described characteristics of scholarship throughout his book (1990), but he did not define scholarship. He proposed "four separate but overlapping functions" of the professoriate as: "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching." In proposing these four functions as forms of scholarship Dr. Boyer in effect classified most, if not all, important faculty activities as scholarship.

In contrast, the OSU guidelines consider that a university and its faculty perform essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. Scholarship is considered to be creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated, and several forms are described including: *discovery* of new knowledge; *development* of new technologies, materials, and uses; *integration* of knowledge leading to new understandings; and *artistry* that creates new insights and understandings.

This description of scholarship does not assume that most faculty activities are scholarship. It recognizes, in fact, that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not only by university faculty members. It emphasizes the importance of validation by peers to help ensure validity, and of communication to broader audiences to ensure that the results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. Nonacademics who have reviewed the new OSU guidelines understand and value this concept of scholarship.

Specifically, the OSU guidelines consider teaching, research, and extension to be important university (and faculty) activities—but do not view these activities as scholarship. The OSU and Boyer approaches are similar in that both achieve the aim of broadening the view of scholarship beyond research, and both articulate, advocate, and provide a mechanism for recognition of scholarship in areas such as teaching, learning, and education. Dr. Boyer does this by proposing that teaching is scholarship. The OSU model does so by recognizing that scholarship in teaching can occur in the areas of discovery, development, integration, or artistry—whenever creative intellectual work in teaching is validated by peers and communicated.

The process at OSU that led to adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines, and the new concepts and ideas about scholarship and performance that were distilled out of those faculty deliberations may prove useful to others who are interested in these issues.

Literature Cited

Boyer, E.L. 1990. Scholarship reconsidered, Priorities of the professoriate. A special report. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, N.J.

Junior Faculty: Their Needs and Professional Development

L. Dee Fink

Instructional Development Program, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019

Institutions of higher education, like all large-scale organizations, must deal with the task of regularly incorporating new personnel into their systems of operation. Many of these newcomers originate from preparatory programs which, in the case of higher education, are graduate schools; others are experienced personnel who transfer from other institutions. Both groups face the challenge of having to learn quickly how to fit into new roles and how to adapt to the peculiarities of a particular institution.

This process, which takes place every year and continues well beyond the first year, raises a number of questions that have begun to be addressed by research and by new institutional practices. This paper will address four of these questions:

1) Why is it important for academic administrators to attend to the professional development of junior faculty?
2) What is happening now to new faculty members as they enter new institutions?
3) What are the reasons for these problems?
4) What is being done and can be done to better assist the professional development of new faculty?

In discussing these questions, I will summarize some of the major research and institutional practices of the last two decades.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF JUNIOR FACULTY

The prospect of hiring a new faculty member into a department is exciting: it provides an opportunity to bring new ideas and workers into the unit, but it also incurs a major cost for the department. This cost includes the direct cost of advertising the position and transporting candidates for interviews, and the much larger indirect cost of tying up major amounts of faculty time for defining the position, preparing the advertisement, keeping track of applications, reviewing the applications, creating a short list, hosting and listening to candidates, deciding who to make an offer to, etc. When these two sets of costs are added together, the real total cost of hiring a new faculty member probably runs into tens of thousands of dollars. Limiting the frequency of such costs by reducing unnecessary turnover of unhappy new faculty members is the first reason academic administrators should concern themselves with the welfare and professional development of new faculty members.

The second reason has a more long-term basis. If a new faculty member stays at an institution for his or her whole career, the institution will eventually spend well over $1 million in salaries and benefits. Some faculty members will make a big return on this investment in terms of high quality teaching and scholarship; others will stagnate after a few years. The difference between faculty members at these two ends of the spectrum stems primarily from their attitude towards and success in working on their own professional development. To ensure that faculty members stay productive over time, it is necessary to start professional development activities early.

The third reason has to do with changing times. It is very easy for academic administrators to think in terms of their own experiences as a new faculty member when working with today's new faculty. The problem with this response is that many of the junior faculty coming into academic today are quite different from those of yesteryear. A significantly larger percentage are women, ethnic minorities, or immigrants. Therefore, administrators need to learn about the felt needs of today's junior faculty.

CURRENT PATTERNS AND PROBLEMS

Researchers have been studying the situation of new faculty members during the last two decades. I have been concerned with what happens specifically during the first year of being a faculty member (Fink, 1984); others have studied what happens during the next 4 to 5 years after that (Boice, 1992a; Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992). I will summarize some of the major points of these studies.

