Doctoral advising, research productivity and the academic balancing act: insights from Michael A. Hitt, Edwin A. Locke, Fred Luthans, Lyman W. Porter, and Anne Tsui

Jennifer A. Moss Breen
Bellevue University

John E. Barbuto Jr.
University of Nebraska- Lincoln

Linking Theory & Practice

Doctoral advising, research productivity and the academic balancing act: insights from Michael A. Hitt, Edwin A. Locke, Fred Luthans, Lyman W. Porter, and Anne Tsui

Jennifer A Moss Breen[1] and
John E Barbuto Jr[2]

[1]Bellevue University, Bellevue, NE, US;
[2]University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, US

Correspondence:
Jennifer Moss Breen, Bellevue University,
1000 Galvin Road, Bellevue, NE 68005, US.
Tel: 406-557-7133
E-mail: Jennifer.moss@bellevue.edu

Abstract
Achieving academic success requires diligence among all concerned – doctoral students, academic advisors, and institutions. This paper presents interviews of five outstanding scholars who have dedicated their lives to research productivity, academic advising, and scholarly service. The work/life balance and output they achieved is the result of purposeful planning, tenacity, and passion for the field and students. The paper first introduces the topic of academic success, then initial thoughts from the authors are presented. Brief biographies of the scholars are shared to demonstrate academic contributions. Interviews are presented as direct quotes from participants, with collective insights offered after each specific question.
Organization Management Journal (2010) **7**, 182–191. doi:10.1057/omj.2010.28

Keywords: research – productivity; graduate advising; interviews

Organization
Management
Journal

Introduction

While success in an academic career can look different in different academic settings, at research universities it usually includes high levels of research productivity, doctoral advising, quality teaching, and outstanding service to the university and academy (Boyer, 1990; Zipp *et al.*, 2009). Identifying the most salient factors in a successful academic career is a compelling line of inquiry that motivates this project.

Green and Bauer (1995) reported that GRE, commitment to research careers, higher affective commitment, work experiences of doctoral students upon entry into their doctoral programs all related to extent of advisors' psychosocial mentoring and quality of leader-member exchange with them. This demonstrated that graduate students contribute many factors that impact their relationships with advisors and eventually lead to future academic success. Brewer *et al.* (1999) examined factors that contribute to research productivity and reported that the strongest predictor of post-doctorate production was the student's research productivity during their doctoral program. This indicates that doctoral students must learn to publish while in their program and that

concrete processes for research development need to be ingrained during their academic program to ensure future academic success.

Given results of these studies, it appears that a multitude of internal and external factors contribute to scholarly success. Many issues need clarification, such as the best practices for advising doctoral students, preferred structures for maintaining successful academic careers, and maintaining balance among multiple responsibilities. It seems that these factors are not mutually exclusive, but that effective advising will require mentorship for developing and creating a strong research agenda and program. It also follows that effective advising will also prepare future faculty for achieving the balance necessary to succeed in advising, research, teaching, and service.

These questions motivated this project in which we interviewed five highly productive scholars in the field of organizational behavior to cover best practices in these areas. Let us begin with some personal remarks on the subject of academic advising, research, and service to describe our journey that led to this project.

Our initial thoughts

Jennifer Moss Breen (Jenny): I wanted to learn more about outstanding academic advisors for one simple reason – I was interested in knowing how my own academic advisor fared regarding his methods when advising Ph.D. students. As any doctoral student can attest, surviving a Ph.D. program is difficult. So many times, I wanted to abandon my research and just be "normal" again. My advisor (John E. Barbuto, Jr., "Jay") and I would set up weekly meetings to discuss our work. I was happy to piggyback on his research, but when it came to receiving feedback on my work, that was a different story. I was often brought to tears by his dreaded "blue pen" editing of my work. I thought, "Does every academic advisor work this way?" When I was in my program, Jay sometimes received criticism from other graduate students because he had high academic standards. In fact, one or two changed advisors, opting for a more congenial relationship. I listened to my student peers, but never considered a change of my own. This process taught me that the best advisors aren't always easy-going, sympathetic, or lenient. Jay and I had a lot of fun together, but he was always consistent with his expectations, even when he knew it would upset me. When I was done with my Ph.D. program, I had authored seven journal publications

