

Pedagogy of Scholarship in
Higher Education Administration

by

Aaron Coe

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Approved March 2011 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Alfredo G. de los Santos Jr., Co-Chair
Kris M. Ewing, Co-Chair
Keri L. Heitner

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2011

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this phenomenological hermeneutic study was to explore the meaning found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship for five higher education administrators from within the major areas of administration in higher education--academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs--from a single research university in the western United States. In the historical and recent scholarship in and about the three fields of higher education administration, academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs, one issue that has not been addressed is what it is like to produce scholarship as an administrator. Current scholarship in the field helps administrative practice by focusing on the practice of administration; however, current literature did not provide an understanding of what it means to do scholarship as an administrator. Thus, the challenges and rewards of producing scholarship as a practicing administrator, creating the first step toward a possible new era in the practice of scholarship on college campuses, were explored in the this study. Individual semi-structured interviews were the primary source of data. The structured questions were used to set up the un-structured questions used to explore specific examples and instances pertaining to producing scholarship as an administrator. A three-step data analysis process was used to develop both an understanding of what scholarship means for each participant and an interpretation of the meaning of producing scholarship as a higher education administrator.

Across all of the lived-experiences and the participants' varied scholarly endeavors, each administrator was more connected to education and contributed more to the educational environment by participating in scholarly activities. The administrators were found to be more connected to the people within the university, their own field of practice, and with the university itself.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my family, who has supported me throughout my doctoral journey. In particular to my wife, Carrie, who has put up with the late nights of writing and researching, along with the long weekend blocks needed to make this work possible. Thank you, Carrie, I love you. To my children, Hazel and Henry, may my accomplishment show you that your dreams can come true. And to my parents, Ed and Cheryl, who have always done things the right way and have set the example through their actions, thanks for the work ethic and drive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my thanks to everyone who has supported me and given of their time on my behalf towards this dissertation and my degree. Each person has given me the support, encouragement, and teaching that I needed to complete this endeavor.

First, I would like to recognize my dissertation committee: Dr. Alfredo G. de los Santos, Jr., Dr. Kris Ewing, and Dr. Keri Heitner. To my chair, Dr. de los Santos, thank you for teaching me how to think about narrowing my topic and like the Oracle in *The Matrix*, for always knowing and saying exactly what I needed to hear to get this far. To Dr. Ewing, thanks for never quitting on me as a part-time student; from my very first class to the finished dissertation, you have stuck with me and supported my growth. To Dr. Heitner, thanks for your constant guidance and support and for editing my documents for so long. You have taught me a lot about research and myself.

I would also like to recognize some of the faculty I have worked with throughout my career. To Dr. Caroline Turner, thanks for many wonderful memories and experiences; your passion for education is contagious. To Dr. Mary Lee Smith, thanks for your tutelage and guidance in my formative stages as a qualitative researcher; I hope this work finds your approval. To Dr. Leonard Valverde, Dr. James Rund, Dr. Rufus Glasper, Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick, and the other faculty and administrators I have come in contact with during my program, thanks for a great experience and opportunity.

Finally, I would like to recognize and thank my friends, colleagues, and co-workers at University of Phoenix and especially in the School of Advanced Studies. Thanks for the encouragement, prodding, support, and flexibility needed to make one of my dreams a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background to Problem.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Study Context	9
Significance of the Study.....	12
Nature of the study.....	14
Research Method.....	14
Research Design	15
Phenomenological Research.....	15
Hermeneutic Phenomenology	15
Research Question.....	16
Conceptual Framework	18
Definition of Terms	19
Assumptions.....	23
Scope.....	24
Limitations.....	25
Delimitations.....	28
Pilot Study.....	29

	Page
CHAPTER	
Overview of Dissertation.....	30
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	31
Books, Title Searches, Articles, Research Documents and Journal Research.....	33
Scholarship in Higher Education	33
The Term Scholarship and Higher Education	34
Scholarship in and about Higher Education Administration	38
Origins of Scholarship in Higher Education Administration.....	39
Seminal Works on Scholarship.....	44
Current Theories on Scholarship.....	48
Gaps in the Literature.....	52
Phenomenological Hermeneutics.....	55
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	59
Research Philosophy: Hermeneutic Phenomenology a Human Science	61
Research Design: Hermeneutic Phenomenology	64
Research Question.....	66
Population	67
Participant Recruitment and Selection	68

CHAPTER	Page
Informed Consent and Confidentiality.....	69
Data Collection: Semi-structured Interviews.....	71
Data Analysis Process.....	72
Naive Reading and Understanding.....	74
Structural Analyses.....	76
Comprehensive Understanding.....	76
Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Human Science Research	77
4 INTRODUCTION TO ADMINISTRATORS.....	82
Introduction to Dr. Nancy Greene	82
Summary of Curriculum Vitae	82
Interview Setting.....	83
Background in Education and Administration	84
Dr. Greene and the Scholarship of Teaching and Application.....	88
Introduction to Dr. Keith Grayson.....	91
Summary of Curriculum Vitae	91
Interview Setting	92
Background in Education and Administration	92
Dr. Grayson and the Scholarship of Discovery	98

	Page
CHAPTER	
Introduction to Dr. Kevin Simpson	99
Summary of Curriculum Vitae	99
Interview Setting	100
Background in Education and Administration	100
Dr. Simpson and the Scholarship of Teaching	108
Introduction to Mr. Larry Davidson.....	109
Summary of Curriculum Vitae	109
Interview Setting	109
Background in Education and Administration	110
Mr. Davidson and the Scholarship of Application.....	114
Introduction to Dr. Steven Roberts.....	115
Summary of Curriculum Vitae	115
Interview Setting	116
Background in Education and Administration	116
Dr. Roberts and the Scholarship of Discovery	120
5 THE MEANING OF SCHOLARSHIP	122
Dr. Nancy Greene – Scholarship and Maximizing the	
Value of Education	122
The Value in Education	122
Dr. Greene and Personal Values	123
Dr. Greene and Educational Values	126

CHAPTER	Page
Scholarship and Maximizing the Value of Educational Opportunities.....	132
Dr. Grayson – Scholarship and Maintaining a Scholarly Identity	138
Discipline Specific Scholarship in Administration	139
Scholarship in Administration.	143
Scholarship and Maintaining a Scholarly Identity	146
Dr. Simpson – Scholarship, Administration, and Contributing to the Core Mission	147
Administration and the Core Mission.....	149
Scholarship in Administration	151
Scholarship and Contributing However You Can as an Educator.....	156
Mr. Davidson – Scholarship within the Residential Learning Environment	157
Housing as Education.....	158
Scholarship and Creating a Residential Environment that Encourages Engagement and Development Aligned to an Institutions Mission.....	160
Dr. Roberts – Scholarship and Personal- Professional Alignment.....	167

	Page
CHAPTER	
Scholarship and the Transferability of Knowledge	167
Scholarship and the alignment of Administrative and Academic Interests.....	170
6 SCHOLARSHIP IN ADMINISTRATION: THE MEANING OF THE PHENOMENON.....	175
Being More Connected to Education.....	176
Scholarship and Connecting with People.....	176
Scholarship and Connecting with the Field.....	178
Scholarship and Connecting with the Institutional Mission	179
Scholarship in Administration as Social Networking – A Metaphor for Participation.....	181
Future research implications.....	185
Conclusions	186
REFERENCES	189
APPENDIX	
A PILOT STUDY CONSTRUCTS AND THEMES	198
B RECRUITMENT EMAIL TEMPLATE	200
C INCLUSIONS WITH RECRUITMENT EMAIL.....	202
D IRB APPROVAL	207
E INTERVIEW GUIDE	209

APPENDIX

F	VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION STRATEGIES EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY.....	212
G	INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR PARTICIPANT 1	215
H	INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR PARTICIPANT 2	228
I	INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR PARTICIPANT 3	244
J	INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR PARTICIPANT 4	257
K	INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR PARTICIPANT 5	269

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In moving from high school teaching to college administration in 2004, the idea of producing scholarship, such as a journal article or a professional presentation, never really crossed my mind. However, as my role evolved within the field of higher education administration, moving to higher and more responsible positions within my institution as well as taking on an adjunct faculty role, and embarking on a doctoral program in higher education, the idea of producing scholarship began to enter my thoughts. Knowing that my path was likely not to be that of a tenured professor and researcher, my interest grew regarding the role that scholarship could play in my career outside of the professoriate in higher education. The growing interest around the role scholarship may play in an administrative career was the genesis for this study.

