

2018

Teacher Training for PhD Students and New Faculty in Economics


Sam Allgood

Gail Hoyt

KimMarie McGoldrick

University of Richmond, kmcgoldr@richmond.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/economics-faculty-publications>

 Part of the [Economics Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

This is a pre-publication author manuscript of the final, published article.

Recommended Citation

Allgood, Sam; Hoyt, Gail; and McGoldrick, KimMarie, "Teacher Training for PhD Students and New Faculty in Economics" (2018). *Economics Faculty Publications*. 61.

<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/economics-faculty-publications/61>

This Post-print Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Economics at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Economics Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

TEACHER TRAINING FOR PHD STUDENTS AND NEW FACULTY IN ECONOMICS

Short title for running header: Teacher Training in Economics

Sam Allgood^a, Gail Hoyt^b, and KimMarie McGoldrick^c

^aDepartment of Economics, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, USA; ^bGatton College of Business and Economics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA; ^cRobins School of Business, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA, USA

Abstract: Past studies suggest that a majority of economic graduate students engage in teaching-related activities during graduate school and many go on to academic positions afterwards.

However, not all graduate students are formally prepared to teach while in graduate school nor are they fully prepared to teach in their first academic position. The authors characterize current teaching experience and training of graduate students from the point of view of directors of graduate studies and of newly minted academic economists. The authors also query department chairs and new faculty about teacher training, support available for new faculty, and the degree to which newly hired Ph.D. economists are prepared to teach. Findings indicate that while some training is available, there is room for enhancing teacher training in economics.

Key words: Graduate students, teacher training

JEL code: A2

Contact: Gail Hoyt; ghoyt@uky.edu; Teaching Fellow and Professor of Economics, 245S Gatton College of Business and Economics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0034, USA.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Teagle Foundation. They also thank Felipe Benguria, Chris Bollinger, Bill Bosshardt, David Colander, William Hoyt, Jennifer Imazeki, Lala Ma, Mark Maier, Olga Malkova, Georg Schaur, John Siegfried, and Wendy Stock for their helpful comments and suggestions in finalizing survey instruments.

A Ph.D. in economics is primarily a research degree. Those who earn a Ph.D. in economics are deemed qualified to engage in policy analysis, advise the business practices of our largest companies, and conduct the research that shapes the analysis and advice given to policy- and decision-makers. While many economists do work in these areas, the reality is that a large proportion of Ph.D. economists spend a significant portion of their careers engaged in activities related to teaching. For these economists, a successful career will depend as much on the ability to get a 19-year-old to understand comparative advantage as it will on publishing a paper in a journal. Just as success in research requires appropriate training, so does success in the classroom. Teaching college economics effectively requires training, just as effective research does. In this article, we assess the amount and type of teacher training provided in U.S. economic graduate programs.

Past evidence suggests only limited training occurs in graduate school. Walstad and Becker (2010) report that a third of graduate programs require a graduate-credit training course and half have noncredit programs. In a survey of graduate students, McGoldrick, Hoyt, and Colander (2010) find that less than half of those leading a recitation or teaching their own course had any form of teacher training before beginning their teaching-related activities. They also find that many Ph.D. graduates do not feel that teaching is important for their careers. It is unclear if this sentiment is a result of the limited emphasis on the importance of teaching or limited exposure to training while attending graduate school. The reality, however, is that even faculty at top 100 economic institutions spend over 22 hours per week on teaching (Allgood and Walstad 2013). Similarly, Stock and Hansen (2004) report that for academic economists, teaching is more important for success on the job after graduate school than it is for success while in graduate school.

Despite a wealth of information regarding graduate student teaching-related activities, training opportunities and subsequent career choices, there are important gaps in our knowledge base that require filling before one might identify the most effective ways to enhance the training process. There was little change between 2003 and 2008 in the extent to which graduate students participated in teaching-related activities and associated training requirements (Walstad and Becker 2010), but it is not known how this training has subsequently evolved. Past evidence suggests that graduates feel underprepared to teach, but this evidence is based on cohorts of economists who graduated over fifteen years ago and who were only one year out of graduate school when surveyed (Stock and Hansen 2004). Thus, we know little about current practices to prepare graduate students to teach. More importantly, we do not know if such training meets employer needs; namely, the extent to which employers (at all institution types) find that new faculty fall short in their teaching skills when they begin their new job.