and over 15 conference presentations. I had already served on national and regional academic conference boards, and I had taught in our program for two years. Jay always knew when to challenge me and he seemed to know when to encourage me. He consistently set the bar higher for me, and I worked to meet or exceed these expectations. I know I would not have the opportunities I have today had it not been for this high standard. We write this paper together to help other advisor/ student dyads achieve high levels of success and mutual satisfaction. After these five interviews were completed, it was evident that my own experiences as a doctoral student were representative of other high-level graduate student and advisor relationships. At times, taking advice and feedback from Jay was difficult, but I know that his "pushing" was what ultimately led me to earning my Ph.D. and utilizing it fully today. Jay created increasingly challenging opportunities, which ultimately changed the way I thought and continue to think today.

John E. Barbuto, Jr. (Jay): My advising philosophy has evolved towards understanding students' career objective(s) and then work with them to outline a plan that will help them to prepare for it and be successful. When preparing future faculty, I have strived to develop them achieve publishable standards in everything they write. While this standard does not appeal to all students, those who want research and teaching careers usually benefit from this approach. In my 13 years of advising doctoral students I have found that the most rewarding moments have been seeing their excitement when they publish their first article. There has often been a sense of euphoria as students realized that the rigor and high expectations really can serve a purpose and may lead to great valence. My own productivity has benefited from collaborating with doctoral students. While in some ways, papers take a lot longer to write in collaboration, the energy, the excitement, the effort that graduate students bring to these relationships really drives productivity. This has been especially true when collaborating on topics of secondary interest to me, but of primary interest to students. One thing that I have consistently reminded graduate students of is that they are preparing to conduct research but also, and perhaps equally important, to supervise graduate students engaging in research. I remind them that they are preparing for a career in mentorship as much as a career in research. My own advisor experience was a positive one. My advisor,

Richard W. Scholl – University of Rhode Island, was extremely talented and very busy. I learned at an early point in my doctoral program that there were many opportunities to develop – and that Rick would help me I were willing to put in the time and effort (and revisions) necessary. My favorite question that Rick used to ask me was, "What behavior are you trying to explain?" And really, isn't this where all studies begin? I still recall hours after hours of sitting in Rick's office debating the merits of self concept-based work motivation theories, early influence triggers conceptualizations, and the plethora of possible antecedents of leadership. It was in these conversations, in these debates, that my greatest development occurred. I was grateful for the time that my advisor spent engaging in these dialogues during my program. So when Jenny approached me with this interview idea, I thought, "great idea." I was especially excited to hear what some of the top scholars would say about advising, research, and service. Lyman Porter was Rick Scholl's advisor, so hearing the philosophies of my academic grandfather was compelling. Fred Luthans and I have worked at the same University, but in different departments for the past 13 years – so I looked forward to hearing his perspectives. I met Edwin Locke and Michael Hitt at the Academy and was impressed with their wisdom in these areas. Having never met Anne Tsui, I looked forward to hearing her thoughts on these important issues.

Moss Breen/Barbuto: We were interested in hearing from some of the leading scholars in the management field to learn their philosophies, experiences, and guiding practices. We interviewed Michael Hitt, Fred Luthans, Edwin Locke, Lyman Porter, and Anne Tsui – to ask them about their advising, research and service philosophies. This process uncovered a number of anecdotes and strategies for graduate advising, maintaining productivity, and balancing service and research.

Introducing the scholars

Michael A. Hitt received his Ph.D. from the University of Colorado in 1974 and holds the Joe B. Foster chair in business leadership and the C.W. and Dorothy Conn chair in new ventures at Texas A&M University. He has secured funding for 10 research projects and has written 40 books and 43 book chapters. Dr. Hitt, listed in Bedeian's *Management Laureate*, has published 155 refereed journal articles, has delivered 99 conference presentations, and has been a visiting scholar at 61 universities. He is a

former president of the Academy of Management and the Strategic Management Society and a Fellow of both organizations.