Background to the Problem

In my research on scholarship within higher education administration, I found that literature in the field of higher education administration, like much of higher education itself, is generally disaggregated into what could be termed silos. For example, within higher education, types of institutions are categorized into a classification system based on distinctions such as profit motive, or sources of funding and control structure. Likewise, higher education administration has been historically divided into three basic fields: instructional administration, operational administration, and student-personnel administration (Lloyd-Jones, 1934). Those same basic fields remain in higher education today; they are

academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs. While there are other areas of higher education administration, those specific occupations can be found within the three main areas of higher education administration identified above. For example, student housing and health services are specialized areas of student affairs administration; likewise, department chairs and deans are a specialized area within academic affairs, and the president or chief financial officer of an institution are within the field of business affairs. Each of these three fields has its own history and development, which for the most part has been independent of one another over the course of the last 100 years. A more depth explanation of the origins and history of scholarship in and about higher education administration can be found in Chapter 2, the review of the literature. Within the historical scholarship of the three fields, one issue that has not been addressed is what it is like to produce scholarship as an administrator, thus the benefits and costs of producing scholarship as an administrator were unexplored.

The historical development and current state of scholarship in and about student affairs administration, as detailed below, is typical of the development and history of scholarship found in the three areas of higher education administration and serves to frame the lack of understanding of what it is like and what it means to produce scholarship as an administrator. Current scholarship in the field does help administrative practice, by focusing on the practice of administration; however, the current scholarship available failed to provide an understanding of what it means to do scholarship as an administrator.

Scholarship in and about student affairs has a long history dating back to the 1920s, with publications such as *Student Personnel Work at Northwestern University*, by Ester Lloyd-Jones, and Mabelle Blake's *Guidance for College Women*, published in 1926 (Schuh, 2002). In the 80 plus years since those early publications, the field has grown and the discussion in the literature has examined questions such as: Why is student affairs an important and necessary part of higher education? What constitutes student affairs practice? How should student affairs practice be done (Schuh, 2002)?

As the research continued, the literature included journals dedicated to student affairs practice, such as the *Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA Journal)* and the *Journal of College Student Personnel* published by the American College Personnel Association. The proliferation of research also led to the development of theory guiding practice in student affairs, such as Chickering's (1969) early work on student identity. The development of theory is a logical outcome within the maturation of scholarship within any field, as the purpose of scholarship is to inform practice in the field and to assist researchers who seek to explain and therefore improve practice (Komives, 2001). A similar development of scholarship and theory can be found in the other areas of higher education administration.

More recently, a 2001 issue of the *Journal of College Student Development* (Volume 42, Issue 2) and a 2002 issue of the *NASPA Journal* (Volume 39, Issue 2), were both dedicated to scholarship within the field of student affairs. In the *Journal of College Student Development*, authors addressed

several perspectives of student affairs practice and scholarship. Young (2001) addressed the value of student affairs juxtaposed to the value of scholarship and concluded that the values of scholarship were different from the values inherent in the practice of student affairs; thus Young has seemingly put scholarship at odds with the practice of student affairs administration, making them seem incompatible. Blimling (2001) examined the historical nature of the scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of integration within student affairs, concluding that student affairs operated in four different communities of practice. These areas are student administration and student services, which emerge from management philosophy, and student development and student learning, which emanate from an educational philosophy. Schroeder and Pike (2001) examined the scholarship of application, recommending a greater commitment to the scholar-practitioner model in student affairs practice.

The 2002 issue of the *NASPA Journal* (Volume 39, Issue 2) built upon some of the themes established in the *Journal of College Student Development* special issue. Schuh (2002) provided a history of student affairs scholarship, from its origins in the 1920s to the present proliferation of literature on practices in the field. Fried (2002) called for a new way of thinking about scholarship in student affairs and overcoming the “structures that divide academic affairs, student affairs, and institutional administration,” which hinder rather than support learning (p. 128). Malaney (2002) recommended expanding the dialogue around scholarship to include “various notions of research...as long as rigorous, traditional, methodological standards are practiced” (p. 132). Malaney made

connections between the scholarship of practice in student affairs and the scholarship of teaching student affairs practice. However, one issue that neither the current nor the historical scholarship within student affairs has addressed is what it is like to produce scholarship as a student affairs administrator. In other words, there is no information describing the experience or the meaning of producing scholarship as an administrator. The discussions in the literature about scholarship in student affairs fail to provide a clear understanding of what it means to perform scholarship within student affairs. Allen (2002) began moving the conversation in that direction by suggesting a redefining of the meaning and purpose of scholarship for student affairs practice, so that scholarship can “change to meet the different demands and contexts of this field (student affairs) and higher education” (p. 147).

The call for redefining the meaning of scholarship for student affairs professionals was continued in a follow-up 2006 summit on scholarship in student affairs, further illuminating this gap in the literature. The summit produced six points for discussion, which were considered the main concerns and issues in the field: graduate preparation programs, inclination to produce scholarship, student learning, professional association involvement, Boyer’s scholarship, and blended roles (Jablonski, Mena, Manning, Carpenter, & Siko, 2006). The questions emanating from the conference proceedings, in three of the areas in particular – the inclination to produce scholarship, or what motivates administrators to produce scholarship; Boyer’s scholarship, or how his definitions of the term *scholarship* align with the role of an administrator; and blended roles, or

exploration of the scholar practitioner – speak to the gaps in knowledge and understanding around how scholarship is actually produced or enacted. The gap in understanding as to what it means to produce scholarship within the context of student affairs administration (Jablonski et al., 2006) led to the pursuit of this study.

Statement of the Problem

While the purpose of scholarship can be characterized as helping “the field adapt to the context in which...it is practiced” (Allen, 2002, p. 147), there is a general lack of understanding of what it means to produce scholarship within higher education administration, due to no “tradition of administrator research paralleling teacher research” (Riehl, Larson, Short, & Reitzug, 2000, p. 399). Further, there is a widely held belief that administration and scholarship are two functions within higher education that cannot co-exist; faculty produce scholarship and administrators administrate, with never the two to meet (Riehl et al., 2000; Young, 2001). This mental divide between faculty, scholarship, and administration has resulted in what Riehl et al. (2000) described as “two distinct communities of practice” (p. 408): administrators who interact, communicate, and complete tasks and the contrasting academic researchers, whose community of practice is producing research. While Riehl et al. (2000) conceded that it was unlikely for the two communities of practice in education to ever combine, they believed that if scholarship “were owned more explicitly by both academics and practitioners, it could form the basis of a single emergent community in which research is a common focus and knowledge grows exponentially” (p. 409).

During the literature review no published literature was identified concerning what it was like to produce scholarship as an administrator, and the literature available does not address the lived-experience of producing scholarship or the meaning thereof. Thus, the challenges and rewards of producing scholarship as a practicing administrator, creating the first step toward a possible new era in the practice of scholarship on college campuses, were explored in the this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this phenomenological hermeneutic study was to explore the meaning found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship for five higher education administrators from within the major areas of administration in higher education: academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs. The specific position of the participants within higher education administration was not important in the study, because the study was about higher education administrators from a single institution, not a single branch of higher education administration. The production of scholarship from an administrative position is important in the study, as the experience and meaning thereof of producing scholarship was central to the study.

Phenomenological inquiry is not about generalizations in the field; rather it is about an in-depth understanding of individual situations (Van Manen, 1990). Therefore, the study included only five participants, allowing for greater detail and analysis around the experience and meaning of producing scholarship for each of the five administrators. Van Manen (2005) said that “phenomenology tries to distinguish what is unique” (p. 85) from other related phenomena;

providing greater detail allowed for a more thorough exploration about what made each individual administrators experience producing scholarship a unique and different phenomenon.

In this study the meaning of the lived-experience was found in the attitudes, intentions, behaviors, motivations, thoughts, and opinions (Van Manen, 1990) expressed during one-on-one interviews by the participants regarding their experiences producing scholarship. The word *phenomenon* was used because the focus of this study was on understanding the experience of the *lifeworld* of scholarship in higher education administration and to reflect on and theorize about the meaning of that experience (Van Manen, 1990). The four domains of scholarship – *the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching* – as developed by Boyer (1990), served as the basis for defining scholarship in the study.

