. (1987). A literature review of faculty evaluation: Prelude to accreditation standards for faculty in four-year hospitality management education programs. *Hospitality Education & Research Journal, 11*(2), 209-219.

Park, B., & Riggs, R. (1993). Tenure and promotion: A study of practices by institutional type. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 19*(2), 72-77.

Schmidgall, R.S., & Woods, R.H. (1994). CHRIE member perceptions of tenure requirements in hospitality education programs, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research 18*(1), 101-120.

Sheldon, P.J., & Collison, F.M. (1990). Faculty review criteria in tourism and hospitality. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*, 556-567.

Street, D.L., Baril, C.P., & Benke, Jr., P.L. (1993). Research, teaching, and service in promotion and tenure decisions of accounting faculty. *Journal of Accounting Education, 11*(1), 43-60.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Robert H. Woods is Professor, William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration, University of Nevada Las Vegas; **Seong Hee Cho** is Assistant Professor, Hotel and Restaurant Management Program, University of Missouri; **Raymond S. Schmidgall** is Hilton Hotels Professor, School of Hospitality Business, Michigan State University.