Edwin A. Locke is dean's professor (emeritus) of leadership and motivation at the R.H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland in College Park. He received his Ph.D. in Industrial Psychology from Cornell University in 1964. He has secured funding for nine research projects, written or edited 10 books, published 270 chapters, articles and notes, been guest lecturer at 32 universities, and made 94 conference presentations. Dr. Locke is a fellow of the American Psychological Association, Society of Industrial Organizational Psychology (a Division of the American Psychological Association), the Academy of Management, and the Association for Psychological Science.

Fred Luthans is the George Holmes Distinguished Professor of Management. He received his BA, MBA, and Ph.D. from the University of Iowa, and was a post-doc at Columbia University. He taught at the US Military Academy at West Point prior to joining the UNL faculty in 1967. He won the College of Business Administration Distinguished Teaching Award and the University of Nebraska Excellence in Graduate Education Award. A former President of the Academy of Management, he is also the recipient of an honorary doctorate from DePaul University, the Distinguished Alumni Award from the University of Iowa, and the Academy of Management's Distinguished Educator Award. He is an inaugural member of the Academy of Management Hall of Fame, as well as a fellow in the Decision Sciences Institute. Dr. Luthans has published 45 books and has published 170+ articles in refereed journals, and an additional 30+ book chapters. His textbook, *Organizational Behavior* (11th Edition), is considered the first in its field.

Anne Tsui, Motorola professor of international management at the W.P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University and, concurrently, distinguished visiting professor at the Guanghua School of Management at Peking University, received her Ph.D. from the University of California in 1981. She has obtained funding for 17 research projects, has written four books, 14 book chapters and two book reviews, has published 40 refereed journal articles, and has made 76 conference presentations. Dr. Tsui is the founding President of the International Association for Chinese Management Research.

Lyman Porter is Professor Emeritus of Management in the Graduate School of Management at the University of California, Irvine, and was formerly

Dean of that School. Currently, he serves as a member of the Academic Advisory Board of the Czechoslovak Management Center, and a member of the Board of Trustees of the American University of Armenia, and was formerly an External Examiner for the National University of Singapore. Professor Porter is a past president of The Academy of Management. In 1983 received that organization's "Scholarly Contributions to Management" Award, and in 1994 its "Distinguished Management Educator" Award. He has also served as President of the Society of Industrial-Organizational Psychology (SIOP), and in 1989 was the recipient of SIOP's "Distinguished Scientific Contributions" Award. He has authored 11 books and over 80 refereed journal articles.

Interviews with Michael Hitt, Edwin Locke, Fred Luthans, Lyman Porter, and Anne Tsui

Moss Breen/Barbuto: How would you describe your academic advising style? How do you approach the advising relationship with your doctoral students?

Michael Hitt: Well, there are three different stages that I have where a student and I may work together on research. Normally when they're very early in the program, it's very rare for me to put them on a project as a co-author or a co-researcher because they're learning; rather I try to get them involved maybe in some way, helping, because they are on a research assistantship but I try to explain the research and the project. By the time they've been in the program about a year I may involve them in one of my research projects. For example, I've got a project right now where we're collecting data on women entrepreneurs and I've got three different Ph.D. students involved because of their interest either in the topic or some of the research questions. That's a project that I started with some other colleagues at other Universities and I've involved the Ph.D. students. While it is my research, I'll work with the students to develop research questions to add to the project trying to involve them more as co-researchers and co-authors. I guess a third type of project is where a student comes to me with an idea for a study and if I think it is something in which I can help or if it is something on which we can jointly work, then the student would be the lead. The first one obviously, is not as a co-researcher but trying to help them learn how we do research and so on, the second is on a project of mine and the third is a project in which the idea is created or developed by the student and the student is the leader. There are three forms of collaboration that I may have with graduate students. The first one is not as a co-researcher but trying to help them learn how we do research and so on, the second is allowing them to work with me on a project of mine and the third is a project that is led by them, the idea is created or developed by them (student) and that student leads the research. I try to tell them what they have to do to succeed. Everyone is individual but regardless of their career goals, to be highly successful, will take a lot of commitment and a lot of hard work no matter how bright and talented they are. Obviously there are different degrees of intellect and talent but in our profession those aren't the differentiators because there's such a screening process to get in that the differences in those attributes across people are generally not great. Those who can commit, who are highly motivated and really stay with it and get it done are the ones who will achieve the most success. I call it the internal factor, it is motivation and a willingness to really stay with it, put forth the effort and achieve the goals. I try to communicate that in various ways, sometimes verbally but hopefully through my own behaviors. But I don't want people to just emulate what I do because it may not be right for them. They've got to find what works for them and that's what I try to communicate. I don't force my students down one path, I like them to have their own goals; they have to do what's good for them so they have to set their goals and then gain the satisfaction of reaching those goals. I feel the greatest joy when I see them learn, when I see them have success. I just had a paper (with two students) that was accepted at a journal, and I was just delighted to see their faces. It was their first journal article. I enjoy seeing that success for them. I tend to go through students' work carefully, not trying to be critical, but with a focus on style and content. I'll edit, make comments and changes; the number of edits and comments depends on their stage of development … I find it largely individualized. We are all always working on our writing capabilities.

