

Voeks V W. Publications and teaching effectiveness: a search for some relationship.
J. High. Educ. 33:212-8, 1962.
[Department of Psychology, San Diego State College, CA]

Quality of a person's teaching and number of his/her publications are unrelated according to a study of faculty at the University of Washington. This held true across all academic ranks and within ranks, for experienced and inexperienced faculty, for social sciences, physical sciences, and letters considered separately and also combined. Quality of teaching and of research also appeared unrelated. [The *SSCI*® indicates that this paper is the most-cited work from this journal.]

Virginia W. Voeks
Department of Psychology
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

June 5, 1987

"Teaching is improved by research; keeps you stimulated." "Any intellectually alert, dedicated person is bound to do both research and teaching. Professors not publishing are duds—can't be good teachers." We hear remarks like those, and this: "He must be a good teacher! He has a national reputation!"

We also hear the opposite. "He must be a poor teacher; he's always publishing. The more you publish, the less you teach." "Nobody can do everything. Definitely, teaching and research are negatively correlated." "Nonsense," someone chides, "there's no relationship." The argument swirls on.

After listening to several such arguments on several campuses, I still was amazed at the fervor involved. Seldom do informed people have stands so pas-

sionately held and so diametrically opposed as on this subject. Each side recites cases. No one convinces anyone.

Pondering these phenomena while walking home one day, the thought occurred to me that perhaps the discussions were so chaotic because the data were chaotic, or not widely known. I returned to the campus and searched the literature for systematic studies. To my dismay, I found no research at all on the subject—an astonishing gap. As we know, honors, grants, even university positions and many academic promotions can ride on what relationship is assumed to exist between publishing and teaching or between the quality of a person's research and the quality of that person's teaching. Systematic research clearly is essential so we can ascertain what relationships do in fact hold and to what degree.

I was visiting the University of Washington, which had then, as now, a very large and diverse faculty. A wealth of data could be gathered, so I set out to help fill the lacuna in our information—as have others subsequently¹⁻³—with some very careful work.

The biggest hurdle was working out how best to quantify research quality and how best to measure productivity and teaching effectiveness. In actually carrying out the research, I met no real obstacles. Almost everyone was kind and enormously cooperative—partly because they, too, were intensely interested in whether quality of teaching and research are related.

The extensiveness of my investigation and painstaking analyses are appealing. However, the widespread, eager interest in this topic and its enduring importance are (I think) major reasons the study has been cited.

1. Michalak S J & Friedrich R J. Research productivity and teaching effectiveness at a small liberal arts college. *J. High. Educ.* 52:578-97, 1981.
2. Centra J A. Research productivity and teaching effectiveness. *Res. High. Educ.* 18:379-89, 1983.
3. Dent P L & Lewis D J. Relationship between teaching effectiveness and measures of research quality. *Educ. Res. Quart* 1:3-16, 1976.