The study of beginning college teachers was one I conducted, collecting data in the late 1970s on 100 people who had just finished graduate school and were in their first year as college teachers. These people came from the major graduate institutions in the United States

Received for publication 29 Jan. 1996. Accepted for publication 25 May 1996. The cost of publishing this paper was defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. Under postal regulations, this paper therefore must be hereby marked *advertisement* solely to indicate this fact.

and went to a variety of colleges in North America and a few other countries. I collected questionnaires from the faculty members at different times throughout the first year, collected other questionnaires from their chairs and colleagues, had a course evaluation instrument administered in one of their courses, and had site visits and interviews with about one-third of them.

These people varied greatly in terms of how well they fared during that first year. Four major problems had a significant impact on the majority of new teachers:

Teaching Load. The first problem was the teaching load they were given. Most new teachers ended up with a load similar to that of other faculty members, meaning two to four courses per term, depending on the institution. This arrangement is problematic because most, and sometimes all, courses taught by beginning teachers are "new preparations." "New preparations" are courses being taught for the first time. These courses generally take twice as much time to teach well, because one is finding and organizing material, and preparing tests and assignments, all for the first time. Hence, these courses have a work load equivalent that is twice as heavy as for a course that has been taught three or more times. Thus, new faculty members, who were still trying to become familiar with their new institution and the full range of responsibilities, had a teaching load that was twice the work load as that of their more experienced colleagues.

What effect did this have on the quantity and quality of their faculty work? First, it had a major impact on the quality of their teaching. Several factors (e.g., class size and total number of sessions per week) affected the end-of-semester student evaluations of these new teachers. But none had the dramatic effect of the number of separate subject matter preparations (Table 1).

How often was this a problem? Over half (56%) of the new teachers in this study had four or more separate subject matter preparations during their first year (Table 2). Assuming that most, or nearly all, of these were new preparations for these teachers, this means the majority of them had the work load equivalent of eight or more courses during their first year! This is clearly a problem that academic administrators need to address.

Heavy teaching loads also had an adverse effect on other scholarly activities. When the study sample was divided into groups, based on the size of their teaching load, the teachers with heavier loads understandably were less successful in submitting articles for publication, submitting grant proposals, and presenting papers at national conferences. Surprisingly, teachers with heavy teaching loads were somewhat more successful at finishing their dissertations if they left graduate school without having these finished (Table 3).

Intellectual Companionship. A second common first-year problem involved relationships with professional colleagues. During the site visits, I met a new faculty member who was depressed because he had been given a classroom closet for an office and had not been invited to departmental faculty meetings, to field trips with visiting professionals, or to supper by any other faculty member (this was in a small, rural Midwestern town). Consequently, I later asked all participants in the study to indicate in a questionnaire whether they had "found intellectual companionship with their colleagues." Nearly two out of three said they had not (16%), or had, but only to a limited degree (48%).

Other studies (Sorcinelli, 1988; Boice, 1992a) have found that the prospect of being in a profession where people regularly get together to share ideas intellectually was a major reason many people entered the academic profession. But the lack of substantial contacts with their colleagues was frequently a major source of disappointment and stress. Many new professors feel lonely and isolated.

Relating to the Institution. A third common problem had to do with a factor I eventually called "identification with the institution." It seems some people easily identify with the kind of institution they are in and others do not. My awareness of this factor again came from my site visits. One of the people I visited had been a "not too serious" student as an undergraduate. But when he attended a well-known, intense private research university as a graduate student, he got very excited about doing research and personally-driven inquiry. But he was teaching in a small church-related institution, and he just did not find the same concern here for research that had so excited him in graduate school.

At first I thought the issue was whether one's present institution was similar to or different from one's graduate school. But at the very next site visit, I encountered a person who had gone to a large state-supported research university and was teaching at a small liberal arts college. During the interview, I discovered that, although he had successfully completed his graduate studies at the large university, he never felt as comfortable there as he had at his undergraduate institution—a small liberal arts college much like his present institution.

This new information suggested that people vary in how they "identify with" diverse kinds of institutions. Therefore, I proceeded to ask all participants to indicate (a) of the institutions they had attended as a student, which they "most identified with" and (b) whether their present institution was similar to or different from the one they

Table 1. Effect of number of course preparations on course evaluation scores (from Fink, 1984, Table 12, p. 42).