Edwin Locke: The main reason for working with other people is that it creates efficiency. I may work with other people that I can agree with on what is going to be said. With doctoral students of course you have the authority of the final word. We sometimes have disagreements we just iterate back and forth, back and forth, back and forth until

we're both happy with the product. It depends a lot on who you write with, I've written with at least 50 doctoral students, I think. Not all were my thesis advisees but were in the doctoral program. Once I left graduate school, I hardly ever did data analysis. I left that to doctoral students because I thought it was a poor use of my time, because my time was better spent planning the experiment and planning the analysis, but not actually doing the analyses, and it was an opportunity for skill development for them. If I felt they were on an unproductive track, I would say "I don't think this is a feasible idea. How about going here instead?" I could prevent them from going into not very productive directions. I just had background and a perspective in the field and I had a feel for what was going to be useful and what wasn't. I think I enjoyed working with students who had some imagination and could think of something on their own without being baby fed, and students who were able to write somewhat decently without me telling them how to write every sentence. It is efficient to work with others, including students, because you can get far more done.

Fred Luthans: My approach to advising was to be selective and work with people who wanted to work hard and put closure on things. The way I found that out was usually through the classroom setting or a doctoral seminar. I would work with those who did pretty well in class. It wasn't necessarily how bright they were, but how hard they worked in terms of reading ahead, getting papers done, being accurate on putting references together. My approach to advising was that I always wanted to find the hard workers, and then know whether they wanted to join in the journey of my visions and goals. From there, we worked in a highly decentralized manner. I didn't give a lot of specific direction or specific ways to do things. I just wanted to know if they wanted to work at answering research questions in which we jointly had a mutual interest and passion for. Relationships were highly personable, not a supervisor/subordinate dyad, but more of a friendship, social, mutual respect relationship. I tell them from the beginning that I hope I learn as much from them as they do from me. I sought students who had strengths that complemented my weaknesses so we can jointly work together on projects, including their dissertation.

Lyman Porter: I asked a lot of questions. I tried to be sort of a helpful skeptic, so I tried to push

them in their thinking … How would this advance the field? A student would make some sort of declarative statement about something, and, as their instructor, I would say "yes, and therefore?" What stimulated my own productivity, and then what stimulated me to work with students, was just common interest and interest in the topics and issues in the field. I considered students as just another "colleague" and "it wasn't always about work." Sometimes I discouraged a particular individual from working with me and would recommend someone else; if I just didn't think that what they were deeply interested in would interest me at all. I tried to be patient and I tried to keep emphasizing what the ultimate goal was in terms of the career and job aspect. I tried to get not too concerned if they had a slow period as long as they would get back on the job and get past that period. Some worked at a faster pace and one of the best I ever graduated I think took six years but another one took three years. I think most of them were about five years. They varied in their pace depending on what else they were doing and what their outside circumstances were. Interaction is really stimulating. Why else be in academia? I think where it worked out best from the student's standpoint and mine was when we really had a good chemistry. If I look across the 3 dozen or so students that I've worked with over the years, they certainly all were different personality types and maybe I'd go with one of them to the local pub a couple times a month with them and just chat about different things. It wasn't always about work. Then another student that I can think of specifically wouldn't in a million years have thought about doing that or wanted to do that. He would come into my office with a 3×5 card with five things listed-specific topics that he wanted to talk about. He was very conscious of time pressures and things like that. I really enjoyed the interaction and I always felt for myself, some people worked differently, but I did my best thinking when I was interacting with other people.