We use a three-pronged approach to gather primary data by surveying 1) economics Ph.D. programs, 2) academic programs who hire new Ph.D. economists, and 3) the new economists themselves who end up in academic positions that include teaching responsibilities. These survey results allow us to fill gaps identified in the existing literature and to paint a more complete picture of the current landscape for teacher training in economics from the perspective of the producer (Ph.D.-granting institutions), the product (new Ph.D.s with teaching responsibilities), and the consumer (departments hiring Ph.D. economists). Survey questions pinpoint strengths and weaknesses in current training and untapped areas of opportunity for future training.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND DATA

We designed and administered surveys to economics Ph.D. programs that produce new Ph.D. economists, academic programs that hire new Ph.D. economists, and new economists in academic positions that involve teaching. We constructed these three complementary surveys in hopes of gaining a multifaceted perspective of the teaching experience of new Ph.D. economists that fills holes in the existing literature and informs departmental policy with regard to teaching activity, training, and support. We administered our surveys in the fall of 2015.

We gathered information on the teaching-related activities of graduate students and the extent to which the directors of graduate studies (DGS) feel their students are prepared to teach in their first job by surveying the 132 Ph.D.-granting programs in the United States. We obtained survey responses from 78 programs for a response rate of 59 percent. While we used the survey of Walstad and Becker (2010) as a starting point for many questions included on the survey, we expanded our focus to generate additional detailed information about the teaching and training of graduate students.

Table 1 describes the full Ph.D. program sample along with a breakdown of the top 30 Ph.D. programs compared to the programs ranked 31–132 based on McPherson's (2012) research output ranking of U.S. economics departments.¹ When considering program size, there are about two-and-one-half (2.5) times as many students in the average top thirty graduate programs compared with those outside those thirty. Assuming these sample means describe the populations from which they are drawn, the data suggest that 44 percent of graduate students attend the thirty top programs. Students spend about half a year longer in residency at top 30 programs. The average number of years of Ph.D. program residency is 5.74 for top 30 programs and 5.25 years at programs ranked below the top thirty. International students account for

approximately 68 percent of enrollment in U.S. Ph.D. programs.² Students at programs outside the top 30 are much more likely to attend school without funding.

[Insert table 1 about here]

Our survey of department chairs provides information on the teaching experience of new faculty from an administrative viewpoint. Chairs describe standard teacher training and support at the institution. Chair responses have the potential for a great deal of variation as new faculty might be hired by a large public or private university, a smaller liberal arts college, a community college, or even an online institution. We surveyed 797 department chairs at institutions whose names we obtained from the list of institutions that had posted jobs with the American Economic Association (AEA) job market over the five years prior to our survey administration. However, due to differences in the nature of instructional positions across countries, the chair survey sample is limited to U.S. economics departments. Our sample includes 192 responses, demonstrating a 24 percent response rate.³

Table 2 provides descriptive information for the full sample of economics departments as well as the subsample of 51 schools with a Ph.D. program and the 141 schools without an economics Ph.D. program. Departments without a Ph.D. program have fewer faculty, either tenured or tenure-track, and these programs have about a sixth the number of students.

[Insert table 2 about here]

We sent our third survey to 2,804 economists who joined the American Economic Association between 2010 and 2015, excluding those who obtained their Ph.D. from a foreign institution. We have a response rate of 16.3 percent including 159 economists in nonacademic positions and 299 economists in academic positions. Because joining the AEA is not necessarily coincidental with graduation from a Ph.D. program, it is possible that some economists join it

later in their careers. To focus our analysis on more recent graduates we included only those who had received their degree within six years of the time of survey administration. In reporting results, we compare subsamples of economists working at Ph.D.-granting institutions in the United States, economists working in economics departments in the United States without a Ph.D. program, and those working at foreign academic institutions.⁴

Table 3 provides basic demographics for the new faculty sample and characterizes their teaching-related activity in their current positions. Consistent with the current male/female breakdown for assistant professors in the economics profession, we find that about 65 percent of the new faculty sample are men.⁵ Two-thirds of faculty are white, and the racial distribution is similar across Ph.D. and non-Ph.D. granting institutions in the United States. The average age of new professors is 35.23 years and the average time to earn a Ph.D. is 5.61 years with little variation across subsamples.