Boyer's (1990) domains provided a more inclusive definition of *scholarship*, which includes research, theory, and practice, bringing the term scholarship closer to its original purpose and intent of informing practice. Having a more inclusive definition allowed for focus on the meanings of the roles, forms, and functions or pedagogy (Van Manen, 1990) that scholarship takes for five administrators, formed the basis for the research. The word *pedagogy*, "the art, science, or profession of teaching" (*Merriam-Webster*, 2002, p.854), was intentionally used in the study because "pedagogy requires a phenomenological sensitivity to lived-experience," (Van Manen, 1990, p. 2) which in this case was the lived-experience of producing scholarship as a higher education administrator.

Using hermeneutics as the basis for making interpretive sense of the lived-experience of scholarship within higher education administration was intended to increase potential pedagogical contributions of the work. A hermeneutic phenomenological approach was appropriate because attention was paid to both the descriptive explanation of the phenomenon, which in this case, was the lived-experience of producing of scholarship, and the interpretive, hermeneutic meaning of that lived-experience for administrators. The hermeneutic phenomenological approach focused the study on understanding the meaning that the lived-experience of producing scholarship held for each of the five administrators in the study. For a more complete explanation of the methods and approaches employed in the study please see Chapter 3, Research Methodology.

Study Context

Before understanding and interpreting the meaning of the lived-experience of scholars who are higher education administrators, a better understanding of the context of the study was needed. While results of this research emerged from the perspective of the participating administrators, the study was not about the administrators *per-se*; it was about the process that these administrators experienced as they produced scholarship. Before going further, it is important to address why a deeper understanding of scholarship for administrators is important to the field of higher education.

Boyer (1990) developed four domains – the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching – for categorizing scholarship. Boyer’s structure of scholarship takes

into account the expected activities of faculty to obtain tenure and to be regarded as scholars. While faculty members are typically expected to produce and to be rewarded for scholarship (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002), administrators do not have clear expectations for scholarship, as scholarship does not represent the true nature of administrative work (Roper, 2001). Thus, the dynamic of administration is different than that of the faculty role within the academy, in terms of expectations, duties, and requirements related to scholarship (Coe, 2009). The distinctions regarding scholarship between administrators and faculty should be recognized within the academy. This is not to say that the academy is blind to the fact that administrators are not required to produce scholarship. Rather, the point is that, the expectations and, more importantly, the opportunity to produce scholarship is different for administrators within the academy, then the experience, process, and meaning of scholarship may be different for administrators too.

However, a review of the literature produced no real distinctions between administrators and faculty in the characteristics and meaning of producing scholarship. Additionally, no published research was found comparing the experience of administrators producing scholarship with the experience of professors producing scholarship. Thus, although the use of Boyer's (1990) domains of scholarship were useful in this particular study in providing a common foundation for understanding scholarship to identify participants, the domains were inadequate for understanding the totality of scholarship within administration, because Boyer's definition does not address the concept of

completing scholarship from an administrator's perspective. Boyer's domains of scholarship are examined in greater detail in Chapter 2, the review of the literature.

One noted difference between scholarship performed by professors and scholarship performed by administrators was that scholarship is an add-on for administrators (Coe, 2009). As alluded to above, the professoriate is expected to perform scholarship as part of their contract with an institution, whereas scholarship is typically beyond the scope of formal duties for an administrator. The fact that scholarship is an add-on for administrators makes it different from scholarship within the professoriate. Understanding how the add-on nature of scholarship influences the completion of scholarship may lead to a deeper and more meaningful understanding of scholarship for higher education administrators. Therefore, using a phenomenological approach to gather the texts of the participants' experience, and using hermeneutics to uncover the conscious meanings found in the experience of producing scholarship for the participants helped to create a better understanding of what it was like to produce scholarship for each higher education administrator.

The lack of a deep understanding of scholarship for higher education administrators perpetuates several negative trends in higher education, including the further isolation of education administrators from the practices of the faculty (Riehl et al., 2000) and divisions within administration between academic affairs and student affairs. In writing about student affairs, Hossler (2001) noted "most of our administrative colleagues will simply view us as other service or support

providers for the academic enterprise and not even among the most important service units” (p. 358). This perceived divide between student affairs and other administrative units is one long expressed by scholars in student affairs and typically stems from what Hossler characterized as “the Rodney Dangerfield nature of student affairs work; that is, ‘I don’t get no respect’” (p. 356).

Continuing to focus research on scholarship within student affairs, in isolation of other departments within higher education administration, such as academic affairs, only furthers divisions. According to Fried (2002), the different groups within higher education presumably have the need “for slightly different kinds of knowledge about campus life and all the knowledge that is relevant to addressing a particular concern should be shared or perhaps developed jointly” (p. 122). In other words, it behooves professionals in higher education to work across different administrative groups for the betterment of all of higher education. Thus, all of higher education administration may benefit from knowledge of and on how scholarship is produced and is experienced by other administrators across the broad spectrum of higher education administration.

Significance of the Study

The study of the meaning found in the lived-experience of higher education administrators who produce scholarship is vitally important to the continuing prosperity of higher education as a whole for several reasons. First, administrators are and administration is vital to the function and mission of higher education institutions. Second, the study of meaning found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship as an administrator can inform administrative

and scholarly practices in the field. By informing administrative practice, the study of scholarship is squarely aligned with the basic purpose of scholarship, which as previously stated is to inform practice (Komives, 2001).

According to Van Manen (1990) a deeper understanding of the functions of work enables practitioners to act thoughtfully in certain situations, which contributes to knowledge in the field. In this study, the function of work was scholarship, thus the study contributes to the knowledge within the field of higher education administration and the scholarship completed therein. Additionally, a greater understanding of the production of scholarship within administration and how it is similar to and different from faculty scholarship may help in overall efforts to institutionalize scholarship within and across universities, building bridges between administrators, their units of administration, and faculty.

Finally, a phenomenological hermeneutic exploration of the meaning found in producing scholarship as a higher education administrator is unique in the study of scholarship in higher education. As will be evidenced in Chapter 2, the review of the literature, the tendency in scholarship is for categorization so that the scholarly work of faculty can be more easily evaluated (Boyer, 1990; Braxton et al., 2002, Braxton & Toombs, 1982; Miller, 1972; Pellino, Blackburn, & Boberg, 1984; Seldin, 1980). Since the 1970s researchers, primarily from the professoriate, have been trying to expand the definition and view of scholarship in higher education by creating dimensions, identifying factors, and developing domains to define the functions of scholarship (Boyer, 1990; Braxton et al., 2002; Miller, 1972; Pellino et al., 1984). The person doing the scholarship, the

administrator, and the personal stories conveyed by administrators who completed scholarship, is the focus of the work. Therefore, the purpose is not to define scholarship. The purpose is to understand and explain the meaning of the scholarly experience for the participants.

Nature of the Study

Research method. According to Merriam (2009) there are several characteristics of all forms of qualitative research. The first characteristic is that qualitative research is “interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed, that is, how they make sense of their world and the experiences they have in their world and the experiences they have in the world” (Merriam, 2009, p. 13). The primary purpose of this study was to explore lived-experience and reveal how the parts and pieces found in producing scholarship created a *lifeworld* of experience for each of the five administrators.

Another characteristic of qualitative research is that the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis (Merriam, 2009). The researcher was the primary instrument in this study. I conducted interviews, transcribed all the recordings of the interviews, and interpreted the experience of the participants as reflected within the transcribed texts. Employing an inductive research strategy is Merriam’s’ (2009) third characteristic of qualitative research. The research goals were not to test any existing theory, or create a theory; instead the aim of the study was to create a reflective understanding of the experience and meaning for each administrator when producing scholarship. Merriam’s final universal characteristic of qualitative research is that with a focus on process,

understanding, and meaning, the product of qualitative research is richly descriptive (2009). The research study resulted in narrative or story-like descriptions of the administrators' lived-experience in producing scholarship and the meaning thereof. The alignment between the goals of the study and Merriam's universals for qualitative research demonstrated that qualitative research was a viable means for completing this study.

Research design. Through a phenomenological hermeneutic research design I explored the meaning found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship for five higher education administrators. The following sections provide a brief discussion of phenomenological research and hermeneutic phenomenology.

