Colleges and universities should recognize and build on the several, sometimes conflicting, cultures that affect faculty members’ values and behaviors.
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A history of late twentieth-century American higher education could not avoid describing the diversity of institutional types and the plethora of disciplines, fields, and specialties. The insightful sociologist Burton Clark (1985, p. 41) highlights this diversity when he discusses “the endless number of churches and sects” produced by disciplinary distinctions and further divided by the variety of colleges and universities.

Indeed, nearly twenty years ago, Light (1974, p. 14) proclaimed that “the academic man [or woman] is a myth.” That is, distinct disciplinary histories, ways of doing work, and career lines have created diverse professions among academics (Ruscio, 1987); additionally, particular institutional missions have resulted in variation across faculty priorities and workload (B. Clark, 1985, 1987). Furthermore, faculty members’ gender, race, and class affect their experience. They work in a “master matrix” (B. Clark, 1984) where they belong to “an array of groups”—a discipline and department, a specific college or university, a national system of higher education, and a profession (S. Clark, 1986, p. 26).

Kuh and Whitt (1988, pp. 12-13) define culture as “the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups.” Additionally, they explain that culture is “an interpretive framework for understanding and appreciating events and actions” (1988, p. 13). Given this definition, it is clear that faculty not only belong to various groups, in fact, they also live and work in at least four (and often more) cultures. As “interpretive frameworks,” these cultures affect how faculty interact with students, conceptualize and organize their work, participate in institutional decision making, and balance disciplinary and institutional responsibilities.
This chapter describes the four primary cultures that influence faculty values and behaviors: the academic profession, the discipline, the academy as an organization within a national system, and the specific type of institution. Following an analysis of the key elements and values associated with each of these cultures, the chapter identifies issues and tensions that arise from their interaction. Finally, the chapter suggests ways that a college or university can build on the cultural values of these various interpretive frameworks to enhance organizational performance.

The Culture of the Academic Profession

Though disciplinary specialization and institutional type strongly affect faculty perspectives and behaviors, some overarching integrative values link faculty across the range of disciplines and institutions (B. Clark, 1985; Kuh and Whitt, 1988; Rice, 1986). Rice (1986, p. 14) asserts that a “dominant fiction” of what it means to be an academic professional emerged during the expansionist period of higher education, between the mid-1950s and the mid-1970s. This image affected both the expectations and the self-concepts of individual family members, as well as the practices and policies (such as tenure and promotion requirements) of colleges and universities.

Several values and concepts are particularly important bedrocks of the academic profession (B. Clark, 1985; Kuh and Whitt, 1988; Rice, 1986). One of these key values is the notion that the purpose of higher education is to pursue, discover, produce, and disseminate knowledge, truth, and understanding. Research, writing, publication, and instruction are all vehicles for enacting this value. Second, autonomy and academic freedom in teaching and research are valued as ways to maintain quality and protect creative as well as controversial ideas. Peer review processes (in the disciplinary culture) and tenure (in the institutional culture) are the structures that protect autonomy and academic freedom. A third critical value of the academic profession is commitment to intellectual honesty and fairness. Students are to be treated fairly, and, since ideas are held as the most valuable capital in academe, faculty are expected to shun plagiarism or falsification. Fourth, collegiality is held up as the ideal framework for faculty interactions as well as institutional decision making. The professional norms admonish faculty to temper respect for academic freedom with support for one’s colleagues. Along with this value is a belief that the university or college is a community of scholars who work together to govern the institution (Mortimer and McConnell, 1978). A fifth value that undergirds the academic profession across disciplines and institutions is a commitment to service for society. Faculty not only produce knowledge but also transmit culture as they educate young people.

In addition to these core values, the academic profession, over the past
four decades, increasingly has embraced a set of values based in the disciplinary culture. What Jencks and Riesman (1968) term the "academic revolution" has involved an acceptance of an "institutional hierarchy of American higher education" (B. Clark, 1985, p. 43) in which the research university is the model that all other institutions strive to emulate. The widespread acceptance of this hierarchy has made research "the central professional endeavor and the focus of academic life" (Rice, 1986, p. 14); it is accepted as the route to national status. Other elements of this aspect of the culture of the academic profession are the acceptance of the various academic disciplines as the best organizational structure to facilitate the pursuit of knowledge, the recognition that reputations are established through publications and involvement with national professional and scholarly associations, and the understanding that the reward system emphasizes specialization.

