Becoming a Teacher at a Research University
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I was approached by one of the editors of this book to write this chapter after I had given a talk in a symposium Peter Frost had directed at the Academy of Management annual meetings on teaching doctoral students to teach. I thought the idea of the book was great and the topic of the chapter important, and I was happy to be asked to participate in this project. When I agreed to write this chapter, I knew that it would be challenging for me, but it was even more difficult than I had expected. First, I knew that writing about the content required would necessitate my using a very different approach from what I use in other writing. Basically, the chapter demanded that I talk personally about myself, my perceptions and opinions, instead of about theory and data. What I did not anticipate was that it would also be difficult to shift gears in terms of writing style. Like most academics, I am very used to writing in a particular scientific way, with third person being the dominant voice. It was difficult to write more informally, and my bet is that a nonacademic reading this chapter will still believe that my style is too formal for telling a personal story. In any case, what follows is my perspective on the role of teaching at a research university and how to manage the process of balancing teaching and research. In writing this chapter I have learned more concerning my own views about both teaching and research, and my opinions in some ways have evolved in the process.

I think the process of developing into a good teacher at a research university is different than at a primarily teaching-oriented university, for a number of reasons. First, those who have been trained to be researchers and to strive for employment at research-oriented universities probably have not been trained fully, or possibly at all, in how to be good teachers. Generally, good doctoral programs focus on training students to do quality research. The job of doctoral students is to learn the analytic and research-oriented skills that will enable them to become productive scholars. The overarching goal of most doctoral programs is not to turn out good teachers; in fact, some academics would argue that their students don't
need to be trained in how to teach, because if they know the material well they should have no problem communicating it to others. There is a wide variance in how much and at what level of exposure graduating doctoral students have learned how to teach, from having had the opportunity to teach a few courses to having no classroom experience at all. In fact, a common message that is communicated is that one needs only to be competent at teaching, that research should be the number-one priority. I agree with this focus on research and think it should continue, but I believe that teaching can be better integrated into doctoral curricula so that new faculty members are prepared to do both successfully, particularly in business schools, where it is increasingly important to be a good teacher. Therefore, just as there has always been the emphasis on junior faculty to develop into independent, productive researchers, more programs could focus on helping students to develop techniques for quality teaching.

A second issue is that the reward and evaluation systems at traditionally research-oriented schools are not set up to stress or fully address quality teaching. At teaching schools, this is the main focus of evaluations. That is, research universities by their very nature implicitly or even explicitly make it clear that faculty are to concentrate on research. This is the evaluation criterion, and rewards are based on successful research. Thus at research universities it is typically unclear how teaching fits into the promotion and reward equation. If one accepts the premise that at research universities one must be a competent teacher, the issue is whether one should go beyond competence and strive to be very good or excellent at teaching.

Given the emphasis on research, why should one try to be better than a merely competent teacher? Is this something that junior faculty members should be expending their efforts on? I'm sure there are differences in opinions regarding these questions, and I don't know if there are any right answers. I do know that I personally feel that it is important for me to do well at teaching, for two basic reasons. The first is an intrinsic reason, and that is what initially motivated me: If you are going to do something, then do it well. Second, there is a more practical reason that I've just started becoming aware of during the past couple of years, as the emphasis in business schools has started to change toward quality teaching. Specifically, it seems to be becoming increasingly important to have faculty who can teach well and at all levels, including executive programs. Although I haven't seen corresponding changes in the compensation structure to support this, I am starting to see and hear about it being reflected in how selection and renewal decisions are being made for faculty.