Number of concurrent preparations during term of evaluation	Average course evaluation score (Scale: 1–100)
1	44
2	32
3	29
4	22

Table 2. Number of course preparations during first year (from Fink, 1984, Table 9, p. 40).

Number of separate course preparations during the first year	Percentage of all new teachers in study (%)
1	3
2	7
3	32
4	30
5	15
6–8	11

Table 3. Effect of teaching load on other scholarly accomplishments (from Fink, 1984, Table 34, p. 92).

Relative teaching load[z]	Submitted (%) Articles	Submitted (%) Grant proposals	Finished dissertation[y]	Made presentations at national meetings (%)
Light	64	48	47	68
Average	49	42	57	63
Heavy	43	33	64	62
Very heavy	30	20	29	60

[z]These categories were based on the number of courses and the number of different preparations each teacher had.
[y]This figure is the percentage of those who had not finished their dissertations before the year started.

Table 4. Identifying with the institution: Effect on teaching performance (from Fink, 1984, Table 14. p. 46).

	Institution identified with and present institution are: Very different	More different than similar	More similar than different	Very similar
Average course evaluation score	26	32	39	40

Table 5: Teacher–student similarity: Effect on teaching performance (from Fink, 1984, Table 22, p. 58).

Number of dimensions of teacher–student similarity	Average course evaluation score
6 (Very similar)	46
5	36
4	33
3	31
2	24
1 (Very different)	18

identified most with. About two-thirds said they were in institutions that were either "very different" or "more different than similar" to the institutions they identified with as students.

Then I checked to see whether this had an effect on their teaching; it did. Those who were in "similar" institutions, as a group, had higher average course evaluation scores than those who were in "different" institutions (Table 4).

Relating to Students. The fourth common first-year problem had to do with relationships with students. At one of the sites, I visited the classroom of a teacher and saw an amazing lack of communication. The teacher was from a large city in one region of the country, was upper-middle class with a particular religious identity, and was teaching a class of largely rural students in a different region who were lower middle-class and had a different religious orientation. He was sending verbal and nonverbal messages that were very meaningful to him but that were not at all meaningful to these particular students. Conversely they were responding with verbal and nonverbal messages that he did not understand.

Following this experience, I added questions to a questionnaire that went out to all participants, asking them to describe themselves and the majority of their students in terms of seven social characteristics: economic background, urban-rural background, region of origin, religious orientation, ethnic identity, nationality, and age. The average teaching scores of teachers who were similar to their students in a particular way were slightly higher than those who were different. The one exception to this was age: those who were close to their students' age had slightly lower scores.

But then I checked to see whether these differences were cumulative. That is, I added the number of dimensions (excluding age) on which each teacher was different from the majority of their students. The number of differences had a strong relationship with teaching evaluation scores. People who were different on several dimensions received much lower teaching scores than people who were more similar to their students (Table 5).

Does this mean that departments should only hire people who are similar to their students? Not at all. One of the highest teaching evaluation scores in the whole study was earned by a teacher who was different from his students in several ways: nationality, ethnic identity, and class. Why was his teaching so different from others in a similar situation? Somehow, this person seems to have found ways to understand his students better than most and learned how to effectively communicate with them in ways they understood. Having done this, his social differences were an asset, because he had something very new and different to offer his students.

Looking at the whole first-year experience, some of the new faculty were able to settle in, feel comfortable, and do an effective job fairly quickly. But many encountered significant problems in their adjustment, as described above. This situation leads to the question: What happens after the first year? Do these initial problems disappear, get worse, or simply change into new problems?

PATTERNS OF ADJUSTMENT AFTER THE FIRST YEAR

Two research projects have followed pretenure faculty members through their fourth and fifth years of appointment (Boice, 1992a; Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992). Olsen and Sorcinelli conducted their study on one campus over 5 years; Boice was able to track several cohorts at two campuses for up to 4 years and thereby make comparisons across campuses. Most of what they found was fairly similar. I will summarize their research in terms of teaching, research activity, relationships with colleagues, and balancing time commitments.

Teaching. On the positive side, faculty members were eventually able to reduce the time they spent preparing for teaching to a more acceptable level than during year 1. Probably, this change happened partly because they were not teaching so many new preparations and partly because of an increased efficiency in preparation. They also became more comfortable with their teaching and were able to derive more personal satisfaction from it.

However, they had not changed the way they taught, i.e., they had not succeeded in finding or creating an alternative to straight lecturing. They also continued to be bothered by the fact that, if they did do a good job at teaching, their colleagues neither knew about it nor seemed to care.