While these values of the academic profession create a "super ethos" (B. Clark, 1985, p. 42), the nature of specific institutions and disciplines determine how they are played out in faculty behavior and work. For example, while the values that have been incorporated into the academic profession from the disciplinary culture both guide and validate faculty behavior in the research university, they can be the source of incongruence and stress for faculty working in institutional settings (such as community colleges) where teaching rather than research is the dominant institutional commitment.

The Cultures of the Disciplines

In the long-standing debate over whether there is one academic profession or many, a number of voices emphasize that the disciplines are "the primary units of membership and identification within the academic profession" (B. Clark, 1987, p. 7), creating more differences than similarities among faculty. Analysis of faculty work and orientations to teaching and research point without question to variations across disciplines and professional areas (Becher, 1987; Finkelstein, 1984).

During the twentieth century, the department has become the basic organizational element in American colleges and universities and the discipline a major cultural force affecting faculty. Identification with the discipline or professional area begins with the socialization experience of graduate school, in which the initiates learn the language, style, symbols, traditions, and folklore of their respective disciplines as well as the appropriate professional activities. As a faculty member's career develops, the "invisible colleges" of colleagues linked by discipline and subspecialties maintain disciplinary values. Also, the disciplinary professional associations provide publication channels, conferences, and mission statements (Kuh and Whitt, 1988).
Various systems have been advanced to classify the disciplines and the dimensions on which disciplinary differences occur. Lodahl and Gordon (1972), for example, use the level of paradigm development as the basis for classification. Biglan's (1973) frequently referenced classification scheme posits that the disciplines differ along three dimensions: (1) hard-soft (whether a consensus over a single paradigm or body of theory exists), (2) pure-applied (whether there is a focus on practical application), and (3) life-nonlife (whether the research focuses on living systems). Biglan's classification system posits eight categories based on the interactions of the three dimensions. Becher (1987) classifies the disciplines according to the nature of knowledge within each discipline. His system focuses on whether knowledge is seen as cumulative or reiterative and whether "knowing how" is emphasized as much as "knowing that" (Becher, 1987, p. 280). Four disciplinary sectors emerge based on these differences: hard-pure, soft-pure, hard-applied, and soft-applied.

While each of these classification systems offers particular dimensions on which to classify the disciplines, they all lead to the conclusion that disciplinary differences shape the lives of academics in significant ways. In the words of B. Clark (1985, p. 41), the disciplines are value-laden cultures that frame the beliefs and behaviors of faculty members: "Disciplines and subject specialties are going concerns in their own right, each developing in time a tradition, a social organization, a reward system, and especially an offering of professional status and dignity. Once internalized, a subject becomes an inner faith."

The culture of the discipline is the central source for a faculty member's identity, affecting "assumptions about what is to be known and how, assumptions about the tasks to be performed and standards for effective performance, and assumptions about patterns of publication, patterns of professional interaction, and social and political status" (Kuh and Whitt, 1988, pp. 77-78, citing Becher, 1984, 1987; and B. Clark, 1984). For example, in the hard-pure sciences, knowledge is cumulative and the goals are discovery, explanation, identification of universals, and simplification. Projects are often long-term and supported by extensive funding. The culture is characterized by competition, teamwork, long periods of initiation (for example, postdoctoral appointments), fast publication rates, and frequent contact with national and international colleagues through phone calls, visits, conferences, and formal and informal publications. In contrast, in the soft-pure disciplines of the humanities, knowledge is holistic (rather than cumulative), and the emphasis is on understanding, interpretation, and particulars. The corresponding culture involves independent work, single authorships rather than multiple authorships, comparatively fewer publications as well as a slower pace of publications, and less frequent conference attendance. Similarly, the hard-applied and soft-applied disciplines have their own characteristics and cultures.
Though disciplinary cultures imply particular values and behaviors, all members of a particular discipline do not have closely similar careers. The culture of the institution in which an academic is employed affects the strength of the disciplinary culture in framing the faculty member's behavior and work, with the strongest disciplinary influence occurring in the most prestigious colleges and universities.

The Culture of the Academy as an Organization

As American higher education has developed historically, the culture of colleges and universities as social organizations traditionally has revolved around two central values: (1) the belief that universities and colleges are involved in "good work," that is, the production of knowledge for society and the intellectual development of students and (2) a commitment to collegiality coupled with autonomy as the appropriate organizational context within which faculty should work (Austin and Gamson, 1983). These cultural values derive from those institutional predecessors in which twentieth-century American higher education has its roots: the British and the colonial American colleges with their strong tradition of collegiality and the German research universities with their emphasis on peer review and individual specialization (Rice, 1986).