My view is that it is entirely possible to be both a good researcher and a good teacher, but one has to be fairly deliberate about managing the process and realistic about the rewards. Of course there are individual differences and various constraints, but I believe both can be done successfully, and are done well by many individuals. The demands on scholars' time have been increased by the addition of greater emphasis on teaching to the continuing primary emphasis on research. Just as we work at developing the skills, norms, and values that enable our doctoral students to become productive researchers, we can instill values concerning teaching so that our students are successful in both areas as junior faculty. Basically, I view teaching as an essential, though not necessarily rewarded, component of my job. Therefore, I try to do well at it. I really couldn't see spending so much time in the classroom over the years and not doing a good job. I don't know if it is achievement motivation, ego involvement, or both that's the explanatory factor driving me, but it is logical to think that most of us may not have chosen academia as a profession if not for having had some good teachers. So why not continue the tradition?

As for my story, I see my developing into a good teacher as a definite passage. Quite simply, I did not choose this as a profession based on my desire to teach. In fact, the idea of teaching was almost a deterrent to my choosing to go into academia. Plain and simple, I chose this career in order to be free to pursue research in which I was interested and to work in a stimulating intellectual environment. Today, I would be uncomfortable stating this so plainly to my undergraduate or master's students. When I started teaching I was concerned with being competent, but as I progressed and did better (and realized I could do better), teaching became more important to me. In fact, I can honestly say that I really enjoy teaching and
have enjoyed getting to know many of my students—although I still do complain about the amount of time teaching takes away from my research.

In the following pages I present my perspective on the process of becoming a good teacher at a research university. I tell you about my background, discuss some of my experiences, highlight some key issues to consider, and, finally, offer some recommendations to others that may enhance their own experiences and help them avoid some of the apparent and not so apparent pitfalls. Although much of what I say here concerns my own experience balancing research and teaching demands as a doctoral student at the University of Illinois and as assistant professor at the University of Arizona and some of the experiences of colleagues at the same and different academic institutions, I think that the majority of the issues discussed and experiences mentioned can be generalized to most research universities. Given that I am speaking in general, I realize that there are some exceptions to what I am saying. For example, there are a few top research universities where MBA and executive teaching always have been heavily emphasized. However, at many research universities, particularly public land grant universities, this has not always been the case. Also, I discuss below some fundamental changes in business schools regarding teaching that have occurred (and are still in the process of occurring) since I started in the late 1980s.

From Whence I Came

In sitting down to write this chapter, reflecting on how I became a good teacher while attaining the research productivity desired at a research university, I had to think about how oddly things have turned out—from where I started to where I am now. As an undergraduate social psychology major at SUNY Albany, I was committed to getting a PhD in applied psychology or a related field in order to do empirical research. As I neared graduation from college, I realized that graduating PhDs in social psychology were not getting jobs. Being ever so practical, I started to look for related areas. During that time, one of the last undergraduate classes I took was an organizational behavior course taught by Tom Taber; I loved it, and
views of ourselves that may not always be in sync with how others view us, but I did not think I would be good at teaching. In some ways, looking back, it might have been fortunate that I had no choice but to teach from the first semester in the doctoral program, or I might have avoided the experience for as long as possible. The way funding was then set up at Illinois, doctoral students taught 10 hours per week and were research assistants for 10 hours. During my first semester in organizational behavior, I was assigned to teach an introductory management skills course under Dave Whetten's direction. This course was a precursor to the organizational behavior course and, as such, the material was dealt with in an introductory manner, with a strong emphasis on the use of experiential exercises for skill building. Because of this, the instructor's job was more facilitation than lecturing. As someone who had never taught and was not used to public speaking, I found this difficult. Dave had the new group of teaching assistants participate in a fairly comprehensive training session about teaching techniques and course material for about a week, and we were given a textbook, syllabus, and sample exercises. Even so, I found it daunting to go into that first class and facilitate discussion. I can say that I did all right, no complaints to the dean, but I was by no means wonderful. The next semester I repeated the process and improved slightly, but still did not enjoy it. I would probably go so far as to say that I worked at getting through my teaching days. I definitely did not look forward to teaching and did not really enjoy the students at that point.