[Insert table 3 about here]

About 80 percent of respondents are tenure-track or tenured. U.S. Ph.D. programs and foreign institutions are more likely to hire faculty into non-tenure track positions. Almost 10 percent of faculty at Ph.D. programs are contracted as full-time lecturers⁶ versus only about five percent at non-Ph.D. programs. Respondents were able to indicate what other positions they held and almost all were post-doctoral or research associate positions. This suggests that faculty working in doctoral programs tend to be more specialized in either teaching or research. The United States differs from other countries in how faculty job titles are linked to tenure. Twenty-two percent of respondents at foreign institutions indicate they are not in a tenure-track position, yet almost 90 percent indicate they have the title of assistant or associate professor. Additionally,

foreign institutions make less use of contract teaching specialists than do U.S. economic departments.

TEACHING ACTIVITY AND PREPAREDNESS

Table 4 provides an overview of teaching loads for new faculty in our sample. Teaching loads vary across subsamples as one might expect. The overall number of undergraduate course preparations is higher for new faculty not associated with a Ph.D. program, although they prepare fewer graduate courses. Since acquiring their academic job, new faculty in non-Ph.D.-granting departments have prepared an average of 4.31 undergraduate courses and 0.97 graduate courses compared to 1.6 undergraduate courses and an average of 1.77 graduate courses for new faculty at Ph.D.-granting departments. In terms of teaching intensity, most striking is the difference in total number of class/sections taught since coming to their job. Forty-two percent of new faculty in departments without a Ph.D. program have taught 20 or more sections while this is true for only 14 percent of new faculty in departments with Ph.D. programs, likely reflecting differences in the weight of teaching in the faculty member's time allocation and the nature of their jobs. Almost all of those at non-Ph.D. programs have taught at least one class whereas almost 10 percent of new faculty at departments with Ph.D. programs have not taught a single section. It is interesting to note that the distribution of the number of sections taught in foreign departments is comparable to the Ph.D.-granting U.S. departments. Average class size for new faculty at Ph.D.-granting departments is substantially larger at 60.55 students compared to an average class size of 36.05 students for new faculty employed by departments that do not grant a Ph.D.

[Insert table 4 about here]

Table 4 also indicates how new faculty report they spend their time. Not surprisingly, new faculty at programs that grant a Ph.D. spend more time doing research than do new faculty in departments without a Ph.D. program, at 58.24 percent and 32.15 percent respectively. Likewise, new faculty in Ph.D.-granting departments spend 32.03 percent of their time on teaching-related duties while new faculty in departments without a Ph.D. program spend 53.76 percent of their time on teaching activity. Faculty employed at foreign institutions spend their time differently than the average faculty employed at a U.S. institution, with a greater time allocation to research and less to teaching. However, the time allocation of foreign employed faculty is very similar to those at Ph.D. programs in the United States. The difference is only with those at non-Ph.D. programs.

Are faculty prepared for this extent of teaching activity? Almost 83 percent of DGS strongly agree or agree that graduates from their program are prepared to teach effectively. Chairs that hire these new faculty are somewhat less positive about the preparedness of new faculty to teach. Sixty-eight percent of department chairs feel that newly hired assistant professors are adequately prepared to teach. The new faculty themselves have the least positive view of their preparedness to teach. Only three-fifths strongly agree or agree that their graduate school training adequately prepared them to teach.

Table 5 outlines some of the teaching experience of graduate students and thus provides insight about how directors of graduate studies form their opinions about the preparedness of their new graduates to teach. The average graduate program has about 16 percent of their students teach a course without faculty supervision, and these students teach about 3.5 unsupervised courses while in graduate school.⁷ However, less than two-thirds of graduate students are viewed as prepared to do this activity. Top 30 programs have a smaller fraction of

students teach without supervision, and these graduate students do this less often, but the DGS of these programs believe the students are prepared to teach without supervision (83.3 percent). Programs outside the top 30 have a larger fraction of students teaching more classes without supervision, but only 58 percent of DGS at these programs believe their students are prepared for the task. Aside from leading a recitation, the other types of teaching activity reveal a similar breakdown across program rank.

[Insert table 5 about here]

Recall that almost 83 percent of directors believe that students are adequately prepared to teach when they graduate. This suggests some gain while in graduate school given that table 5 shows that only about three-fifths of directors believe that graduate students are ready to teach their first class without supervision. This gain seems to be stronger among students outside the top 30. Although not reported in table 5, 92 percent of directors at top 30 programs believe their graduates are prepared to teach, and 81 percent of those outside the top 30 thought the same. However, 83 percent of directors at top 30 programs view students as prepared to teach without supervision versus only 58 percent of directors outside the top 30. It is not clear if this difference between programs in the top 30 and those outside the top 30 reflects greater initial aptitude of top 30 students or differences in expectations about what it means to be prepared to teach.

TEACHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT

The survey results in table 5 indicate that many graduate students have limited experience in front of students. This may be of little concern if these students receive adequate teacher training so that they are prepared for activities that will amount to a quarter or more of their job after graduation (Allgood and Walstad 2013). However, our results suggest that four out of ten

graduate students do not feel they are prepared to teach when they come out of graduate school. So, what types of training are available?

Table 6 outlines, from the perspective of directors, what training activities graduate students are likely to participate in at some point during graduate school. Fifty to sixty percent of responding programs indicate that graduate students are likely to attend workshops, seminars or training offered at the institution, whether organized at the department, college, or institution level. Interestingly, students at top 30 programs are 50 percent more likely to attend a department-sponsored teaching workshop or seminar, and they are 50 percent more likely to take a teacher-training course offered by the university. According to directors, students are much less likely to attend a publisher-sponsored teaching conference or attend teaching-related sessions held at various conferences. Although only 20 percent of directors at top 30 programs report that students attend a publisher-sponsored teaching conference, these students are ten times more likely to attend such a conference than are students at programs outside the top 30.

[Insert table 6 about here]

Table 7 provides a slightly different view on the topic. Directors were asked at what level, if any, is teacher training offered. Training is most likely to be available at the institutional (72 percent) or departmental level (68 percent), but only one in four report that their college offers training. Only a small percentage indicate that no training is offered at any level although this is more likely to be true for top 30 programs. However, top 30 programs are also more likely to be housed in a college that offers training.

[Insert table 7 about here]

On a separate item, over half (58 percent) of directors indicated that their departments offer a teacher-training course. The survey item allowed for differences in the structure of the

course, including those contained within a single day or conducted over a full semester. Of those offering a training course, only 40 percent have students take the course for credit. However, three-fourths of departments offering a class require all graduate students with teaching responsibilities to take the course and a similar fraction require graduate students to take the class before they teach for the first time. When it is offered, the teacher-training course is typically taught by economics faculty (75 percent).

New faculty provide a similar view of the training exposure they received while in graduate school. Table 7 reveals that 23 percent⁸ of responding programs have students take a teacher-training course for credit and table 8 reveals that about 20 percent of new faculty took a for-credit course in graduate school. About 86 percent of new faculty report that they are required to take the credit course, a number consistent with the 72.5 percent reported by DGS. Interestingly, new faculty that attended top 30 graduate programs are generally more likely to be required to take some form of teacher training, a credit course being the exception. In general, new faculty and directors provide a similar picture of training while in graduate school.

[Insert table 8 about here]

New faculty can also obtain teacher training once they are employed. Table 9 gives the perspective of department chairs regarding the teacher training that is available for new hires. A third of chairs state that new faculty are assigned a teaching mentor but a quarter of chairs never assign a teaching mentor. Non-Ph.D. departments are more likely to always assign a mentor and those with a Ph.D. program are more likely to never do so. For comparison, half of departments with a Ph.D. program always assign a research mentor and only one-fifth never assign a research mentor. About two-thirds of departments offer peer observation of teaching, but departments without a Ph.D. program are over 20 percentage points more likely to do so. On-campus teaching

workshops are available on 75 percent of campuses, regardless of the existence of a graduate program. Departments with and without Ph.D. programs are equally likely to offer financial support for curriculum development, but non-Ph.D. programs are much more likely to offer financial support for attending a teaching conference or to provide support for procuring teaching-related materials.

[Insert table 9 about here]

New faculty responses regarding training and support available at their jobs create a different perspective than that provided by department chairs.⁹ Seventy percent of new faculty state that no teacher training is required at their employment (see table 10). Interestingly, those employed in foreign institutions are more likely to be required to participate in teacher training. Domestically, almost a quarter of non-Ph.D. programs require training at some point versus only 12 percent of those with Ph.D. programs. Chairs and new faculty also report a similar level of availability of on-campus workshops for teacher training. However, new faculty report a lower level of financial support to attend teaching conferences, regardless of program rank. A similar fraction of new faculty report that financial support is available to obtain course materials when compared with the response of chairs, but new faculty suggest a lower level of availability of financial support for curriculum development. It is possible that this support is available and new faculty are not aware of it, but we are not able to clarify this distinction with the data from our survey.