Also, organizational culture relates to the kind of compliance system that characterizes the relationship between subordinates and superordinates in an organization. Etzioni (1961, p. xv) defines compliance as "a relationship consisting of the power employed by superiors to control subordinates and the orientation of the subordinates to this power." Compliance systems may be normative, utilitarian, or coercive. Colleges and universities are predominantly normative, with faculty motivated by the belief that the work is significant. Historically, faculty have been willing to trade higher financial rewards for the opportunity to work within an atmosphere of autonomy and collegiality (Corson, 1979).

In addition to the collegial elements, however, universities and colleges have a bureaucratic structure and a corresponding managerial (Rice, 1986) or utilitarian (Etzioni, 1961) culture. (The balance between these cultures varies by institutional type.) While the collegial and bureaucratic structures always have produced inherent conflicts, in the past decade external pressures—such as economic constraints, state and federal guidelines, and the labor market—have shifted the balance between the collegial and managerial cultures. For example, demands for accountability have resulted in increasing emphasis on quantitative measurements of the outcomes of faculty work. Also, external pressures have contributed to greater centralization, diminished faculty participation in organizational decisions, constraints on faculty autonomy, increased workloads, and decreased salaries (Austin and Gamson, 1983). These changes threaten to weaken the core
cultural values of the academy: the belief that the central goal is "good work" and that the rewards are the collegiality, the autonomy, and the intellectual discovery and sharing. While these values undoubtedly are deeply embedded, the cultural shifts (occurring in varying degrees, depending on institutional type and context) threaten to increase the influence of organizational characteristics more typically associated with other sectors of the work force—increased competition at the expense of colleagueship, fewer intrinsic rewards, less normative commitment to the institution, less "lofty" personal and institutional goals.

The Cultures of Institutional Types

Light, Marsden, and Corl (1972) conceptualized the modern academic career in terms of three strands: the disciplinary career, the institutional career, and the external career (work-related activities based on disciplinary experience but occurring outside the institution). The employing institution defines the institutional career, strongly affecting the duties, opportunities, rewards, relationship to the discipline, and prestige the faculty member experiences.

Key elements that contribute to a college or university's culture include mission and goals of the institution, governance structure and leadership style of administrators, curricular structure and academic standards, student and faculty characteristics, student-faculty relations, size and location, and physical environment. The characteristics of each element and their interactions with each other create a unique culture for each college and university (Peterson, Cameron, Jones, Mets, and Ettington, 1986).

The institutional mission is a particularly important element, affecting recruitment processes, socialization of new faculty, tasks faculty must fulfill, and performance standards (Kuh and Whitt, 1988, citing B. Clark, 1963; and Ruscio, 1987). For example, in universities with a strong mission to produce knowledge, the research activities tend to be highly specialized. In institutions that emphasize teaching, such as liberal arts colleges, scholarly projects tend to be less specialized, spanning knowledge in several fields and often synthesizing or organizing in new ways knowledge already discovered or produced. The extent to which teaching is a primary institutional commitment affects how faculty spend their time and participate in the disciplinary culture. Those faculty with heavy teaching responsibilities find that as the disciplines become more specialized, they are less able to make connections with the research community (Ruscio, 1987).

Institutional administrative and governance patterns also play a significant role in shaping organizational culture and, in turn, faculty behavior. In colleges and universities with a strong bureaucratic orienta-
tion, faculty are less central to decision making, and the work environment tends to be very structured in regard to teaching load, office hours, and salary schedules. In more collegial cultures, decisions are less centralized, faculty experience more autonomy, and relationships and behaviors are less constrained by formal rules.

While the particular mix of variables makes each college and university unique, institutions of similar type tend to have similar cultures; thus, the faculty in each institutional type share common experiences (B. Clark, 1985, 1987). Professors in major universities feel strong kinship in their disciplines, place priority on research, and value stimulation from interactions with disciplinary colleagues. They tend to be cosmopolitan and well traveled, attending conferences, enjoying considerable autonomy, and maintaining control over their time. Here, the disciplinary culture dominates faculty values and behavior more than in any other institutional type.