Fortunately, things changed in my second year of the program. There was an opportunity for one of the doctoral students to teach a human resources course. That person would be given full responsibility for the course—and it was lecture/discussion! I lobbied to be assigned this course for a variety of reasons. I had a master's in the area, so I was well qualified to teach the material, I felt that I would be better at a class that was structured primarily around lectures rather than facilitation, and I thought I would enjoy teaching this material. I was given the course and set to work developing it. Initially, I had to invest a significant amount of time in structuring the course, because I'd never taken a basic human resources course, even though I had taken courses in a number of the topic areas covered. Without a syllabus, with no book selected, and without the kind of training and structure Dave had provided, it meant quite a time sink. This was probably not what I should have been doing as a second-year PhD student, but it was worth it. I was much more comfortable with this type of material, and the lecture format, and I did better. As I kept improving and my ratings went up, I started to enjoy teaching and really came to enjoy my students.

What's interesting now is that my teaching has come full circle. My teaching style now is very facilitative, even in large lecture courses, but still very factually oriented. So ultimately my initial experience was good for my development—and I still use some of the techniques that I learned in Dave's training course. However, I am glad that I opted to put time into developing my own course that second year—or I might not have felt as good as I eventually did about teaching. I think that this has been a recurring theme for me—that sometimes it is worth putting in the time because of the rewards that I ultimately get. One of my last semesters teaching at Illinois, I was named to the TA Teaching Distinction List; this recognition of my efforts was a nice addition.

**Managing the Process as a Junior Faculty Member**

When I started at the University of Arizona, I felt confident that I could be a competent teacher, but wanted to continue my upward trajectory of doing well teaching. Let me stop and say that by no means was I then, or am I now, aspiring to be the best. What I wanted was to do very well at teaching. Basically, I refuse to commit the effort needed to be rated excellent. Of course, when I receive an excellent rating I am very happy, but I don't feel I can commit the time and resources to do that well consistently. I think I had very realistic training in how I was to make it in academia—publish, plain and simple, and be competent at teaching so they don't have to get rid of you. My training at Illinois prepared me for Arizona, where, as in any other research-oriented school, to do well I had to publish in quality outlets. Teaching was documented, but teaching alone wasn't going to lead to promotions. Looking back, given the demands on my time and the evaluation pro-
ness that was in place, the strategy I chose may not have been the best, but there were subsequent changes that occurred at Arizona that resulted in teaching quality being more carefully scrutinized, so that I actually benefited in the long run by the decision to focus on producing quality research while still striving to do very well at teaching.

What I found unexpectedly at Arizona was that even though we weren't rewarded for teaching, our ratings were made public. I think this was a way to try to motivate faculty to be at least average teachers, if not better. At the end of each semester, faculty members received a list of the summary teaching scores of all members of the department. At Arizona there were quite a few good teachers, and many also were very productive scholars. One in particular, Greg Northcraft, provided a good model for me. Greg has always been an excellent teacher, besides being highly productive. It appeared to me that Greg personally valued both and could do both well, which I found motivating to see in a senior colleague. At Arizona it really became a circular process for me; as I did better at teaching I liked it more, and the more I enjoyed my students and teaching the material, the more my ratings increased. I found that teaching can be very seductive when you do it well, that you can make an immediate contribution that can be seen when students get excited about topics in class, want to pursue graduate studies in the area, and so forth. It really does feel great. I think in this way it is very similar to research—once one gets that first publication or first solo publication, one feels legitimated, one thinks, "I can do this." It is the same with having a really good class session, receiving good ratings, and winning teaching awards. I think once one becomes legitimate in the process, one knows what one is capable of doing, and so it becomes more important to do well. The more I started to get named to the top teaching list in the College of Business at Arizona, the more it became an expectation or goal of mine. By the time I left Arizona, I consistently was named to the list each semester and had received numerous other teaching awards and distinctions. As in our research, if we are to continue to develop, the benchmark must keep rising.