Anne Tsui: I do change my style between American students and Chinese students because they are different in terms of carefulness of work. Chinese students are a little bit less because they are just not used to it, somehow through their own educational system, they're not used to the accuracy, professionalism, and citations. You know, copying and pasting sentences, they just don't know it's wrong to do that and sometimes they just

don't have that high level of professionalism we expect of our work. So I'm harder on them. I'm harder on my Chinese students and they know that by reputation. Writing is the biggest challenge for most students … The students I enjoyed the most were the ones that were really conscientious and careful and really learned from the feedback. Every student is different. Some students are much more mature in terms of their intellectual development. They have a pretty good idea of what their interest is and they come to you with an idea, this is what I'd really like to study, would you help me? … the matching of student and faculty is very important. You have to be sure you are matched with a student that has some common interests. If not, that's OK, it's only the first year and the second year the student can go work with somebody else and you move on. It's a learning experience; they (students) can see things are there, like the sentence is just not very nicely written. They can see their errors, you know. All I need to do is highlight a couple places in the couple pages and you can see. Sometimes I only read the first and second pages and then I say, OK carefully read everything on the first and second page and try to imitate (these changes in the rest of the paper). They (students) should get to the same level of writing style and writing sophistication necessary to convey the message. You cannot write, a term paper, in 7 seconds in a graduate student style; It's not scholarly. Some people write like a manager with no references, no citations, a lot just odd, and that's just not the way we write scholarly papers. The professor's responsibility is to involve students in research so that they can learn to do research by hands-on involvement.

Collective insights on graduate advising

The scholars varied in the number of students they advised, typically ranging between 3 and 11 students at a time. Each viewed academic advising as an important tool to develop talent in a particular discipline or domain. Because academic advisors are responsible for working with students to help them create fruitful research projects, they must evaluate student ideas, and students rely on the expertise of their advisors to know if their ideas have merit.

Scholars varied in their style of interaction with students, however, all expected high-quality work from their students, and all recognized that each graduate student was unique in terms of their assets and developmental needs. Some viewed the advisor/advisee relationship as strictly professional, while two likened it to more of a friendship. Sharing of intellectual energy was a key ingredient in working together – shared research interests seems a productive bond. All of the scholars interviewed took their responsibility for advising doctoral students seriously and most described advising graduate students as beneficial both intrinsically and in terms of increasing their own productivity.

Most of the scholars reported strong preference for graduate students that possessed a dedication to research and those that have demonstrated their research potential in coursework, research enthusiasm, and care and attention to detail in course projects. Opportunities to work closely with established scholars in the field should be a high priority for graduate students as this may be the best way to learn how to write for publications and also how to develop the research acumen necessary to succeed in academia. These opportunities should not be taken lightly by graduate students – as scholars report that they have many responsibilities competing for their time.

Moss Breen/Barbuto: What work habits and patterns have you developed that have contributed to your research productivity and success?

Michael Hitt: I do a lot of my writing in the mornings – when I have an opportunity to think and I don't have as many interruptions. In the afternoons I keep my door open all the time I'm in the office unless I'm in a meeting with someone. So it's open for students, colleagues or whomever for discussions. I still work in the office, but obviously, I have a lot of interruptions but that's understandable because of the way I structure my day; so I save part of the day for productivity on my research free of interruptions … so I make a part of that day for the most productive research and the other part is for being a colleague, being a teacher, mentor, etc. I have multiple goals in several domains of activity; similar to Fred Luthans, I'm not only doing research. I co-author and co-edit some books and I have some other professional activities in which I'm involved. Each of those activities may take precedence at a given point in time. They all relate to my own professional career goals. Although I engage in several activities that I enjoy, I don't enjoy everything that I do. But similar to many professors, I like to teach, although I don't like to grade. I don't enjoy some of the parts of the grading and most of my colleagues say the same thing. As a whole, we must enjoy what we do

and gain at least intrinsic value from it; it's what keeps us vital. So I gain value from doing what I hope is good research and writing and in making a contribution. I want to be successful, which is part of my drive and motivation. Probably the biggest interruption I have is email. But I can't totally avoid it because others are expecting my feedback. I tend not to accept phone calls unless they're scheduled, like this one, unless it is family or close friends. I try to avoid other forms of communication until the afternoon. It's just a way of trying to manage my time and to get work done.