Phenomenological research. Phenomenology is the study and science of phenomena. The philosophical theory of phenomenology can be traced back to the 19th century and Brentano (Bothamley, 2002). However, it was Husserl who moved phenomenology toward human science as a descriptive method for reflection on philosophic and human thought (Van Manen, 1990). Husserl sought the essences of the lived-experiences that one experiences in the context or *lifeworld* in which they occur (Van Manen). In this sense essences can be considered a linguistic description of the phenomenon. Interviews were used to collect the linguistic description of the participating administrators' lived-experience, the transcripts of which was the text for analysis.

Hermeneutic phenomenology. Hermeneutics provides a means for interpreting the texts of the lived-experience of the participants. Hermeneutics,

which literally means the study of interpretation, dates back to biblical studies, but moved toward the study of persons with Dilthy (Bothamley, 2002).

Hermeneutical phenomenology is the study of a person within the human world as it is found, where each human person, i.e. the participants in this study, is unique as a being (Van Manen, 1990). I sought to find and interpret those unique meanings found in the experiences of each of the five administrators participating in the study. Hermeneutical phenomenology makes us aware of and attentive to seemingly trivial, taken-for-granted, dimensions of everyday life. In this case, the taken-for-granted was represented in the nuanced differences found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship while holding an administrative position, which had never been explored. Thus, a phenomenological hermeneutic design supported the primary goals of exploring the essence or essential meaning of the lived-experience of producing scholarship as a higher education administrator.

Research Question

A single, overarching research question, guides this study: What meaning does the lived-experience of producing scholarship have for higher education administrators? This focus on the meaning or nature of the lived-experience helped frame the interviews for data collection and provided “a framework within which respondents can express their own understanding in their own terms” (Genzuk, 1999, p. 12). The framing of interviews provided insight into the experience and meaning of producing scholarship from an administrative position in higher education.

Asking what the scholarship experience itself was like for administrators also moved this study into a more “temporal dimension in which, as everyone recognizes, phenomena occur” (Becker, 1992, p. 208). This ‘temporal dimension’ allowed for the exploration of both the ontic, or concrete reality of producing scholarship for administrators, as well as the ontological, or “essential nature” of the lived-experience itself, which is fundamental to phenomenological study (Van Manen, 1990, p. 39). In this study, the ontic elements of the lived-experience were found in the realities faced while producing scholarship as an administrator, such as having to overcome the add-on nature of scholarship, which is one of the facts of being an administrative scholar. The ontological element was found in the exploration of the lived-experience of the participants and the quest for understanding the meaningful nature of existence or the nature of being for those participants. In other words, the emerging understanding of why the participants actually produced scholarship, or participated in a scholarly activity helps to understand each participant’s ontology and connect with each of them as participants.

Interviews served as the primary means of data collection in the study. Interviews were an appropriate means for data collection in that they allow exploring what is “in and on someone else’s mind,” in this case the participants (Patton, 1990, p. 278). The transcribed interviews regarding the lived-experience of producing scholarship for the five participating administrators resulted in narrative text reflecting the experiences and meanings found as each of the five

administrators produced or participated in some form of scholarship, such as a journal article, a conference presentation, or teaching.

Telling the story of each of the participating administrators created an ongoing multi-dimensional dialogue between the research and text from the interviews, the reader, and the researcher. The ultimate meaning of the study was then found in the ongoing dialogue among the three dimensions. This study was an effort to pull “the reader into the question in such a way that the reader cannot help but wonder about the nature of the phenomenon” (Van Manen, 1990, p. 50). Both the literature review and research methodology chapters illuminate the considerable attention given to the design of the study, which was fundamental in the ability to understand more deeply the production of scholarship as an administrator.

Conceptual Framework

In undertaking a study to explore the experiences of any group or person, it is important to understand the frame of inquiry held by the researcher. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2008), qualitative practitioners carry principles of belief about ontology, epistemology, and methodology. The sum of these beliefs about the nature of reality (ontology), the relationship between the researcher and participant (epistemology), and the way we gain knowledge of the world (methodology) creates what Denzin and Lincoln (2008) termed a *paradigm* (p. 31). My personal paradigm, or set of beliefs, served as my conceptual framework for this study.

The framework employed within the study remained at a conceptual level, as part of the phenomenological reduction process, which is to strip the theories and scientific conceptions away, so one can see the phenomenon in a non-abstracting manner (Van Manen, 1990). A constructivist-interpretive paradigm was employed which was derived from a relativist ontology, subjectivist and interpretive epistemology, and included naturalistic methodological procedures (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). A *human science* orientation was appropriate with my given constructivist-interpretive paradigm.

Human science, from Dilthey's idea of *Geisteswissenschaften*, is the science of human phenomena, such as thoughts, historical actions, or social situations (Van Manen, 1990). Hermeneutic Phenomenology was an appropriate human science approach for this study, as both phenomenology and hermeneutics focus on exploring essence in meaning. Phenomenology is used to explore questions about meaning, the meaning of being, and the search for meaning (Ricoeur, 1981). The question, *what*, is the general assumption within any hermeneutic work (Ricoeur, 1981). The *what* and the meaning found therein explored in hermeneutic work aligns epistemologically with the exploration of the essence in meaning sought in phenomenological work. The combined philosophies, framed the research and the search for the meaning of the lived-experience of administrators who produce scholarship.

Definition of Terms

This section defines philosophical and academic terms and phrases used in the study. Context specific definitions for these terms are necessary for a

common understanding of the terms in the study.

Academic Affairs. Academic affairs is the broad term for one of the three primary areas of higher education administration. Based on a review of *The Chronicle of Higher Education's* job listings, academic affairs is the generally accepted term for the administrative group within a higher education institution, whose purpose is to deal primarily with academics, including curriculum, instruction, and assessment (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2011a).

Blended Roles. Synonymous with the scholar-practitioner, blended roles is the act of moving back and forth between the roles of theory and practice in order to advance theory or improve practice (Jablonski et al., 2006).

Business Affairs. Business affairs (or administrative affairs) is the broad term for the traditionally non-academic areas within higher education administration, including public relations, alumni affairs, and financial affairs (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2011b).

Dasein. The term *Dasein* was developed by Heidegger to refer to the aspect in humans, which has the ability to inquire into its own Being and wonder about its own existence (Van Manen, 1990). For Heidegger, the *Dasein* was being-in-the-world and “understanding is the original characteristic of the being of human life itself” (Gadamer, 1998, p. 259).

Higher education administration. Higher education administration is the title and field for the employees who plan and run the day-to-day management of academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs within a higher education institution.

Hermeneutics. Hermeneutics is a philosophy, which literally speaking is the theory and practice of text interpretation (Van Manen, 1990). Originally from biblical studies, later Schleiermacher, Dilthy, and Gadamer brought the philosophy to its more modern definition (Bothamley, 2002). The research was informed by Dilthy's (1985) interpretation in which hermeneutics is expressed in three pieces, the lived-experience, which is the point of departure in study; expression, which is the text of the lived-experience; and understanding, which occurs when life comes to an understanding about itself.

Lifeworld. Lifeworld or Lebenswelt, in German, was described by Husserl (1913/1962) as the "world of immediate experience" (p. 103). The *lifeworld* "is a world of persons, and in the natural attitude the validity of this personal world is always assumed" (Gadamer, 1998, p. 247). The immediate and natural context, in which administrators in the study find themselves as they work to produce scholarship, represented the *lifeworld* in this study.

Lived-experience. The focus of phenomenological inquiry, lived-experience is the nature or meaning of everyday experiences (Van Manen, 1990). Lived-experience is captured in an insightful description of an event or occurrence as experienced by the person living in or through the event prior to reflection (Van Manen, 1990). In other words the experience should be documented and reflected upon free of any classification, creating a focus on insight rather than explanation.

Narrative/stories. Narrative and stories are terms used interchangeably in the study for the written results of the interpretation, representing the stories of the

lived-experience (Merriam, 2009) of the participants. The narratives or stories are what emerged from my interpretation of the transcripts or texts of the interviews.

Persons. *Persons* is a term used for the subject or participant in a phenomenological hermeneutic study. The term *person* is preferred over participant in a phenomenological study because the word *person* refers to the “uniqueness of each human being” whose experiences are being explored in research (Van Manen, 1990, p. 6). The term *persons* is synonymous with and used interchangeably with the term participant within the dissertation.