At Arizona I continued teaching courses in human resource management. During my first year, I was given three different course prepa-

ations (one of which was similar to the human resource course taught at Illinois) and was asked to prepare another new course my second year. By my third year I had prepared five courses (three undergraduate and two graduate). Although these were all under the broad framework of human resource management, there was quite a bit of time involved in developing each class. Additionally, because I commonly had students take all three of the undergraduate classes, the course materials could not overlap too much. Even though this took quite a bit of work, I believe my efforts paid off down the road. I began to think more strategically about my teaching during the middle of my second year there. I decided that I could not keep preparing different courses, and that I really needed to teach ones that were regularly offered so that I would start to benefit from my investments. Given this, I volunteered to teach the last course I prepped there, which was my fifth preparation, with the aim of ultimately cutting down on my workload. There were a few reasons this made sense. First, I knew that no one else in the department was really interested in teaching this course on human resource policy. It was required of all graduating majors and, as a result, had to be offered every semester. As such, I should be virtually guaranteed the same course every semester, which in effect would lock my teaching in and prevent me from having to prepare other service courses. In general, my teaching has been focused on critical courses that are needed, and so are somewhat valued by the department, but that most people don't or can't teach. That way I know that once I have invested the time, it is basically my course (or at minimum I will be able to teach it relatively often). For this reason, while I was at Arizona I opted never to teach an organizational behavior course, because there was too much demand among the faculty for those courses.

Looking back, what I find interesting is that in the first two or three years of my academic career I worked very hard at making sure that I didn't put too much time into teaching at the expense of research. Also, I was very concerned that my colleagues never have the perception that the reason the students liked me and I got good ratings was because I put too much time into teaching. Therefore, I consciously tried to minimize the visibility of my teaching efforts while trying to make my research activities
salient. This strategy changed somewhat after a few years. After my fourth-year review, when I had basically passed a major evaluation hurdle, I decided that I needed to have people recognize that besides being a productive researcher, I was doing quite a bit of service for the department with my teaching. My teaching consisted almost exclusively of core required courses, and I was doing a good job of it. I think that some of my colleagues had started to take what I was doing for granted, and in some ways teaching was seen as being easier for me than for others, although this was not true. Therefore, I started to work at reminding my colleagues that it did take real work for me both in and out of the classroom, as I had taught many students and was also the primary adviser to all our undergraduate majors. I felt that I had paid my dues and that good teaching was not without its costs for me, and that this should be recognized. It was an interesting switch, and one with which I was not totally comfortable at first. I went from downplaying the amount of time spent investing in teaching to saying, “Look, this takes real work for me, it benefits the department and college, and I would like this contribution realized.” I think my colleagues were responsive to these messages. We often don’t realize the contributions others are making until they are made salient. It was odd to have to say, “Yes, I am a researcher, but I also want you to recognize my teaching and how that contributes to our mission.”

Subsequent changes at Arizona resulted in research still being strongly weighted while quality teaching became more of an expectation. As at most other public universities around this time, in the early to mid-1990s, because of concerns and criticism from the legislature and public about how little of professors’ time is spent in the classroom, there was more of a demand to justify our time and document the quality of teaching. Even though there are differences across institutions, increasingly, research universities have begun talking about and further emphasizing teaching quality across all levels—undergraduate, graduate, and executive education. Therefore, ultimately, in reviews my teaching started to be recognized and rewarded at Arizona.

What I Have Learned
(or Am Still Learning)

I feel I have been fortunate in this process because the paths I have chosen have worked out well for me and I am satisfied with my performance and career progression. Timing is very important, and in some ways I was lucky to have started my career at the time I did, because my values with regard to emphasizing research while still valuing quality teaching are being reflected in changes going on at research universities. The environment in business schools at research universities is in the process of change, in that there is more need for faculty to develop into good MBA and executive education teachers. Although teaching is becoming more important and may be given greater (or at least some) weight in the evaluation/reward equation, I doubt it will ever completely overshadow research. Therefore, quality teaching may become a more important minimum requirement of our jobs. Because teaching can take an enormous amount of time and there are fewer tangible rewards attached to quality teaching, we need to focus on some of the intangible benefits, such as helping with research, keeping fresh and up-to-date, and potentially helping to gain access to future field sites for research from MBA or executive education contacts.