Research Productivity. After the first year or two, people were finally able to spend more time doing their research and writing about it. However, this did not always mean they felt satisfied with the quantity of their scholarly products.

Boice, in his study, found that the reduced time spent in teaching preparation went mostly to increased committee work rather than research and writing. Writing time had increased, but was still less than 2 h per week, and most faculty members were submitting only one manuscript per year to a refereed outlet. For many of them, this quantity of output was still below what their departments expected; this was especially true for women and minorities (Boice, 1992a, p. 96). Olsen and Sorcinelli found that virtually all faculty had had at least one refereed article published, 40% had had a book published or accepted, and another 40% had received external grant funding (Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992, p. 18). However, anxiety about the adequacy of their scholarly output was increasing rather than decreasing over time, presumably because the tenure review decision was getting closer.

Relationships with Colleagues. Both studies found that relationships with colleagues continued to be an area of concern, even after 4 and 5 years. Again, this was especially true for women and minorities (Boice, 1992a, p. 33). Social and professional contacts were eventually made, but they were often with people in the same discipline at other campuses or with people off-campus in the local community. The original expectation that the home department would be a "community of scholars," where ideas and research were discussed, was never realized for most people.

Balancing Time Commitments. By their third year, faculty started "talking" about addressing the imbalance they felt between work time and personal time; by the fourth year they had actually started doing something about it, or at least had specific plans to do so.

This step meant that they felt better, presumably about their home life and personal life. But it did not solve the major problems they felt about their work life. Olsen and Sorcinelli found that, by and large, people continued to find a high intrinsic satisfaction in the work they were doing, i.e., they still liked working with ideas and with students. But, their overall stress increased and their overall job satisfaction decreased. The proportion who characterized their work lives as "very stressful" rose from 33% in the first year to 49% in the third year and 71% in the fifth year. In addition, over 40% indicated that their health had deteriorated over the five-year period (Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992, p. 22). Again, much of the reason for the decline in job satisfaction was attributed to problems in relationships with colleagues and the lack of support received.

POTENTIAL PROBLEM ATTITUDES

If a significant number of new faculty members have adjustment problems during their first year, and if many of these continue in one way or another over time, what is the basic reason for this? In a general sense, I believe it is because department chairs and experienced faculty simply have not seen the needs of new faculty members as a distinct, important area for attention, and hence have taken a passive, reactive attitude towards the issue. The following three attitudes are widespread and seem partially responsible for the problems described above.

"Hit the ground running." Whitt (1991), in a study of new faculty in a college of education, interviewed new faculty and administrators about their experiences, and heard one phrase that seemed to characterize their expectations: "New faculty should 'hit the ground running.'" This view, although perhaps desirable, ignores the large amount of information that has to be acquired by new faculty to operate effectively in a particular institution, the new roles that have to be learned, the unwritten rules of operation that have to be discovered, and the institutional resources that have to be located.

"I'm available if you want." The other common attitude of experienced faculty, sometimes communicated verbally and at other times simply assumed, is that new faculty members should simply ask if they need help. This approach overlooks the tall barrier that exists for political and emotional reasons to such requests. New faculty are often

afraid to ask for help because they feel so vulnerable. If they ask for help, they will appear confused and incompetent to people who will be voting on their tenure and hence hold critical political power over the future of their careers.

"Sink or swim." One other view, a bit more callous, is that new faculty members should "sink or swim," i.e., they should either produce (on their own) or be judged unworthy and denied tenure. People taking this highly individualistic view put the whole responsibility for the professional development of new faculty on new faculty themselves. This attitude results in the cultural discontinuity many professors feel, and which was articulated by an assistant professor in one study of junior faculty: "In graduate school, I had a network of support, but now I feel like I'm in this alone" (Stanley and Chism, 1991, p. 59).

SUGGESTED CHANGES

The alternative view is that junior faculty deserve and can greatly enhance their own professional capabilities if department colleagues and academic administrators take a more proactive view of this issue. Some individuals and institutions have established a variety of support activities and feel quite pleased with the results. I will describe several of these under three categories of initiative: 1) programs that can be initiated by the institution, 2) actions that can be taken by individual department chairs, and 3) efforts that can be made by junior faculty themselves.

Institutional Initiatives

Institutions have at least three initiatives they can take to support the professional development of junior faculty.