[Insert table 10 about here]

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT?

Our survey results suggest that 40 percent of new faculty do not believe they are prepared to teach and over 30 percent of chairs believe that new faculty are not prepared. The survey results

also suggest limited teacher training, whether in graduate school or upon obtaining employment, so it is natural to ask what training new faculty need. To this end, we asked new faculty what training would have been helpful to have received while in graduate school. Their responses are summarized in table 11, which provides the percentage responding either “very helpful” or “helpful,” rank-ordered from largest to smallest.

[Insert table 11 about here]

New faculty want help with how to teach, regardless of how one defines “teaching.” Almost three-fourths wish they had learned about different pedagogies and three-fifths want help with structuring a lecture. Faculty need assistance delivering content to their students as well as interacting with students and figuring out how to manage their classes. In fact, half of new faculty—whom one might think are more up to date on such matters—would like to learn more about available technology, and they are not even sure what to look for when picking a textbook. The three remaining items are about assessment, and about half of new faculty need help developing assessments, whether writing exams or assignments, and choosing their grade weights. The bottom line is that the majority of new faculty want help with almost every aspect of what it means to be a post-secondary teacher.

Department chairs view the new faculty teaching experience very similarly to the new teachers themselves. Chairs were asked “...to what extent do you wish the following skills were stronger in your newly hired assistant professors?” with table 12 reporting the percentage responding either “a lot stronger” or “somewhat stronger.” Department chairs express various concerns about how new faculty teach and interact with students. Three-fourths of chairs believe their new faculty struggle to teach courses at an appropriate level of difficulty. The next two items (engage students and deal with student difficulties) reflect other ways in which chairs

believe their new faculty struggle in their interactions with students. While chairs at departments without Ph.D. programs are more likely to hold these views, these are still commonly held across departments. It is perhaps not surprising that these items top the list for department chairs. Students might not complain to a department chair about a professor whom they believe gives a boring lecture, but they will complain about courses they view as unfairly difficult or professors whom they feel unfairly handle a student's difficulty.

[Insert table 12 about here]

Chairs are concerned about how instruction is carried out as well, given that over 65 percent wish to see improvement in the ability to structure a lecture or employ different pedagogies. However, chairs of Ph.D. programs are less troubled by this aspect of teaching relative to other chairs. While chairs are less concerned than new faculty about their use of technology and the choice of textbooks, chairs do wish new faculty were stronger at assessment.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

By their own admission, 40 percent of new faculty do not feel prepared to teach. These new faculty wish they knew more about different ways to teach, how to handle classroom and student issues, and how to assess student performance. That is, they wish they knew more about critical elements of effective teaching. Department chairs also wish these new faculty were stronger in almost every area of teaching. While certainly time and resources constraints in graduate programs are contributing factors, the lack of preparation is also likely influenced by the fact that many directors of graduate programs who oversee the training already believe those graduating from their programs are ready to teach.

The good news is that resources are available to provide the training that new faculty need. This journal, along with other sources, publishes articles that address many of the issues

raised by new faculty and department chairs. For example, research articles help identify which teaching methods are actually effective in promoting student learning (Hoyt and McGoldrick 2012). The AEA also promotes teaching enhancements through work carried out by the Committee on Economic Education. Every May, the committee organizes a conference dedicated solely to economic education, providing a plethora of opportunities for educators to gain hands-on knowledge (of both content and pedagogic practice) they can take to the classroom. Additionally, a wide variety of conferences devoted to economic education are offered by academic institutions and publishers, and numerous sessions at the AEA and regional association meetings are devoted to economic education practice and research. More locally, many universities support teaching and learning centers that faculty do not take full advantage of either because they are unaware of the resources they provide or because they do not have appropriate incentives to do so.

The status quo regarding teaching training has been in place for many years. Walstad and Becker (2010) find no appreciable differences over time in the extent to which graduate students participate in teaching-related activities, but there has been a modest increase in graduate programs that require a graduate credit course as preparation for instruction. Given that teaching will continue to be an integral component of the work life of academic economists, the question remains—can attitudes and incentives be altered so that departments and individuals take advantage of the many teaching-related resources available?

NOTES

¹ Fourteen of the top thirty schools replied for a response rate of 47 percent and 64 of the remaining programs responded for a response rate of 63 percent.