So what are the main issues that junior faculty have to consider in learning to balance teaching and research and in determining whether they are going to strive to be very good teachers at research universities? When one is a faculty member at a research university, it is accepted that one needs to immerse oneself in research and publish the results of this research in high-quality journals. In the past, typically when performance has been reviewed at a research university, research has been by far the dominant focus; teaching may have received some consideration (but often none at all) and evaluation of service has been more perfunctory. Therefore, it makes sense that the bulk of a junior faculty member’s time would be focused on developing and executing the skills and behaviors needed to be a productive researcher. So if one wants also to develop as a good teacher, or if there are external pressures to do this, what
are the important issues that need to be dealt with?

Long-Term Versus Short-Term Rewards

From a junior faculty perspective, it isrationally known that tenure is based on one's research record, and that this probably will never significantly change at research universities. The tenure clock is interesting in that, in some ways, it seems to be fairly long when you think about going through your day-to-day activities for 5 or 6 years, yet in reality it is very short, because in order to have enough work in process at various stages and to have it complete the publication process by the time you are reviewed for tenure, you need to conduct a great deal of research in the first few years of your career. Thus junior faculty have always had to keep from being sidetracked, particularly in their first few years. Now add to that the fact that teaching quality is being stressed, with possibly some short-term rewards attached. Here there is much more of a danger in emphasizing the wrong components of the job. For example, when I arrived at Arizona I found that teaching was stressed by my department and college much more than I had anticipated, particularly given the publication expectations. Because teaching ratings were public among the faculty in my department, teaching results were both visible and salient. However, at promotion and tenure time, research was really the only factor that mattered.

Over the past few years this has changed somewhat. At Arizona there has been more of an effort to evaluate teaching rigorously and to reward teaching success, primarily thorough different department and college teaching awards. Faculty are given more feedback and there are better qualitative data to be used at promotion and tenure review. How much these data are weighted in the review is unclear. What is clear is that more material than previously is being collected and evaluated, and feedback is being given concerning teaching quality, improvement, and so forth. Another good example of the increasing emphasis on documenting teaching is that structured interviews with student focus groups are used in evaluating junior faculty members' teaching performance. In our department, senior faculty lead the focus groups and have to provide feedback to the junior faculty. Thus they become even more aware of how junior faculty are performing in the classroom. This helps because some of the senior faculty have not taught undergraduates and/or MBAs recently and may not realize what the demands are, how much work it takes to do a good job, and who does well.

As these changes were being made at Arizona, some junior faculty found themselves caught between earlier standards, in which teaching wasn't at all important, and newer standards, in which they were expected to at least good teachers. So, basically, they had only a short time frame in which to improve their ratings. Given all this, it would have been easy for them to get sidetracked into improving teaching in the short run and losing sight of their research progress. If junior faculty picked up on the short-term emphasis on teaching and stressed it too much, ignoring their research, it would not have boded well for their future on the faculty. Although across universities teaching quality may be more important now, the overall reward systems at most universities have not changed significantly to address this. Some universities are grappling now with these issues, but I don't think there have been many fundamental changes yet. Essentially, a faculty member has to deal with how to balance these priorities, with potentially no payoff, or perhaps only an unknown payoff, down the road.