In the state colleges, where heavy emphasis on undergraduate instruction is often coupled with institutional aspirations to move up in the pecking order, teaching loads remain full even as expectations for faculty publication increase. Faculty often have little time for research and writing and have few advanced graduate students. As a result, they often feel conflicts between the research activities to which they were socialized and that their institutions would like them to pursue and the day-to-day demands of teaching.

In the liberal arts colleges, where the emphasis is on the development of undergraduates as "whole persons," excellence in teaching is the most highly valued element of faculty work. Small departments mean that few colleagues with similar disciplinary interests are readily accessible. In the nationally renowned liberal arts colleges, faculty still maintain connections with their disciplinary networks and carry out research agendas, though limited time and resources may influence the dimensions of the research. In the less prestigious liberal arts colleges, narrowly defined disciplinary research and publication in scholarly journals occurs less frequently. Generally, for faculty in liberal arts settings, commitment to institutional responsibilities diminishes disciplinary involvement and commitment (Kuh and Whitt, 1988).

Faculty in community colleges experience an institutional culture different on many dimensions from the other institutional types. Heavy teaching loads, an absence of upper-level students, and, often, the need to provide remedial assistance are the norm. In this setting, many faculty are motivated primarily by seeing students learn and the intrinsic rewards and satisfaction they derive from this work.

As this overview suggests, the culture of an institution (as defined both by its individual characteristics and by its type) is a strong force affecting faculty values and activities.
Issues and Conflicts Relating to Multiple Faculty Cultures

Various issues and conflicts develop out of the multiple and interacting cultures in which faculty members work. Though the values of some of the cultures coincide, faculty must make trade-offs between those values that are dissonant. Sometimes accommodation of the values of each of the four cultures (the profession, the discipline, the academy, and the institutional type) is impossible; trade-offs become unworkable. Light, Marsden, and Corl (1972, p. 14) call the process of working through these conflicts "the moral career of the academic man [or woman]."

A difficult conflict occurs for a faculty member when the traditional values of the disciplinary culture differ from those of the culture of the employing institution. For example, faculty socialized in graduate school to the disciplinary values of specialized research and publication may feel that they are unsuccessful when they find themselves in an institutional setting that requires many hours of teaching in the classroom. On the other hand, if employed at an institution dominated by the research imperative, a faculty member committed to teaching may feel out-of-sync and undervalued.

Problems concerning career development also may result from the interaction of the disciplinary culture and the institutional culture. The values of the discipline define career development as a process of narrowing one's research specialization. At the same time, employment in a single institutional setting for a long period of time can limit opportunities for personal growth and new experiences. In such a situation, broadening and rechanneling one's research interests might be more stimulating than focusing on a narrower research question (Rice, 1986).

The previously discussed issues and conflicts confront individual faculty members and can diminish their vitality and productivity (S. Clark, 1986). The conflicting values of multiple cultures also pose problems at the institutional level. For example, impelled by the disciplinary and professional cultures, the criteria for campus reward systems increasingly emphasize scholarly productivity, as evidenced by the number of publications. Yet, in many colleges and universities, an overemphasis on research as a criteria for reward ignores realities of heavy teaching loads and increasing numbers of students requiring special assistance. Additionally, heavy emphasis on specialization for all faculty (a disciplinary value) has the potential to diminish an institution's ability to reallocate faculty time and effort to meet new needs and to develop interdisciplinary approaches. Also, the disciplinary values that honor research specialization, when taken to an extreme, can obscure the fact that good teaching requires more than excellence in research. Finally, the power of the disciplinary culture in recent years has forced splits between faculty at different ranks; junior faculty, for
example, sometimes feel they must meet more stringent publication require-
ments to receive tenure than those faced by their senior colleagues. In
situations of conflict between the cultures of the profession, the discipline,
and the institution, institutional community, trust, and morale can falter
(Bowen and Schuster, 1986; S. Clark, 1986; Rice, 1986).

Suggestions for Practice

The fact that faculty members live and work in several different cultures
creates some interesting and challenging tensions. But how can a college
or university build on these various cultural values to increase organiza-
tional performance? The following suggestions are divided into two catego-
ries. Those in the first group are directed specifically to administrative and
faculty leaders in colleges and universities. The suggestions in the second
group pertain more broadly to the American higher education community.

Suggestions for Institutional Leaders

Institutional leaders interested in building on cultural values should con-
sider analyzing the mix of cultures at the particular institution, clearly
stating institutional priorities, celebrating institutional values, establishing
clear evaluation and reward systems, helping faculty understand differences
across their fields, and examining how cultural values affect faculty percep-
tions and reactions.