Edwin Locke: Most people don't write all day – you can't do that mentally – but I was very good at turning back on and not letting things slide as so many people did, and I developed good habits as a student. For instance in college I never did a single all-nighter for an exam or a single all-nighter for a paper. I always did have good study habits and good writing habits so I was never a procrastinator and that discipline really helped me in my career because so many people do procrastinate and of course you lose productivity enormously that way. Whenever I opened a manuscript, I would bring it up on my computer and I'd start reading from the beginning again and I'd revise and then refresh my memory and keep revising until I got to the point where I'd stopped last time. Then, I'd continue with the newer sections. I'm not the kind of writer who can make a very detailed outline, follow it and have a polished draft; my mind simply doesn't work like that. With a book you have to do an outline but if it's an article, I sometimes make a half page outline of topic but I won't outline all the connections because I simply can't make them in my head, I have to see them on paper. Time spent writing now can range from half an hour to 3 h probably. I try not to start if I know I'm going to be interrupted; if I know there's not going to be at least an hour or two without interruptions I won't even start because I would have to make all the connections in my mind again. I do all my writing at home, hardly ever in the office, because you couldn't be in the office without being interrupted. I would do a little writing in the office but I'd say 90% of my writing was done at home. You might get phone calls but not nearly the kind of interruption that you would get trying to write in the office.

Fred Luthans: I have been following my own advice, and that is self management in terms of developing rituals and goals and then reinforcing

them. I led my whole career from the point of view of setting time aside, in my case, 7–11 p.m. every evening, although family activities always took priority. If there was a previous family commitment, I attended that; otherwise, I worked. Also, I would reward myself for keeping to this schedule. I kept track using the clock, and at 11 p.m., I would log off. As my reward for working from 7–11, I would exercise or watch television as my reward. That is what I have tried to do and it has worked for me. If you write 5 pages a day, after a years' time, you end up with about 1500 pages of manuscript. You can turn out a lot of writing and articles if you dedicate yourself to those types of goals. But, I want to emphasize you have to reinforce yourself. I love the DVR because I can watch the types of shows I want to watch when I want to watch them. I know that some people don't work that way, but that is how I have always gotten it done. It all gets down to rituals and goals, specific behaviors at specific times. You also have to reinforce yourself for doing that. And, I never sacrificed kids' activities, they always took precedence.

Lyman Porter: I would work in spurts or depending on if I had a heavy day of meetings I wouldn't have much time for writing. If tomorrow was lighter I might spend time examining data or something or talking with a student, so no, I didn't have a set routine. I liked teaching as an interactive activity, and then research, obviously, and then administration. I wouldn't have wanted to just teach and do no research or have been totally administration without any research going on. I tried to always have two or three research projects at different stages of development … You have some things on the front burners and some things on the back burners. Sometimes a project doesn't work out so you know it moved to the front burner and it boiled over or something. Then you move something from the back burner to the front burner since that front burner one didn't work out. Or if it did, it got completed and then you move something up from the back burner.

Anne Tsui: Of course, research is always the most favorite part of the job for me; that's just the fun part. You're creating something. You know, we enter this profession because we love the research. It's the main drawing thing, and all the other things are necessary to what we want to do. I spend not as much time as I would like doing research. I teach 3 classes … and I supervise dissertations … I spend

maybe 30–40% of my time on research. When I have to write, I write at home. I could do revisions at the office, but I try to stay at home. If I really have to write, I stay home for 2 or 3 days and get it done and then the rest is just changing and revising it. Editing I can do in between other things. But creating a new paper takes concentrated time and usually has to be done outside my office. It feels great (working from home office). I can be in my pajamas drinking my tea and walk out to the back yard and look at flowers for a few minutes, it's just really nice. That's how creativity comes as your mind because you can just concentrate on just one task. Work is so pervasive that you can be driving and thinking about other things and then all of a sudden you would think about that other project, an idea just hits you. Ideas, whether it is research or teaching or administrative stuff, you know, in your head it's just processing all the time and I've learned over time that if I have a problem, I don't try to force myself to work on it, I just let it sit for a few days and somehow as the subconscious is processing that and then somehow when you're ready to sit down and OK, I really need to do this, it just flows.