Faculty/Instructional Development Program. The first option is to establish a faculty or instructional development program. In a survey of institutions of higher education conducted in 1985, 20% of all colleges and universities reported having some kind of program in this area, and the number was increasing (Erickson, 1986). These programs usually offer workshops, and individual consultations, serve as a clearinghouse of information, and often sponsor a faculty newsletter for sharing ideas by faculty for faculty. Such programs, when they exist, can help junior faculty, not only by being an individual beneficiary of specific services, but also as a way of helping them build a network of colleagues.

New Faculty Orientation Program. A second, more specific action is to sponsor a new faculty orientation program. In a review article, I described five formats that are currently being used at various institutions (Fink, 1992). At the Univ. of Oklahoma, we have been offering a weekly luncheon/seminar for new faculty members each fall that runs for 14 weeks. It consists of short and longer sessions that address various aspects of four themes: (a) support services for faculty research activity, (b) support services for and ideas on effective teaching, (c) institutional policies, characteristics, and support services, and (d) issues in the professional development of junior faculty. This program is voluntary, but ≈70% of all new faculty decide to participate. In the end-of-program evaluations, participants give the program a very high rating, saying that they value the advice and information. But they also greatly appreciate the sense of belonging and networking that comes from having weekly lunches with 25–40 cohorts each week.

Mentoring Programs. A third institutional initiative is to set up a mentoring program. These may be done at the department, college, or institutional level. Boice, who has studied these programs extensively, concludes that the usual procedure of finding a senior faculty mentor and linking the mentor up with a junior faculty member in the same department can work quite well. But crossing departmental lines, as well as gender and ethnic lines, can work just as well (Boice, 1992b, p. 53). What was more important than the personal characteristics of the matched pair of faculty members was having a program coordinator who would nudge the mentoring pairs to meet regularly and continuously, provide some directives about what they could do to enhance their effectiveness, and provide occasions for them to share their successes with other mentoring pairs (Boice, 1992b, p. 55).

Initiatives by Department Chairs

Wheeler (1992) conducted a national study of academic chairpersons, one part of which was concerned with their strategies for dealing effectively with the professional development of junior faculty. He summarized much of his findings in terms of seven possible roles that chairs should consider fulfilling. These are:

Chair as Resource Link: helping junior faculty make connections with resources and resource people, within the university and in the community at large.

Chair as Mentor: If an institutional mentoring program is not available, the chair may serve as a mentor. If so, they must be clear about their dual responsibility to provide support and evaluation.

Chair as Facilitator of Mentoring Relationships: initiating procedures or structures for senior colleagues in the department to be a mentor for junior faculty.

Chair as Institutional Authority or Representative: clarifying expectations and helping to set priorities that allow a junior faculty member to say "no" when appropriate, and serving as an advocate for junior faculty in larger institutional discussions.

Chair as Evaluator: providing frequent feedback on professional performance that is specific, honest, and constructive.

Chair as Faculty Developer: staying in touch with junior faculty so that felt needs can be detected and responses can be developed collaboratively.

Chair as a Model of Balance: helping junior faculty achieve an effective balance between academic work and life away from work by talking about the importance of maintaining this balance and by modeling it themselves.

In addition, Wheeler has identified 19 specific actions that chairs can take to provide tangible and collegial resources, separated into those that are especially important in the first year and those that become more important in years 2 through 5 of their academic appointment (Wheeler, 1992, Exhibits 8.1 and 8.2, pp. 94–95).

Initiatives by Junior Faculty Themselves

While the institution, fellow faculty members, and chairs have fairly clear opportunities (responsibilities?) that they can take to *support* the professional development of junior faculty, it is the junior faculty themselves who must take advantage of this support and "make it happen."

Building on the four themes identified by Sorcinelli and Austin (1992) in their review of junior faculty, I suggest the following.

Teaching

Negotiate a small teaching load during your first few years. Try especially to get the number of separate subject matter preparations to no more than one or two per year.

Search out information on ways of teaching that use "active learning" (rather than the passive learning that results from an over-reliance on lecturing). Many new faculty focus on getting good student evaluations and therefore put an excessive amount of time in on lecture preparation. This effort reduces the time available for other scholarly responsibilities and, in fact, often results in lower, rather than higher, student evaluations.

Colleagueship

Search out ways of drawing on the creative insights and experiences of successful senior colleagues. If a mentoring program exists, take advantage of it. If not, find other means.