Analyze and Understand the Mix of Cultures at the Institution. The
time and resources used to analyze and understand the cultural values that
affect faculty at one's own college or university are well spent. While all
faculty members are affected by the several cultures described in this chap-
ter, the strength of each culture and the balance among them will vary
across institutions (as well as across faculty members). Assessment of faculty
cultures can be done in several ways, as indicated by the variety of methods
described in other chapters of this volume. In my own research, I have
found it useful to combine surveys and interviews. Often a set of open-
ended interviews with faculty can identify some of the key elements that
should be included in a survey. Then a carefully constructed survey can
provide a composite and general overview of what faculty across the insti-
tution and in various subunits value, are influenced by, and perceive about
the institution. Following the collection of survey data, intensive interviews
with individual faculty members or groups of faculty can provide more
detailed, rich information about the cultures affecting the faculty as a group
and within subgroups.

In working with institutions engaged in self-analysis of their cultures, I
have found that retreat settings can be very productive. Small groups of
faculty can be set to the task of exploring and delineating the various cul-
tures in which they work, the key values in each of those cultures, and the conflicts created by these sets of values. An alternative to a retreat is a series of meetings for different departments, schools, or other subgroups of the faculty (groups of faculty of similar rank in related disciplines might be useful), convened for the purpose of discussing and analyzing the cultures and values affecting the faculty.

One important point must be stressed regarding each of these methods. Any person, team, or committee sending out a survey, conducting interviews, leading a retreat, or holding group meetings must be perceived by all faculty members as sensitive, bias-free, tactful, discreet, and honest. Although administrators may certainly embody these characteristics, their role typically puts them in a disadvantageous position for personally carrying out these methods. Faculty members generally are more likely to talk freely with another faculty member or with a respected outsider.

The analysis of the cultures affecting faculty within a college or university should lead to greater understanding of faculty behaviors, concerns, problems, and perspectives. Additionally, cultural analysis is a useful prelude to the following suggestions.

**Clearly Establish Institutional Priorities.** Research in both higher education and business indicates that effective leaders should clearly and frequently articulate the primary values, goals, and commitments of the institution (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Rice and Austin, 1988). Since individual faculty members may emphasize different values, depending on the cultures that most influence them, a clearly stated and widely understood institutional mission and culture is a necessary foundation for linking many individuals and creating a community.

A clear statement also provides a framework against which individual faculty members can evaluate their own cultural values to determine how best to contribute to the institution. For some faculty, reflection on a set of clearly stated institutional values and goals may lead to the conclusion that employment in another setting would provide a more conducive environment for enacting their own sets of values. Results of a study sponsored by the Council of Independent Colleges show that liberal arts colleges with supportive academic workplaces and high faculty morale not only have clearly stated and widely understood missions but also emphasize these institutional values as part of the faculty recruitment process. Serious effort is made to ensure that individuals joining the faculty feel they can support and work productively within the institutional culture (Rice and Austin, 1988).

**Promote and Celebrate Institutional Values.** Clear and frequent articulation of an organization's mission and values does not alone strengthen institutional culture. Additionally, rituals, ceremonies, myths, and even architecture can convey and strengthen an institution's values. For example, at some colleges, buildings are named for respected teachers on the faculty.
rather than for contributors. The institutional commitment to excellence in teaching is clear (Rice and Austin 1988). For those colleges and universities seeking to strengthen the organization's culture in the face of conflicting values from other cultures, attention to these vehicles for promoting and celebrating the institution's values is particularly useful.

Establish Clear Evaluation and Reward Systems. Since the various cultures that influence faculty have some conflicting values (different emphases on teaching and research, for example), an individual faculty member faces a variety of choices concerning how to allocate his or her time and effort. Furthermore, institutions often send mixed signals about what is valued; for example, institutional leaders may assert that both research and teaching are institutional priorities, but in actual practice tenure decisions depend almost solely on research contributions. In my own interviews of junior faculty in more than thirty universities, conducted among those who participated in a faculty development program focused on the enhancement of teaching, I frequently have heard this concern about mixed signals expressed. Such double messages are confusing and discouraging. Institutional leaders must recognize that, since faculty members work within the context of several sometimes conflicting cultures, fairness demands that the criteria for evaluation and reward systems be clear.