² This characterization of the Ph.D. students is consistent with Siegfried and Stock (2004) who find 62 percent of students are international and the international share of program enrollment has been growing since the mid-1970s.

³ Although community colleges do advertise in the JOE, there are a limited number of job postings and the nature of community colleges made it much more challenging to identify the appropriate target to complete the survey. Thus we dropped these institutions from our sampling process. It was also difficult to contact institutions who employ economists, but do not have an economics department and these are excluded as well.

⁴ The foreign departments may or may not have a Ph.D. program.

⁵ The 2016 Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession annual report notes that women comprise approximately 28 percent of assistant professors at doctoral-granting institutions (CSWEP 2017, 12).

⁶ Although there are many titles for non-tenured faculty that teach, we use the term lecturer throughout as a catch-all for these positions.

⁷ To be clear, the percent of students engaged in a given activity is computed for each program and the number reported is the average of this number.

⁸ Of the 58 percent who offer a training course, 40 percent state that the course is taken for credit.

⁹ It is possible that this difference is simply because chairs and new faculty do not necessarily reside in the same departments.

REFERENCES

- Allgood, S., and W. B. Walstad. 2013. How economists allocate time to teaching and research. *American Economic Review* 103 (3): 654–58.
- Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (American Economic Association) (CSWEP). 2017. The 2016 report on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. *CSWEP Reports* 2017 (1): 1–17. <https://www.aeaweb.org/content/file?id=3643> (accessed January 16, 2018).
- Hoyt, G., and K. McGoldrick, eds. 2012. *The international handbook on teaching and learning economics*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- McGoldrick, K., G. Hoyt, and D. Colander. 2010. The professional development of graduate students for teaching activities: The students' perspective. *Journal of Economic Education* 41 (2): 194–201.
- McPherson, M. A. 2012. Ranking U.S. economics programs by faculty and graduate publications: An update using 1994–2009 data. *Southern Economic Journal* 79 (1): 71–89.
- Siegfried, J., and W. Stock. 2004. The market for new PhD economists in 2002. *American Economic Review* 94 (2): 272–85.
- Stock, W. A., and W. L. Hansen. 2004. Ph.D. program learning and job demands: How close is the match? *American Economic Review*, 94 (2): 266–71.
- Walstad, W. B., and W. E. Becker. 2010. Preparing graduate students in economics for teaching: Survey findings and recommendations. *Journal of Economic Education* 41 (2): 202–10.

TABLE 1: Ph.D. Program Characteristics (Perspective of Directors of Graduate Studies)

	Full Sample (n=78)	Graduate Program	
		Top 30 Programs (n=14)	Programs 31-132 (n=674)
Graduate students in program	53.78	110.86	41.1
(Range)	1-200	60-200	1-105
Years in residence	5.34	5.74	5.25
International Students (%)	67.77	70.08	67.25
<i>Current graduate students in program (%)</i>			
On assistantship-teaching only	43.11	46.96	42.25
On assistantship-research only	13.83	10.77	14.51
On assistantship-teaching and research	22.20	23.59	21.88
With no funding	11.37	3.29	13.16

TABLE 2 Economics Department Characteristics and Teaching Activity (Survey of Department Chairs)

	Full Sample of Departments (<i>n</i> =192)	Departments with Ph.D. Program (<i>n</i> =51)	Departments without Ph.D. Program (<i>n</i> =141)
Tenure track faculty	11.66	20.37	8.81
Non-tenure track faculty	3.08	5.82	2.09
Faculty who are lecturers (%)	19.49	22.53	18.36
Tenure track faculty hired in last 5 years	1.88	3.39	1.32
Non-tenure-track faculty hired last 5 years	1.05	1.35	0.95
<i>Departments housed in (%)</i>			
College of Arts and Sciences	37.70	41.18	36.42
College of Business	32.98	29.41	34.29
Other Colleges	29.32	29.41	29.29
Undergraduate majors	240.17	611.17	110.66
Courses/sections taught in a typical year by a tenure track faculty member	5.04	3.55	5.61
Courses/sections taught in a typical year by a non-tenure track faculty member	6.25	6.04	6.36
Our department offers some courses online (%)	49.21	58.82	45.32