Phenomenology. Phenomenology is both a descriptive method and human science movement for the study of phenomenon. Phenomenology offers, “accounts of experienced space, time, body, and human relation as we live them” (Van Manen, 1990, p. 184), in an effort to seize the meaning of the world itself.

Producing scholarship. Producing scholarship is a generic term used in the study encompassing the act of participating in a scholarly activity or producing scholarship as defined by the domains of scholarship established by Boyer (1990).

Professoriate/faculty. The professoriate is the term for the collective faculty of employed within higher education whose primary job functions are teaching, service, and scholarship.

Scholarship. A catchall term for academic work possessing several of the same common elements including, the use and or discovery of knowledge, which is shared with an audience, and object to public criticism (Braxton et al., 2002).

Student Affairs. Student affairs is one of the three primary areas of higher education administration (Lloyd-Jones, 1934). Student affairs is primarily concerned with serving students in a capacity outside of the regular classroom environment and including departments such as student athletics, residence life, career services, or academic advising (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2011c).

Texts. Texts are the descriptions of the experiences of the participants as expressed by the participants (Van Manen, 1990). Within this study the term *texts* refers to the transcribed interviews from data collection. Each interview text was explored individually in the study.

Transferability. Transferability is a qualitative research term generally associated with the quantitative concept of generalizability. The concept represents one-fourth of Lincoln and Guba's (1985) concept of trustworthiness, which they conceived as a parallel concept to reliability and validity found in quantitative work.

Verification. Verification is the process of confirming and being certain in the research, and is based on the principles of qualitative inquiry, which is self-correcting (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002). The verification process, which can lead to rigor, is covered in the research methodology chapter, and was used in this study to ensure reliability and validity.

Assumptions

Two major assumptions underlie the proposed research. The first assumption pertains to the research method: that using the hermeneutic

phenomenological design would capture the essential meaning and essence of the lived-experiences found in producing scholarship for administrators. According to Van Manen (1990)

To *do* hermeneutic phenomenology is an attempt to accomplish the impossible: to construct a full interpretive description of some aspect of the lifeworld, and yet to remain aware that lived life is always more complex than any explication of meaning can reveal.

The phenomenological reduction teaches us that complete reduction is impossible, that full or final descriptions are unattainable. But rather than therefore giving up, we need to pursue its project with extra vigor. (p. 18)

The hermeneutic phenomenological method allowed for the text of the study to produce an evocative description of the meaning of the lived-experience of the participants.

The second assumption was that five scholarly administrators could be successfully recruited to not only participate and accurately communicate their lived-experience via interview for the study, but would also serve as co-creators in the narrative outcome of the study through continual participation and collaboration regarding the accuracy of the description, interpretations, and meanings found in the study.

Scope

The primary objective of this hermeneutic, phenomenological study was to explore the experience of and meaning of producing scholarship for five higher

education administrators. A purposeful sampling approach was used to identify participants according to explicit criteria (Merriam, 1998). The participants were (a) employed in a full-time administrative position in higher education, and (b) have produced or participated in scholarship within the last two years as defined by one or more of Boyer's (1990) domains.

Limitations

There were several limitations or potential limitations to the study, including the sample size and my own biases as the primary researcher. The first potential limitation involved the number of participants for the study. The availability of willing persons fitting the sampling frame was assumed.

Potentially limitations could have arisen in the form of geographic distances and whether or not all interviews could be conducted in a face-to-face environment. Successful efforts were made to find five persons who fit the sampling frame, which allowed for face-to-face interviews.

The sampling size was small, as the universal character found within the possible human experience inherently described within phenomenology makes having a large sample unnecessary. In other words, because the human experience described in phenomenological research is so descriptive and detailed, it is easy for a reader to find shared characteristics, feelings, or experiences from within even a small sample size in a study.

The other limitation within the study, which may also be a strength, was the researcher as the primary instrument and my bias as an academic affairs administrator and aspiring scholar. According to Morse et al. (2002) research is

only as good as the researcher's flexibility, sensitivity, creativity, and skill. In the act of writing the proposal and dissertation and conducting the study, I was engaging in scholarship as an administrator, of which the very nature and understanding the meaning was the goal in the study. The potential misinterpretation of meaning found in the act of producing scholarship was be minimized through the use of member checking with the study participants in the form of follow-up communications and sharing of the resulting description and interpretation. Follow-up conversations furthered participant reflection, which may have helped to determine deeper meanings from the experiences (Van Manen, 1990). Hermeneutic conversations, or "the art of testing," as Gadamer (1998) termed it, also occurred through the sharing of the ongoing interpretation that resulted from the hermeneutic analysis with fellow administrative colleagues and my committee. The subsequent conversations strengthened the work and interpretation.

As the researcher, the decisions I made regarding the study enhanced the potential transferability of the conclusions. According to Slevin and Sines (1999/2000) transferability of findings is enhanced by five main criteria: providing dense and rich data, focusing the research on the typical, multisite investigation, studying the leading edge of change, and the use of a systematic approach in the study. Attention to method during data collection and analysis and providing "a substantial amount of information about the phenomenon studies" (Slevin & Sines, 1999/2000, p. 12) ensuring a thick and rich description of the phenomenon.

The concept of focusing on the typical applied to the sample used within a study. Schofield (1993) suggested theoretical sampling, which increases the potential applicability of the research by using participants who have relevant knowledge and information about the phenomenon of study. The purposeful sampling used in this study mimicked the same concepts of theoretical sampling in that participants were chosen for being known to possess knowledge of the phenomenon of study, the act of producing scholarship as an administrator. All participants work at the same institution, providing a greater potential for transferability to other administrators working toward similar missions and visions within an institution.

In this study, multisite investigation was replaced by multi-participant involvement. Exploring the experiences of five participants produced five unique meanings regarding the lived-experience of producing scholarship. Having five meanings rather than one increases the likelihood of transferability for readers. Although cross-participant analysis was not the aim of the study, the presence of attributes or behaviors among the five participants could inform future researchers or administrators about producing scholarship as an administrator. Since there was no current theory on scholarship within administration, the study was already on the leading edge of change. Finally, a systematic approach to the research, from data collection through analysis, enhances the transferability of the findings (Slevin & Sines, 1999/2000).

Delimitations

Entry and mid-level administrators were not a focus in this study. The focus was not on executive level administrators, such as presidents or chancellors of an institution, or full-time academics who also administer, such as deans or department chairs. While I was interested in the definition of scholarship within administration, I did not seek theory or the creation of a new definition of scholarship; rather I used a shared definition of scholarship (Boyer, 1990) to identify participants and then allowed the experiences of the participants define what scholarship was for each participant.

Transferability, which replaced the idea of generalizability traditionally found in quantitative research, was the most significant delimitation. The use of a phenomenological hermeneutic research design and a small sample size meant the generalizability of the findings is limited. According to Merriam (1998) “the question of generalizability has plagued qualitative investigators for some time” (p. 207). The questions plaguing the concept of generalizability in qualitative research come from the disconnect between the qualitative concept and quantitative concept of the term itself.

According to Van Manen (1990) the only generalization allowed in hermeneutic phenomenology is to never generalize. The exploration of meaning within a particular phenomenon leads to reflective dialectical outcomes that will not be generalizable to the larger population of administrators. In other words, not all administrators undertake research or are interested in undertaking research. Even if administrators do undertake research they are not necessarily doing it the

same way for or for the same purposes. However the dialectic nature of the study opens the potential for “reader or user generalizability” (Merriam, 1998, p. 211) thus the applicability from the outcome of the study is dependent on the reader and the extent he or she chooses to use it. Thus an administrator who has or wants to undertake research from his or her administrative position may have a reflective dialect with the study. User or reader generalizability has been closely associated with the term *transferability* in qualitative research, as part of Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) parallel concept to reliability and validity *trustworthiness*. The approach to reliability and validity within this study is addressed further in Chapter 3.

Pilot Study

In Spring 2009, exploratory interviews were conducted with six senior-level administrative scholars who also teach. A grounded theory approach was followed and the data collected and subsequent analysis thereof both informed and contributed to the development of this current study. The pilot study resulted in 14 theoretical constructs which were grouped into three more encompassing constructs of *The individual self in administration, Related to the academy, and Practice informing practice: Scholarship in administration* (See Appendix A for pilot study constructs table). More than anything the pilot results suggest that the phenomenon of administrators performing scholarship does exist and provides some foundational data for the current research. The cited data from the pilot study (Coe, 2009) was from the poster presentation at the annual conference of

the Association for the Study of Higher Education in Vancouver, British Columbia in November 2009.