As well as clarifying the reward systems, institutions should consider whether these systems could be made sufficiently flexible to allow individual faculty members to maintain and be rewarded for the particular balance they individually forge between the values of the various faculty cultures (Boyer, 1990; Rice, in press). For example, within the same college or university, some individuals might excel in and be rewarded for traditional scholarly publication, while others focus on and are rewarded for teaching.

Help Faculty in Different Fields Better Understand Each Other. Since the values in various disciplines and fields differ, faculty in different departments or schools within a university sometimes have difficulty understanding and appreciating each other. For example, faculty in law have difficulty understanding professional practice and values in education, and faculty in history do not know much about the values of nursing. Lack of understanding easily breeds disregard, underestimation, and inappropriate conclusions. These problems are especially significant if they affect decisions regarding tenure, recommendations for institutional financial allocations or cuts, and graduate student awards or grants. Institutionally sponsored opportunities to discuss goals, values, and criteria for excellence in the different disciplines and fields would help diminish problems arising from mutual ignorance of others' disciplinary cultures.

Consider Cultural Influences on Faculty Perceptions and Reactions. The values inherent to the cultures described here affect how faculty members react to institutional situations and policies. For example, a new depart-
ment chair who assigns courses to faculty members in a department where collective decisions typically have prevailed undoubtedly will encounter resistance or hostility. Another example pertains to teaching centers, which are new additions on many campuses today. Such centers often are avoided or neglected by faculty members, largely due to the disciplinary culture's emphasis on the department as the center of the academic professional's life and to its view of teaching as a secondary priority. Leaders must find ways to help faculty see beyond these barriers if such centers are to succeed.

Presidents, provosts, deans, department chairs, and other leaders should evaluate the impact of cultural values on faculty reactions and behavior. Such evaluation may indicate that a proposed plan is inappropriate or may enable a leader to address resistance even before it crystallizes.

Suggestions for the Higher Education Community at Large

The higher education community at large, as well as particular institutions, would benefit from greater awareness and application of the diverse cultures affecting faculty. Along those lines, suggestions for the higher education community include changes in graduate school socialization processes, efforts to make teaching activities more central to professional and disciplinary activities, new ways of conceptualizing scholarship, and a broadening of the notion of academic professional.

Review and Reform of Graduate School Socialization. While the graduate school experience historically has been a primary vehicle for socializing prospective faculty members into the culture of the discipline, American higher education might be better served if graduate students also were made aware of the diverse cultures and values of different institutional types. With such information, new faculty members might consider carefully which institutional settings best match their personal commitments and interests within the discipline. For example, graduate students in biology who discover a special love for teaching the discipline might seek employment not in the major research universities but rather in the strong liberal arts colleges where teaching is an institutional priority. This new kind of socialization would need not only to expose students to different institutional settings but also to teach them to value the particular contributions of each setting.

Bring Teaching into the Core of Professional Activities. S. Clark (1986), in an essay delineating the tensions confronting the academic professional, urges that teaching activities be brought into a more central place within professional and disciplinary activities. Disciplinary associations might honor stellar teachers among their members, and prestigious scholarly journals might regularly include articles concerning pedagogy within the discipline. Such efforts to elevate the notion of excellence in
teaching within the discipline could help reduce the tensions faculty experience between the disciplinary and institutional cultures.

Develop Broader Ways to Conceptualize Scholarship. There is increasing momentum within higher education to find new ways to conceptualize the scholarly contributions of American academics. Rice (1986, in press) and Boyer (1990) assert that scholarly activity has become too narrowly defined as research productivity that leads to publication in scholarly journals. They argue for a broader view of scholarship that honors and rewards a range of scholarly activities, including integration, synthesis, application, and teaching, as well as knowledge production. This perspective would maintain the centrality of scholarship to the academic profession but value the different forms that scholarly activity can take. Such a reconceptualization would link teaching and research and diminish some of the tensions created by conflicting cultural values.

Broaden the Notion of Academic Professional. The contributions of faculty members are diverse; some discover new knowledge, some are superb teachers, some take prominent institutional roles, some apply knowledge to the solution of problems outside academe. American colleges and universities would be enriched if a variety of career paths and contributions were recognized, supported, and rewarded. A broader view of what it means to be an academic professional (Rice, 1986) would build on the values of the several cultures in which faculty work, diminish the tensions between these cultures, and thereby strengthen the American college and university.
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