TABLE 3: New Faculty Characteristics

	Full Sample (<i>n</i> =299)	In Dept with Ph.D. Program (<i>n</i> =102)	In Dept without Ph.D. Program (<i>n</i> =116)	At Foreign Institution (<i>n</i> =81)
Male (%)	64.90	62.75	60.34	75.31
<i>Race (%)</i>				
White/non-Hispanic	66.78	72.56	68.10	59.26
White/Hispanic	12.91	10.78	11.21	16.05
Asian	14.24	14.71	11.21	18.52
Black	2.32	0.98	5.17	0.00
Age in years	35.23	34.57	35.45	35.79
Time to degree in years	5.61	5.62	5.74	5.4
<i>Type of Position (%)</i>				
Not tenure-track	19.54	29.41	9.48	22.22
Tenure-track but not yet tenured	62.58	63.73	66.38	54.32
Tenure-track and has tenure	17.88	6.86	24.14	23.46
<i>Rank (%)</i>				
Assistant Professor	66.89	64.71	65.51	70.37
Associate Professor	17.55	8.82	25.00	18.52
Full time teaching position, contract less than 3 years	3.97	4.90	5.17	1.23
Full time teaching position, contract greater than 3 years	1.66	4.90	0.00	0.00
Part time teaching position	1.66	1.96	1.72	1.23
Other	6.62	14.71	0.86	4.94

TABLE 4: New Faculty Perspective of Time Allocation and Teaching Activity

	Full Sample (n=255)	In Dept with Ph.D. Program (n=85)	In Dept without Ph.D. Program (n=103)	In Dept at Foreign Institution (n=67)
<i>Number of class sections taught so far (%)</i>				
0	5.10	9.41	0.97	5.97
1-5	21.57	21.18	17.48	28.36
6-10	22.75	27.06	15.53	28.36
11-20	24.71	28.24	23.30	22.39
20 or more	25.88	14.12	42.72	14.93
Undergraduate courses prepped	3.01	1.65	4.31	2.64
Graduate courses prepped	1.41	1.77	0.97	1.63
Average class size	51.42	60.55	36.05	66.36
<i>During the current semester, what percent of your time each week do you devote to... (%)</i>				
Teaching	40.87	32.03	53.76	34.26
Research	46.53	58.24	32.15	51.51
Service	12.64	9.73	14.21	14.23

TABLE 5: Teaching Activity in Graduate School from DGS

Teaching Activity	Full Sample ($n=65$)			Top 30 Programs ($n=12$)			Graduate Program Programs 31-132 ($n=53$)		
	% of Students	Avg #	Prepared %	% of Students	Avg #	Prepared %	% of Students	Avg #	Prepared %
Teach course, no faculty supervision	15.8	3.46	61.2	5.10	2.83	83.3	18.1	3.54	58.1
Teach a course with faculty supervision	4.60	4.44	83.3	3.10	5.00	100	5.0	4.25	76.6
Lead a recitation for a faculty's course	20.1	4.47	75.0	31.10	5.20	100	17.7	4.24	67.7
Provide instructional support for faculty	33.4	5.23	89.6	24.8	4.50	90	35.4	2.96	89.5
Teach a course online	1.2	4.00	66.7	0.3	4.00	100	1.4	2.50	62.5

Notes: “% of Students” is percent of students in PHD programs who do the indicated activity; “Average #” is the average number of times a student would do the activity; “Prepared %” is the percentage of DGS who believe students who do activity are prepared to do it.

TABLE 6: Which of the following are your graduate students likely to participate in at some point during your program? (from DGS; %)

	Full Sample (<i>n</i> =61)	Graduate Program	
		Top 30 Programs (<i>n</i> =10)	Programs 31-132 (<i>n</i> =51)
Attending a department-sponsored teaching workshop or seminar	49.2	70.0	45.1
Attending a college- or university-sponsored teaching workshop or seminar	63.9	60.0	64.7
Attending a general teacher-training course offered by your university	45.9	60.0	43.1
Attending a publisher sponsored teaching conference	4.9	20.0	2.0
Attending teaching-related sessions at meetings such as the ASSAs, SEAs, EEAs, WEAs, Midwest meetings, etc.	8.2	10	7.8

TABLE 7: Teacher Training Offered While in Graduate School from DGS (%)

	Full Sample (n=78)	Graduate Program Top 30 Programs (n=14)	Graduate Program 31-132 Programs (n=64)
<i>Programs that offer training at:</i>			
Institution	71.8	78.6	70.3
College	28.2	50.0	23.4
Department	67.9	71.4	67.2
None offered	3.8	7.1	3.1
<i>Teacher-training course offered</i>			
Course is taken for credit	58.0	58.3	57.9
Course required of all students with teaching related responsibilities	40.0	28.5	42.4
Course must be taken before student teaches first time	72.5	85.7	69.7
Course is taught by economics faculty member	75.0	57.1	78.8