Number and Types of Preparations

Every junior faculty member knows to keep the number and types of course preparations down when beginning a career. However, the reality is that many departments ask their junior people to teach a variety of new courses. From the department's perspective it makes sense, because the new person generally has to prepare a new course anyway, so why not give him or her a new course or courses that no one else wants to teach? Unfortunately, this can be very demanding for new faculty members, particularly if they are asked to teach a diverse portfolio of courses. Depending on the composition and philosophy of the department, a junior faculty member may end up doing some of the "harder teaching," what others can't or won't do. If senior faculty have not wanted to do or
have never done what they are asking their juniors to do, they may not realize how labor-intensive certain preparations are, how difficult it may be to get good teaching ratings in those courses, and so on. Therefore, they may not be totally aware of some of the pressures junior faculty are under. I think junior faculty need to find a way to bring such issues to their departments' attention without appearing to be complaining. They need to make their colleagues aware of how labor-intensive some preparations are and how every course one is asked to teach may require new preparation, which may not be an appropriate load for a junior faculty member's first few years.

How Good Should You Strive to Be?

When we speak about good teaching, how good is good enough? Let's assume that the individual, the institution, or both value teaching. If the goal is to be an effective teacher, what does that mean? There are decreasing returns to scale for putting time into one's teaching. It takes a certain amount of work to be good, and the time spent raising the level of teaching from competent to very good is not much more significant (see Figure 6.1). However, the time spent to become excellent may require quite a bit more work. Where does one want to be? A junior faculty member must consider seriously how much is enough in terms of quality, and whether being excellent at teaching is worth the investment of time and psychic energy required. Time is not the only issue when we talk of being an excellent teacher; there are also individual differences in ability that might make it more feasible for some to be consistently excellent teachers. Therefore, each faculty member needs to decide where his or her values and strengths are as well as how much time and resources he or she needs to commit, and can afford to commit, to developing into a very good teacher.

Managing Perceptions

Let's assume that junior faculty members have their priorities straight and are capable of balancing teaching and research effectively. They still need to worry about managing the perceptions of their colleagues. They do not want to look as if they are spending too much time on their teaching to the detriment of their research. Even if their university values quality teaching, as junior faculty members, the last impression they want to give is that they are devoting significant amounts of time to teaching and student-related issues at the expense of their research productivity. On the other hand, they don't want to look as if teaching is effortless for them. If a junior faculty member does manage to do a good job in the classroom and does not look as though he or she needs to spend a significant amount of time to do so, he or she may be labeled a "natural." This is not necessarily a desirable attribution. The danger in this assessment is that the faculty member is not receiving the credit he or she deserves for the amount of work expended. Furthermore, such a faculty member may get more work piled on him or her than someone who hasn't tried as hard or done as well, or who has struggled in the classroom. Because quality teaching takes time, one should want it recognized that one has worked hard to learn to manage time effectively in balancing teaching and research. I say all of this with the assumption that one's research is progressing. If one is at a research university and is in the position of spending time and doing very well at teaching but has not been publishing, probably the last thing one wants to do is lobby to have one's efforts at teaching recognized.

Executive Education

Finally, executive education is potentially a very ambiguous issue for a junior faculty member. It varies across business schools, but at some universities only a few of the faculty (some of whom are not considered research faculty) are involved in executive education programs. In fact, in many departments some senior faculty are not interested in participating in executive education and also may not value it. Yet increasingly, when business schools hire, they want new candidates to have some potential for or interest in participating in executive education programs. Many research universities never before expected their research faculty to teach executives. As more business schools develop executive MBA programs and other executive education programs, it is increasingly neces-
sary for them to hire faculty who are willing and able to teach executives. Of course, there are exceptions—schools that have always had a strong research focus while having high-profile MBA or executive programs—but this is occurring across the majority of research-oriented programs now. An important issue, then, is whether a junior faculty member should be involved in executive education before receiving tenure. It can be helpful for junior faculty to talk with senior faculty members at their institutions and with other colleagues about these issues.