Collective insights on maintaining scholarly productivity

The scholars each enjoyed their work, whether writing, collaborating, serving on committees, or advising. Most reported that they preferred research more than any other job-related activity. All described an enjoyment of the work-life balance that an academic career provided them. For each, there was little differentiation between their work lives and their personal lives.

Some common themes around research productivity center on the protection of research time to maintain productivity. Maintaining a high level of research productivity requires proactive strategies to create environments conducive to concentrated efforts – without interruptions. The scholars reported that they were most productive when allowed flexibility in managing their time and organizing their work to avoid interruptions. All of the scholars indicated that they perform the majority of their best research from home. Some high achieving scholars went so far as to take two or three days at a time away from the office to make sure that they were giving their research the focused effort necessary. None of the outstanding scholars did substantive research work in their

work offices at their respective universities. Some described trying to do research in the office as futile.

Each of the scholars acknowledged that the balance of the academic life and synergy that comes from these activities appealed to them. They created schedules and environments that allowed them to work uninterrupted. They had strategies to alleviate distractions, such as having their own work space removed from the rest of the house. Each described their best writing taking place from their home offices. They also scheduled periods of time where they were free to "work" at their favorite task, usually writing, and this time needs to be carefully protected.

Moss Breen/Barbuto: How do you balance service with the need for productivity in your department?

Michael Hitt: For many years I have split my time at my university office and home office. Most of my writing is done in my home office in the mornings. Then I spend the afternoons in my university office and my door is always open (unless I have a meeting). This approach may not work for everyone but it has been productive for me. I am accessible to my colleagues and students but also take time to focus on my research and writing without interruptions. Furthermore, I always try to participate in and provide appropriate service to my school and institution. It is our responsibility, especially as senior professors. I do not remember rejecting a request to serve the university.

Edwin Locke: To me this is not a problem. (1) Faculty members have to set their own priorities at work and in life. (2) If research is important, you make time for it and especially uninterrupted time (usually by working at home). (3) If you are responsible, you are conscientious about all your duties but you still allocate your time. I never found that administrators came into play except by inventing more administrative work for us. The worst thing would be to force everyone to come in (to the office) for 8 h every day. Rightfully, office presence was only required during office hours. When I was chair I came in more than I would have otherwise, but then I also had a reduced teaching load.

Fred Luthans: I have always felt that service activity is something you have to do your share of, but must not ever let it take priority. I prefer to serve on the distinguished professorship committee, looking at

other research done across the university and rewarding people accordingly. I enjoy serving on graduate education committees. I don't enjoy serving on things like library committee, or things that do not contribute to my major priority of research and teaching. As far as service to the profession, I have always given a lot of attention to that because it helps brand the school you are from (i.e., academy activities). I have always been a closed door person. I know I should not be that way, but the reason I do it is because I frankly do not have the time. I see a lot of my colleagues wasting time, but I even bring my lunch into the office with me because I don't have time to go out to lunch. However, any doctoral student always has access to me, and of course any colleague as well if we are working on projects together. I am concerned that with all this online stuff we do we miss the interaction that stimulates new ideas. I see a lot of that missing. I feel this is unfortunate. I know there is a lot of social networking going on, but my generation does not do that. We are missing that part of it. I write at night, and during the day I keep busy. I am editor of three journals, which is pretty demanding. We have a lot of help. But that takes a lot of time, as well as working on still turning out 3–5 research articles per year, which takes a lot of time. That is what I am working on. Thankfully I have been teaching so long I don't have a lot of class prep time. I can draw from research when I'm in the classroom.