TABLE 8: New Faculty Teacher Training While in Graduate School (%)

	Full Sample (n=250)	Graduate Program Top 30 Programs (n=123)	Graduate Program 31-132 Programs (n=127)
<i>Did you receive teacher training?</i>			
Credit course	19.0	16.0	22.1
Non-credit course	7.6	8.5	6.9
Workshop	36.4	37.7	34.4
Seminar	10.1	7.7	12.7
<i>If so, was it required?</i>			
Credit course	85.7	75.0	93.1
Non-credit course	70.6	88.9	50.0
Workshop	60.7	76.2	42.5
Seminar	33.3	40.0	28.6

TABLE 9: Teacher Training: Chair's Perspective (%)

	Full Sample of Departments (n=192)	Departments with Ph.D. Program (n=51)	Departments without Ph.D. Program (n=141)
<i>New faculty members are assigned a teaching mentor</i>			
Yes, always	35.93	25.49	39.71
Yes, sometimes	39.58	37.25	40.42
No, never	24.47	37.25	19.85
<i>New faculty members are assigned a research mentor</i>			
Yes, always	36.45	54.90	29.79
Yes, sometimes	32.29	25.49	34.75
No, never	31.25	19.61	35.46
Peer observation of teaching is available	62.90	46.94	69.12
On-campus teaching workshops are available	76.34	75.5	76.49
<i>Financial support is available:</i>			
to attend a teaching conference	72.04	48.98	80.15
to procure teaching-related materials	64.52	42.86	72.79
for curricular development	65.59	63.33	66.19

TABLE 10: Training and Support at Employment—New Faculty (%)

	Full Sample (n=244)	Department without Ph.D. Program (n=77)	Department with Ph.D. Program (n=101)	Foreign Institution (n=66)
<i>Required to attend teacher training</i>				
Before beginning appointment	9.35	9.90	6.49	12.12
After beginning appointment	12.60	7.92	3.90	28.79
Before and after appointment	3.25	4.94	1.30	1.52
No training is required	69.51	71.29	80.52	54.55
I do not know if this is required	5.28	4.95	7.79	3.03
Training at on-campus teaching workshops is available	70.46	73.74	70.67	65.08
<i>Financial support is available to:</i>				
Attend teaching conferences	45.99	63.64	34.67	31.75
Procure course materials	63.29	66.67	53.33	69.84
For curriculum development	38.40	44.44	34.67	33.33
Attend off-campus teaching workshops	32.91	44.44	26.67	22.22

TABLE 11: Helpful to Have Learned More about in Graduate School
(New Faculty- Very helpful/Helpful)

	Full Sample (<i>n</i> =244)	Graduate Program	
		Top 30 Programs (<i>n</i> =118)	Programs 31–132 (<i>n</i> =132)
Different pedagogies or ways to teach	71.60	65.25	77.27
How to deal with student difficulties	66.67	61.54	71.21
How to structure a lecture	61.45	64.10	59.09
Logistics of managing a class	53.82	53.85	53.79
Available technology	52.61	53.85	51.52
How to write an exam	50.40	50.85	50.00
How to choose a textbook	46.99	47.86	46.21
How to create an assignment	46.40	48.31	44.70
How to choose assessment weights	34.41	33.04	35.61

TABLE 12: Skills Department Chairs Wish to See Improved (Chairs: A lot or somewhat stronger)

	Full Sample of Departments (n=184)	Graduate Program	
		Departments with Ph.D. Program (n=47)	Departments without Ph.D. Program (n=136)
How to gauge the appropriate level of difficulty of the course	78.57	72.34	80.60
How to engage students	77.84	68.75	80.88
How to deal with student difficulties	71.04	61.70	74.07
How to structure a lecture	68.48	47.92	75.56
How to use different pedagogies/ways to teach	67.39	45.83	75.56
Logistics of managing a class	57.92	44.68	62.22
How to write an exam	57.61	38.30	63.97
How to create a grading rubric	44.57	29.79	49.26
How to create an assignment	44.57	31.25	48.89
How to choose assessment weights	33.15	21.28	36.76
How to use available technology	32.24	25.53	34.81
Command of subject	28.96	19.15	31.85
How to choose a textbook	25.97	13.33	29.63