There are many questions that need to be considered in addressing the issue of whether or not to participate in executive education and how much participation is necessary or desirable. For instance, will such participation be seen as a worthwhile contribution that will be considered in a promotion decision? It may be that the dean's office will value an individual's contribution to these external programs, but will the senior faculty? And even if the dean's office does value it, will the dean exert influence concerning this area to make sure it is positively factored into the promotion and tenure decision? If a junior faculty member doesn't think it is worthwhile at this point for his or her career development, but the dean wants the individual to do it, should that person say no, and what are the potential repercussions of declining this opportunity? Does participation in executive education look bad? In other words, will it hurt promotion and tenure cases by reflecting that a person's priorities are not in the right place? On the other hand, does one need to be able to demonstrate competence in executive education? And if so, how much is necessary and when does it potentially become too much? For instance, if an individual participates in executive education and does well, he or she will probably be asked to become more involved in the program. How much executive education teaching is considered appropriate for junior persons, if any, to demonstrate that they can be effective with executives? And when is participation viewed as too much, leading to the perception that the individual will be seduced by the money to do executive education and consulting exclusively after tenure. The start-up costs for executive education can be quite large. Therefore, a junior faculty member really needs to evaluate whether there is a payoff aside from the immediate monetary compensation, and whether the costs are worthwhile relative to the benefits.
Epilogue for Future Researchers/Teachers

Unfortunately, most graduate programs do not address how to be a good teacher or how to balance quality research effectively with quality teaching. I believe that graduate training can be used to help doctoral students gain the knowledge and skills they need to be good teachers. The rest can be done in a more informal manner; mentors, for instance, can fill an important role for graduate students and junior faculty. In any case, there are some important points that should be highlighted.

Experience

First, I think it is critical for doctoral students to get experience teaching, ideally by handling preparation and full responsibility for at least one course. Having the experience of full preparation of a course is invaluable, and having the opportunity to repeat the course and make improvements is also worthwhile. There are enough things for a junior faculty member to learn without being at the disadvantage of never having taught a course. On the other hand, I don’t think a graduate student needs experience in preparing a large number of courses, because it is always unclear what one will be teaching as a faculty member. I have seen some doctoral students try to collect courses so that they can list them on their vitae, in the belief that this will help them when searching for a job. I think this is a waste of time, especially when the courses are in specialties that may not be duplicated at other universities. I believe that the highest payoff comes from choosing a good mainstream course (e.g., human resources, organizational behavior, organizational theory or strategy) or a marketable elective course (e.g., bargaining and negotiation, groups, or power and politics) that most schools offer in some form. This will help the student both in building the skills and confidence needed to prepare courses that he or she potentially will teach again and in competing in the marketplace for that first job. Doctoral students should be encouraged to try numerous teaching methods, because teaching performance in graduate school tends to be less visible than it will be on their initial jobs.

I would discourage new faculty members from continually developing new courses, particularly doctoral-level courses, which, depending on the size of the program, may be offered sometimes on an infrequent basis. A lot of times new graduates are excited to be able to teach doctoral-level courses—they may want to give their students what they had or what they feel they should have had, and this is fine, in moderation; it is a great service to the students and department. But remember, a university’s commitment to a new faculty member is for only a few years. A faculty member has an entire career in which to teach and influence doctoral program course offerings, so new members should at this time be more focused on their own career development.