Overview of Dissertation

The above context and introduction sets the stage for this six-chapter dissertation.

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature, framing the lack of understanding held about the scholarship practices of higher education administrators further.

Chapter 3 is a review of the research methodology, which elaborates on the hermeneutic phenomenological design used in the study. Chapter 4 is an introduction to the five administrators who participated in the study, providing some personal, professional, and educational perspective on each participant.

Chapter 5 represents the analysis of the individual texts created by the one-on-one interviews with each of the five participants. The analysis and explanation thereof convey the interpretation of meaning found in producing scholarship for each of the administrators. The final chapter, Chapter 6, is a broader interpretation of the meaning found for all of the participants in the act of producing scholarship as an administrator. Additionally, conclusions and recommendations for future study can be found in Chapter 6.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature for a phenomenological hermeneutic study about the meaning of the lived-experience of producing or participating in scholarship for higher education administrators. To explore properly the meaning of the lived-experience of producing scholarship as a senior level administrator, the central literature review focused primarily in three areas: the definition of scholarship in higher education, scholarship in and about higher education administration, and the proposed research method, phenomenological hermeneutics. The definitions of scholarship in higher education and scholarship in and about higher education administration have a symbiotic relationship in the review, because the focus of the study was on the meaning of producing scholarship within the context of higher education administration. Therefore, the literature review includes relevant research and theories related to scholarship, higher education administration as appropriate, and phenomenological hermeneutics. The lived-experiences, motivations, and behavioral patterns of higher education administrators who produce scholarship were explored to answer the following question: What meaning does the lived-experience of producing scholarship have for administrators?

Five specific questions provided direction for the literature search:

1. What is considered scholarship in higher education?
2. What history of scholarship exists in higher education administration?

3. What connections exist within the scholarship on higher education administration and scholarship in higher education administration? (Is there a scholarship of administration?)
4. What is phenomenological research?
5. Which phenomenological method of inquiry is best suited for exploring and interpreting the lived-experiences of administrators who produce scholarship?

To answer these questions, three main topics are addressed in the literature review: (a) scholarship in higher education (b) scholarship in and about higher education administration and (c) phenomenological hermeneutics. Of the three topics, phenomenological hermeneutics is rather straightforward and was the design used to conduct the qualitative research. The method and design of inquiry are then explained in detail in Chapter 3. The other two topics, both explore scholarship within higher education and are a bit more complex covering several perspectives, both historical and current, on scholarship, on higher education administration, and on scholarship in and about higher education administration. It is the convergence of the two concepts, when scholarship is completed in higher education administration and the meaning found therein, that was the ultimate focus of inquiry in the study. Therefore, several sections are carefully crafted together to paint a shared picture of understanding around the idea of a scholarship of administration, creating a foundation for the exploration of meaning found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship as an administrator in higher education.

Books, Title Searches, Articles, Research Documents, and Journal Research

Books, title searches, articles, research documents, and journals were retrieved from the Arizona State University Library both on campus at the Hayden Library, as well as online via the Internet databases, such as Academic Search Premier, JSTOR, and ERIC. Additionally, University Library Internet Digital Databases at the University of Phoenix were used, such as ProQuest, EBSCOhost, and InfoTrac One File.

Scholarship in Higher Education

Any modern discussion on the term, word, or concept of scholarship as it relates to academics and/or higher education today, likely begins with some connection to Boyer's (1990) seminal work *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, where Boyer offered a larger more holistic view of scholarship than the narrow, singular association of scholarship to research publication, which had become the norm over the 20th century in higher education. Starting with a picture of the transformation of the acts associated with scholarship over time, Boyer (1990) crafts reasons and rationale for a larger understanding and acceptance of acts that should be considered scholarship, as it relates to faculty and the professoriate. Although, not aimed at administrators, the concepts of scholarship presented in Boyer's work provided a shared sense of understanding as to the acts that can be considered scholarship within the academy. This understanding of the acts that constitute scholarship provided a common place for departure for the participants, their experiences, and my understanding of the meaning found therein. Subsequently this shared foundation

of understanding as to the definition of scholarship provides a similar beginning point of understanding for any future readers of the results of the study. The sections that follow will frame this shared understanding of scholarship through a review of: the term scholarship, as it relates to higher education; the origins of scholarship in higher education administration, including the division of scholarship in higher education administration; and current dialogue on scholarship in and about higher education administration.

The term scholarship and higher education. The meaning of the term scholarship, like many words, has changed over time. With origins in the works of great philosophers like Plato and Socrates, the term scholarship has always been associated with the learned. In ancient times, the learned were the philosophers and in more modern history the learned were the leaders within the church. It is with church leaders where the concept of scholarship really begins within the United States, specifically those leaders whose job it was to educate and uplift the religious leaders of tomorrow in the colonial colleges of the time like Harvard College (Boyer, 1990). The religious education of the colonial college is the first of three distinct, yet overlapping phases within the historical transformation of the term scholarship. The three phases of teaching, service, and research within higher education have grown into the triumvirate of expectations for professors today, with the last of the three, research, having the strongest and most common association to the term scholarship, prior to Boyer's (1990) work.

The origins of the colonial college are associated with the origins of the United States and were rooted in religion and the need to have educated

clergymen and church leaders to establish the kind of country settlers desired. As such teaching specifically character and morals was of paramount importance in American higher education (Boyer, 1990). Teaching was the primary focus of American colonial college from its origins in the 1600s with the founding of Harvard, Yale, and William & Mary, through the mid- to late-1800s. However, in the mid- to late-1800s, as the country and industry expanded, a shift began in higher education toward service and the production of a workforce for the growing nation (Boyer, 1990).

While not all colleges and universities moved from a classical education to a more applied or technical education, and some rejected what many termed cow colleges (Boyer, 1990), job preparation became a more common and more important part of American Higher education. However, with the passage of the Land Grant or Morrill Act of 1862, the shift toward service and development within American higher education became permanent. The Morrill Act donated “public lands to the Several States and Territories which may provide Colleges for the benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts” (Library of Congress, 2009, para. 1). Under the Act states and territories received 30,000 acres of land to sell and used the subsequent proceeds to fund colleges to service the needs of the growing country in agriculture and mechanical arts (Library of Congress, 2009).

The service mandate for American higher education included responses to crisis as well as commerce and industry. Both World War I and World War II, along with the Great Depression forced additional service needs upon American colleges (Boyer, 1990), further making service a permanent fixture in American

higher education. Stemming from some of the same forces leading American colleges and universities toward service, commerce, growth, expansion, and crisis, all contributed to the boom in research and science, the third phase for the term scholarship, which dominated the concept of the term for most of the 20th Century prior to Boyer's (1990) work.

The third aspect of traditional scholarship: research, was generally associated with the idea of science and the scientific method and can be found in America since its inception (Boyer, 1990). During the late 18th century through the mid-19th century most research and science occurred outside of the college, as the ideals of scientific fact and discovery were and are seemingly at odds with the faith and doctrine, which dominated religious beliefs in what was the largely religious-based American college system. As a result the majority of early American science and research occurred outside of the American college and was the work of innovative individuals (Boyer, 1990). While some professors and colleges did dabble in science, such as John Winthrop at Harvard, it was not until after the applied science of the land grant college took hold in American higher education and a few schools, such as the University of Chicago and Johns Hopkins University were founded and dedicated to science and research, that research and the scientific method became a noticeable and permanent fixture in American colleges (Boyer, 1990). As Gilman remarked upon the assumption of the Presidency of Johns Hopkins University, while teaching was a priority, his institution was going to be committed to research (Hawkins, 1979). The push toward research was an effort by some to move the American college system

closer to the German university system, where professors are researchers, detached from the everyday world (Boyer, 1990, Hawkins, 1979). The movement toward research, like the movement toward service, did not occur all at once and the shift toward research as the primary focus of scholarship moved slowly until external forces put a national spotlight on research. Similar to how the call for manifest destiny and the Morrill Act of 1862 led to growth in the land-grant colleges, the demands of World War II led to the establishment of what eventually was called the Office of Scientific Research and Development and more importantly, the commitment of fiduciary support for research from the federal government (Boyer, 1990). With newly found funding for research and a growing student population from the G.I. Bill in 1944, the pursuit of new knowledge and science following World War II became the new accepted association with the scholarship. Despite the work of Boyer and others building from Boyer's ideas, at the time of this study the academy was still in the third phase associated with scholarship, where research was generally most closely associated with scholarship.