One creative response by a junior faculty member at Oklahoma was to use the ordinary hallway greeting between colleagues when one says "Hi, how are you?" Instead of making the perfunctory response of "Just fine," this person decided to respond by saying: "Overall things are going great. But I do have one question about 'x'. Do you have any ideas on how to deal with this?"

This solves the problem of how to ask for help without appearing incompetent, by saying overall things are going well. It also develops positive relations with senior colleagues by letting them know you admire them enough to request their advice.

Institutional Expectations and Resources

Get clear, specific information on what your department and institution expect of you. The primary source for this information is generally the department chair, but it should probably by supplemented by talking to others as well and perhaps even by reviewing the tenure portfolios of recent successful (and, if possible, unsuccessful) tenure candidates from the department.

Search for information on resources within the department and institution. If your institution has an orientation program, take advantage of it. If not, try to find university publications listing various resources, offices, policies, etc.

Handling Stress

There will be stress, lots of it. Start developing ways of coping with it. Generally, efforts in this direction will take three forms:

a) Get well organized so you can get more done in the same amount of time.

b) Reduce the amount of work you have to do, by adjusting your self-expectations, and learning how to say "no" when you can.

c) Help your body deal with whatever stress you do encounter.

Sorcinelli (1992, pp. 34–36) offered 10 guidelines for junior faculty in dealing with stress.

Prioritize to identify the value of projects.
Set realistic goals as a first step toward reaching the ideal.
Use organizing techniques to get control of work time.
Know and capitalize on one's own prime time.
Find alternative work space to avoid interruptions.
Initiate relaxation exercises to restore energy.
Change work style to enhance a sense of well-being.
Cultivate a coping philosophy to overcome pressures.
Seek social support on and off the campus.
Reward oneself for working hard at a demanding career.

To this, I would only add to make sure you find ways to protect a predefined amount of personal and family time.

Faculty members who lose their drive over time because they forget to recharge their personal batteries are neither highly productive nor highly satisfied faculty members. The same is also true of faculty members whose families are in turmoil and disarray because, as a spouse and/or parent, they did not spend enough time with their families.

CONCLUSION

The professional development of junior faculty is one of the most important issues that institutions of higher education continue to have year after year. In many places it is not being handled well, with relatively high costs. When it is handled well, there are major benefits for the students, for the faculty members themselves, and for the institution.

If one accepts the premise that the faculty, collectively, is the primary intellectual resource of a university, then a front-end investment into activities aimed at enhancing the quality of that resource will yield major dividends for years to come.

Literature Cited

Boice, R. 1991. New faculty as teachers. J. Higher Educ. 62:150–173.

Boice, R. 1992a. The new faculty member. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Boice, R. 1992b. Lessons learned about mentoring, p. 51–61. In: M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin (eds.), Developing new and junior faculty. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 50. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Erickson, G.R. 1986. A survey of faculty development practices, p. 182–196. In: M. Svinicki (ed.). To improve the academy, a publication of the professional and organizational development network in higher education (vol. 5). New Forums Press, Stillwater, Okla.

Fink, L.D. 1984. The first year of college teaching. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 17. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Fink, L.D. 1992. Orientation programs for new faculty, p. 39–49. In: M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin (eds.). Developing new and junior faculty. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 50. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Olsen, D. and M.D. Sorcinelli. 1992. The pretenure years: A longitudinal perspective, p. 15–25. In: M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin (eds.), Developing new and junior faculty. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 50. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Sorcinelli, M.D. 1988. Satisfactions and concerns of new university teachers, p. 121–131. In: J.G. Furfiss (ed.). To improve the academy, a publication of the professional and organizational development network in higher education (vol. 7). New Forums Press, Stillwater, Okla.

Sorcinelli, M.D. 1992. New and junior faculty stress: Research and response, p. 27–37. In: M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin (eds.). Developing new and junior faculty. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 50. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Sorcinelli M.D. and A.E. Austin (eds.). 1992. Developing new and junior faculty. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 50. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Stanley, C.A. and N.V. Chism. 1991. Selected characteristics of new faculty: Implications for faculty development, p. 55–61. In: K.J. Zahorski (ed.). To improve the academy, a publication of the professional and organizational development network in higher education (vol. 10). New Forums Press, Stillwater, Okla.

Wheeler, D.W. 1992. The role of the chairperson in support of junior faculty, p. 87–96. In: M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin (eds.), Developing new and junior faculty. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 50. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Whitt, E.J. 1991. 'Hit the ground running': Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. Rev. Higher Educ. 14(2):177–197.