Teaching Stream

Once one has a job, one needs to work consciously at developing a teaching stream, exactly as one does with research streams. One needs to think about establishing a teaching niche that will pay off in multiple ways. For example, one might develop a portfolio of courses that build on and complement each other. Also, one needs to be as efficient as possible in developing teaching materials and techniques that could be used at all levels—cases, experiential exercises, and discussion of timely issues that could be used with executives, MBAs, and undergraduates. Different techniques work with different audiences, but a lot of the same material can be used well at all levels. I know that many doctoral students looking for jobs are not stretching the areas they can teach—from micro to macro, and so on. Given the market, that’s understandable, and it is good to be flexible. Once in a job, however, one needs to be more deliberate in choosing courses. Unless one’s interests are diverse, one’s teaching shouldn’t be. Ideally, it is nice to teach in the same areas as one does research, but often that is not possible, and one is asked to stretch. Still, choosing where one stretches is critical. One should choose to invest time in courses that cover areas that can enhance one’s research stream or provide new directions for research. Also, it is preferable to focus on courses that will always be offered, to stay away from one-time preparations. It is desirable to choose courses that are offered on
both graduate and undergraduate levels (so that, with some appropriate changes, one is well on the way toward another preparation). Along the same lines, it is wonderful if one can teach courses that are of interest to the executive program. Always keep in mind that one should spend one's time efficiently. Don't let teaching suck up more time than it needs. I have talked about how things are changing at universities with regard to teaching, but in part because of these changes, the demands on faculty time have increased. Therefore, one cannot put much more time into teaching; rather, one needs to be more deliberate in planning how to balance teaching and research.

Maintaining Research as the Top Priority

Finally, it almost goes without saying that a junior faculty member at a research university should always maintain research as the top priority. I don't think the rewards for teaching are clearly figured in the promotion equation, but as there is increasing pressure to do a good job in the classroom and there may be some short-term rewards, junior faculty need to focus on how to manage the process while not losing sight of the fact that high-quality publications will probably always be the dominant criteria for promotion at research universities. They also need to think very carefully about whether they should be involved in executive education—before making this decision, they should find out as much as they can about what the culture and values are at their institutions.

In closing, I have tried in this chapter to share my experiences and what few insights I have with the hope that this can encourage others to balance high-quality research and teaching in order to be successful at research universities. As for me, I am still actively trying to manage this process. I had a great start at the University of Arizona, and have recently moved to the Georgia Institute of Technology. It is interesting how the impetus for the move came about, given that I really hadn't been looking to leave Arizona. The year before I would have gone up for promotion and tenure review, I was approached by a friend and colleague, Don Fedor, about whether I would be interested in applying for a job at Georgia Tech. During my time at Arizona I was totally focused on developing my stream of research and on becoming a quality teacher, with the ultimate goal of making tenure. I had been so focused on the goal of tenure that I really hadn't thought seriously about what lay beyond tenure. Don's request that I apply for the position at Georgia Tech prompted me to start considering more fully what type of environment would be desirable for this next stage of my career and personal life. This is not to say that I am not an introspective person—actually I am very much so. However, I had so much on my plate during those years, balancing career and family while still trying to have some leisure pursuits (though not nearly enough), that I was just too busy and focused on attaining my goals. It was interesting that once I was so close to goal attainment, I came to realize that I had a number of important needs that could be met better at Georgia Tech. For example, Georgia Tech had a core group of organizational behavior/human resource researchers with a number of research interests that would lend themselves to collaboration. At Arizona I had worked with a few of my colleagues, but there were not as many natural connections. More important, when I began to reflect on what direction my research was going, I felt that there were more growth possibilities for my work at Georgia Tech, particularly regarding the possibility of more field sites in Atlanta and collaboration on survey research. Finally, the School of Management at Georgia Tech was just starting to develop a number of executive education programs that could potentially provide me with more opportunities.

So far, all of my expectations have proven to be true. Already after spending a year at Tech I have seen my research areas broaden in positive ways, and I am collaborating with a number of colleagues and doctoral students. Also, I like the philosophy of the group, with a strong emphasis on group cohesiveness and an overall collegial atmosphere in the school. Another issue was location. Relocating to a major city provided much better employment possibilities for my spouse, who has always been very flexible about moving where it would be best for my career. Finally, there is always the economic reality that we must not forget: With any voluntary move, salary improves. Thus here I am, an advanced assistant going up for tenure. Once again, I am dealing with trying to balance quality
research with new course preparations and other work demands. At this stage of my career, I am beginning to get involved in executive education programs and am achieving high quality in this arena as well. As always, I am endlessly wishing that there was more time in a day.
Peter J. Frost
M. Susan Taylor
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