Fortunately, closely associated with research was publication, which together provides a history of not just scholarship itself, but also a traceable history of scholarship within higher education administration. This third phase in the life of the term scholarship provided a history of the path research in higher education administration has taken that is the basis for the next sections.

Scholarship in and about Higher Education Administration

A brief history on scholarship within higher education administration is presented in this section. In beginning this effort, I held the belief that the history of scholarship in administration would be easy to trace; however, this was not the case. Beginning in the late 1920s and early 1930s specializations began to emerge in higher education administration, creating what eventually would become three broad, distinct areas within higher education administration: academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs. While I recognize that many different departments exist within higher education administration, most departments fall within the scope of one of the three previously mentioned areas of administration: academic, student, or business affairs. The historical division in the scholarship on higher education administration around these three general areas of administration leaves us today with no modern works available covering the broad history and/or field of higher education administration in general. Rather there is scholarship on specific departments found within each of the three main areas of higher education administration. For example, there is literature about presidents, and literature about deans, and literature about housing and dormitories, but there are no comprehensive works that cover the history or whole of higher education administration today, that would discuss all three: presidents, deans, and dormitories. With a lack of singular history regarding higher education administration as a whole or the emergence of the three distinct areas of higher education administration, I felt it was worthwhile to uncover a bit of background to see where the division of the field began. Thus, this section

reviews the origins of higher education administration, and creates, to my knowledge, the first account of the origins of the division of scholarship on higher education administration.

Origins of scholarship in higher education administration. Published and available scholarship in and about higher education administration has only been around in the United States for about 110 years. In my research and according the author in the prefatory notes, Thwing's *College Administration* (1900), was the first book "published on the administration of the American college" (pf). The book was based on Thwing's personal readings, work, and experience as a higher education administrator. Thwing eventually became president of Western Reserve University (1900), later to be named Case Western University. *College Administration* was a comprehensive look at the American college, covering almost every conceivable aspect of higher education at the time. Thwing (1900) provided a behind-the-scenes look at the processes and beliefs held within higher education administration at the turn of the twentieth century. Thwing's (1900) work along with that of Eliot (1908) together provided the origins of the field of higher education administration while simultaneously laying the foundation for the future specialization of scholarship in higher education administration. The origins of the divisions in the scholarship on higher education administration are evidenced in the separate chapters dedicated to topics like finance, the presidency, students, and faculty (Eliot, 1908; Thwing, 1900).

The works of both Thwing (1900) and Eliot (1908) are comprehensive books taking the reader behind the scenes of the previously very mysterious and still, at the time, very elite world of higher education. The prior century had witnessed the distancing of higher education from its religious origins and had moved more toward its still modern day functions of preparing students for business and industry (Thwing, 1900). Both works covered the origins and organization of higher education, with Thwing focusing more on the constitution of various colleges, including the organizational structure and flow of power, whereas Eliot (1908) focused more on the political establishment with boards and trustees. While both books cover similar territory, they did so from very different perspectives and in different ways. Thwing (1900) used a lot of information from outside sources, such as previous books, letters, and surveys of other presidents, providing a picture of the differences and nuances found at various institutions, whereas Eliot (1908) focused the content of his work from his experience as President of Harvard. Despite the limited perspective across American higher education provided by Eliot, he was able to capture, what in my mind is the timeless essence of administration in higher education regardless of institution. In speaking of the breadth of higher education administration Eliot (1908) wrote,

Anyone who makes himself familiar with all the branches of university administration in its numerous departments of teaching, in its financial and maintenance departments, its museums, laboratories, and libraries, in its extensive grounds and numerous buildings for various purposes, and in its social organization, will

realize that the institution is properly named the university. It touches all human interests, is concerned with the past, the present, and the future, ranges through the whole history of letters, sciences, arts, and professions, and aspires to teach all systemized knowledge. More and more, as time goes on, and individual and social wealth accumulates, it will find itself realizing its ideal of yesterday, though still pursuing eagerly its ideal for tomorrow. (p. 254)

The comprehensive works of Thwing (1900) and Eliot (1908) represent the first of what are a limited number of works on higher education administration as a whole. As early as 1911 works can be found dedicated to specific areas of administration with Foster's (1911) *Administration of the college curriculum*, focusing on teaching and what is taught in college, which would be categorized as a work on or in academic affairs today. In the 1920s there was a rise in the publication of books dedicated to specific areas of administration and the creation of "the three main divisions of educational administration" Lloyd-Jones wrote about in 1934 (p.142): operational administration, instructional administration, and student-personnel administration, which are business affairs, academic affairs, and student affairs today. From an operational or business perspective Arnett (1922) wrote *College and University Finance*, focusing on the financial aspects of college administration. And what was then student-personnel administration saw a boom in works with Hudelson (1928) *Problem of college education: studies in administration*, focused specifically on issues in dealing

with students, as did Seashore (1927) *Learning and living in college*, and Lloyd-Jones (1929) *Student Personnel Work at Northwestern University*. However, there were still some more comprehensive books on higher education administration, which were published during the same period, Kelly's (1925) *Tendencies in college administration*, as well as Lindsay and Holland's (1930) seminal work in the field, *College and university administration*.

In my research, Lindsay and Holland's (1930) comprehensive 666-page volume marks an effective end to examining higher education administration as a whole and solidifies the specialization of higher education administration in three basic administrative areas: operational or fiscal administration, instructional or academic administration, and personnel administration (now student affairs). Interestingly the presidency, which received ample attention in the works of both Thwing (1900) and Eliot (1908) was not addressed as an independent section; rather the presidency and duties thereof cut across the various areas of administration discussed in the book.

While there have been a few single volume works covering all of higher education administration since Lindsay and Holland, those works have been few and far between and lack the depth and breadth provided in the 1930 seminal work. Further, the 1930s saw a rise in a new form of media, the scholarly journal, which furthered and sped the disaggregation of higher education administration into specific fields. In particular *The Journal of Higher Education* provided a platform for the further development of each field as a separate area of specialty in higher education administration.

In an examination of the first five volumes (1930-1934) of *The Journal of Higher Education*, administration was seldom the topic of an article. Over the five-year time-span, only three articles were found on the broad field of higher education administration, the most comprehensive of which is Hawkes' (1930) article on the tendencies in college administration over the preceding 25 years. The other two were only tangentially on administration. In 1931 Ruthven wrote about the plan for administration at Michigan, which was an idea for greater academic freedom and self-governance. Another article Chase (1930) explored the question of research or administration. Thus, as early as 1930, the line was beginning to be drawn in the sand; administrators don't do research and researchers don't administrate. As Chase put it, there was simply "not, in the ordinary college or university, enough administrative work to go around" (1930, p. 217). If not everyone could administrate, then research was the alternative for college professors, creating a bifurcation between research and administration that has seemingly existed to this day. At the same time research and administration were becoming dueling tracks for the faculty member; administration as a field was dividing itself and specializing which can be seen in the scholarship.

In the same five-year period within *The Journal of Higher Education*, articles were published on personnel administration, or student personnel work, business administration, advising college students, and the deanship. Johnston (1930) provided some research results around the effectiveness with freshman advising when using students college-aptitude results as an early indicator. McGinnis (1933) detailed the growing demands and activities found in the life of

a dean. Lloyd-Jones (1934) sought to draw connections between student-personnel administration and general administration, thus identifying as early as 1934 a divide appearing within the different fields of higher education administration, which practitioner-scholars were seeking to cross. Cowley (1934) proffered ideas for efficiently organizing non-academic personnel within a college to deal with the economy and great depression. These articles represent some of the foundations of the modern fields of academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs and serve as examples of the divergent paths of development that each of the three identified areas of higher education administration academic affairs, business affairs, and student affairs have taken in the last seventy-five plus years of American higher education.

Seminal works on scholarship. As previously mentioned modern dialogue around scholarship in higher education usually begins in some form with Boyer (1990) and the domains of scholarship his work established: the scholarship of application, the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching. While the primary driving force for the current dialogue in and around scholarship in higher education, Boyer (1990) is not the only seminal work on scholarship in higher education. A few works by a small group of researchers sought to expand the measurement and meaning of scholarship from the narrow definition of scholarship as research, discovery, and publication which took hold following World War II, to a more holistic dimension beyond the published article or scholarly books (Braxton et al., 2002). Of note

are the works of Miller (1972), Seldin (1980), Braxton and Toombs (1982), and Pellino et al. (1984), which is covered in the following paragraphs.