Lyman Porter: I think any professor at a major university should feel a definite obligation to try for high (research) productivity and to contribute appropriate amounts of organizational citizenship behaviors – we are not isolated scholars on an island but are part of, and (especially) benefit from, a scholarly community. Nobody ever said that this (combined) role performance is necessarily easy, but it is one to which I think we should aspire.

Anne Tsui: You must distinguish 'face time' *vs* real service work. Also, each unit has its own culture. Faculty must get clarity from the department head about the expectation regarding service work and mere presence in the office. The department head must understand the work habit of the faculty. Some research faculty need to be away from the phone and office to get good thinking work done. The department head should respect this working style. If the department values some service work,

then the head must discuss with the faculty about the nature of the work and to make sure that such work does not interfere with the research productivity of the faculty member. The faculty should also take the initiative to discuss with the department head about the need to have a certain amount of time devoted to research. The research time is sacred and must be protected. Most department heads should understand this. In other words, this is something that should be openly discussed rather than guessed.

Collective insights on balancing service expectations with research

Among the themes discussed were office hours, service to department and field, and balancing expectations from administration. Scholars described office hours as being important, but highly incompatible with research productivity goals. Some scholars distinguish between keeping office hours, just for "face time" *vs* specific tasks that need to be performed. Many faculties are encouraged to not lose sight of the importance of separate dedicated time and space for research by not allowing office presence to interfere with research productivity. Scholars' responses reinforce the need to protect research time when taking on service-oriented department activities.

Service to the department and service to the field were addressed by scholars with consistent responses. Service to the department was highly valued by all researchers, but most scholars cautioned not to allow service activities to interfere with research time. Others described the importance of service to the field (national organizations, reviewing for journals, conference chairing) as this builds the national reputation for faculty and programs. Developing this balance between research excellence, teaching, and departmental service has been described as a three ring circus, where the scholar must learn to become the ringmaster (Toews and Yazedjian, 2007).

Others discussed the practical limitations of administrators expecting too much in terms of service or face time, noting that it would be ill-advised to expect faculty to spend their entire day in the office – that this would neglect the creative needs of research. Also, administrators must curb expectations to allow faculty to balance the time necessary for teaching, research, and service. Communicating and clarifying these expectations was described as salient to the process.

Conclusion

The interview highlights presented shed some necessary light onto the doctoral advising, research productivity and service dynamics of academic life. We hope that others will find these interviews helpful when engaging in academic scholarship. Taken together, these interviews inform scholars and future scholars about the nature and challenges of academic life. Perhaps it is this enthusiasm that represents the most viable factor that leads to scholarly success. Something internal to these scholars drives them to manage their life and work in a manner that allows them to engage in the work that they enjoy most. Researchers are encouraged to consider the approaches of these fine scholars to determine those elements in their lives that must be managed to succeed in academia.

Acknowledgements

References

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brewer, G.A., Douglas, J.W., Facer II, R.L. & O'Toole Jr., L.J. (1999). Determinants of graduate research productivity in doctoral programs of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 59(5): 373–383.

Green, S.G. & Bauer, T.N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisers: Relationships with doctoral student potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(3): 537–562.

Toews, M.L. & Yazedjian, A. (2007). The three-ring circus of academia: How to become the ringmaster. *Innovative Higher Education*, 32: 113–122.

Zipp, G.P., Cahill, T. & Clark, M.A. (2009). The role of collaborative scholarship in the mentorship of doctoral students. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 6(8): 29–36.

About the authors

Jennifer A Moss Breen is the Director of the Ph.D. Program in Human Capital Management at Bellevue University. Her research interests include measurement of leadership development initiatives, human capital investments and human capital theory, interpersonal political skills and servant leadership outcomes, linkages between research and practice, and academic success. She has published and presented over 35 papers in both academic and professional settings. She can be reached at Jennifer .moss@bellevue.edu.

John E Barbuto, Jr (Jay) is Associate Professor of Leadership at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. His research interests include servant leadership, work motivation, global mindset, LMX, antecedents of leadership, influence processes, and pedagogical methods. He has published over 75 papers in journals such as *Organization Management Journal*, *Leadership Quarterly*, *Group Organization Management*, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* and *Journal of Management Education*. He can be reached at jbarbuto@unl.edu.