Differentiating between basic and applied research was the first step in developing a broader definition of scholarship (Miller, 1972). In this instance basic research meant traditional inquiry for publication, whereas applied research was more associated with unique applications of specialized knowledge.

According to Miller, the emphasis in evaluation should come from the departmental priorities related to the application of scholarship. Such is the case in this study, in which the priorities of the administrators that were revealed are very different from those of research faculty who were the basis for the current accepted definition for scholarship, the four domains established by Boyer (1990). Seldin (1980) took Miller's acknowledgement of different applications for scholarship one step further by calling on institutional leaders to declare the type of scholarship they supported, basic or applied, within their institutions. Efforts by faculty researchers to expand the definition of scholarship within the academy demonstrated the growing faculty support within higher education for differentiating what would be recognized as scholarship and count towards faculty tenure (Boyer, 1990).

Braxton and Toombs (1982) and Pellino et al. (1984) deepen the definition of scholarship in higher education by getting into specific activities and actions deemed as scholarship through empirical studies of both faculty and administration. It should be noted that administrators' participation in both Braxton and Toombs (1982) and Pellino et al.'s (1984) studies was limited to

questions on administrative expectations for faculty regarding scholarship, not research related to their own scholarly experiences, which was the focus of the current study.

Braxton and Toombs (1982) expanded the conversation on service and teaching as scholarship, examining activities related to course development and public and departmental services activities. This effort marked the pushing of the 20th century definition of scholarship beyond research and publication, re-acknowledging some of the origins of the idea of scholarship itself, teaching and service. Pellino et al. (1984) began to crystallize the categorization of scholarship by posing several dimensions of scholarship based on the results of a study about attitudes regarding scholarship held by faculty and administrators. Six dimensions were identified via a factor analysis of the multivariate data set resulting from the survey: professional activity, research/ publication, artistic endeavor, engagement with the novel, community service, and pedagogy (Pellino et al., 1984). With no initial hypothesis prior to analysis the study was exploratory, not confirmatory.

Factor two, scholarship as research/publication reflects the traditional 20th century definition of scholarship in higher education as the research and subsequent publication. In the scholarship as research/publication factor several forms of publication were included, beyond original articles, such as book reviews and paper delivered at a “professional meeting” (Pellino et al., 1984, p. 109). The other five factors of scholarship broke from the norm of research and publication and began addressing other scholastic endeavors a faculty member

faces. The professional activity factor included service on editorial boards, working on accreditation teams and delivering a colloquium opening (Pellino et al., 1984). Artistic endeavors included fine arts such as dance or music, as well as writing and poetry. Engagement with the novel was an interesting factor, with the definition of novel being doing something novel, not the literary work. Novel engagements included supervising student projects, applying scholarship results in practice, or creating new processes (Pellino et al., 1984). Off campus consulting and service to “civic or religious organizations” (p. 110) were the items representing the community service factor (Pellino et al., 1984). Finally, the pedagogy factor was centered on the faculty role within a university, including curriculum development, lectures, and other developments in the area of curriculum and instruction (Pellino et al., 1984). These six factors or dimensions of academic scholarship represent one of the first and only empirical attempts to identify specific functions and tasks completed outside of research and publication that could be considered scholarship. 2,000 faculty were randomly surveyed at “selected colleges and universities” (Pellino et al., 1984, p. 104). After several tests were employed Pellino et al. (1984), determined that the sample had “the characteristics of the national population of faculty” (p. 105) producing sound early categorization of the variety of academic work that could be considered scholarship.

Ultimately, all of the works noted have two things in common, as do most works on scholarship within higher education. The first is the definition of, scholarship, and the second is how it applies to faculty evaluation, promotion, and

tenure. It is commonly known that about 90% of all research journal articles are written by about 10% of the professoriate, yet scholarship as traditionally defined by publication exists in almost any faculty evaluation (Boyer, 1990). This means that a broader view of scholarship was needed so that more faculty could meet their tenure and promotion criteria. Thus the collective meaning sought in these works was a broader definition of scholarship, as a function, not for a greater understanding of scholarship, rather for more categories on faculty reviews and evaluations. Boyer (1990) continued this tradition with his four domains of scholarship, which has been the prevailing view on scholarship for faculty in higher education almost ever since.

Current theories on scholarship. As previously mentioned, modern dialogue around scholarship in the higher education usually begins in some form with Boyer (1990) and the domains of scholarship his work established: the scholarship of application, the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching. In the twenty years since Boyer's seminal work numerous writers and researchers have expanded, broadened, and deepened the definitions found in the four domains of scholarship. Most of the works in the last twenty years have typically dealt with one of the four domains specifically and, according to Google Scholar, Boyer's 1990 seminal work had been cited at least 4425 times as of March 2010 (GoogleScholar, 2010a). Only two weeks after noting 4425 citations, GoogleScholar reported 4459 citations of *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The extensive reach and reference to the work clearly makes it the seminal work in the field of

scholarship in higher education. Further, it continues to be the basis for dialogue regarding scholarship in the academy. Each of Boyer's four domains represents some aspect of traditional views on scholarship: service, teaching, and research.

The scholarship of application is just that; it is the engagement in applying the theories and principles found in scholarship to solve problems or improve situations (Boyer, 1990). In what Boyer (1990) termed the "modern view of service" application is about service to both the lay public, in a role such as consulting or expert testimony, and service to the institution itself, with work on committees, such as self-studies, departmental sub-committees or search committees (Braxton et al., 2002). Braxton et al. (2002) even associate publication with this domain, in the form of articles reporting out on the experiences, approaches, and new knowledge gained from the service roles.

The scholarship of discovery is the domain most would associate with traditional scholarship, i.e. research and publication to contribute to both campus climate and human knowledge (Boyer, 1990). This domain represents the very essence of academic life and the idea of having an academic place where people do academic things purely for the sake of academics; it is knowing something just for the sake of knowing something. These activities include writing a book chapter on a new theory, reporting new theory, or describing knowledge gained from a new research design (Braxton et al., 2002). As Boyer (1990) comments, this domain gets at the "heart of academic life" (p. 17). To me the heart of academic life is found across the four domains, including the second domain, integration.

The scholarship of integration domain works on scholarship from an interdisciplinary perspective seeking to make connections across disciplines to reveal new insights than might otherwise be found (Boyer, 1990). This rather interpretive type of scholarship searches for meaning and a more comprehensive understanding. This approach to scholarship reminds me of the Stanford approach to a dissertation defense where someone from completely outside of the department sits on the committee, so that a new perspective on the material can be integrated for consideration into the dialogue (A. D. Coe, Personal Communication, June 30, 2008). Braxton et al. (2002) took the scholarship of integration a step further than Boyer to include almost any publication that is not based on the development or discovery of new theory covering everything from a book chapter applying a specific method, to a book review, to an article in “popular press” (p. 145). From my perspective, the integration domain of scholarship represents scholarship that is meant to happen in the open spaces and everyday life of a university, thus existing at the heart of academic life, much like the scholarship of teaching

The scholarship of teaching is about recognizing the work done by faculty in educating students as scholarship. According to Boyer (1990), the scholarship of teaching starts with knowledge and is carried out in good teaching and ongoing active learning. The scholarship of teaching covers the majority of acts one would generally associate with the teaching side of the professoriate, including overseeing student projects, theses, or dissertations, lecture on current topics from their ongoing readings beyond the texts, developing new courses, or constructing

annotated bibliographies for their classes (Braxton et al., 2002). This domain also includes concepts such as action research or other ongoing pedagogical or classroom experimentations and modifications in search of improvement (Braxton et al., 2002). This movement toward the applied side of scholarship is completed in Boyer's fourth domain, the scholarship of application (Boyer, 1990).

Boyer's (1990) domains of scholarship continue to be the primary basis for discussion on scholarship for faculty today and that is where the discussion ends, with the faculty and the forms of scholarship for which faculty are recognized. As referenced below, nowhere in the literature is there information on the meaning found in the experience of producing scholarship, nor is there much information on what administrators should be doing with regard to scholarship. However, one work, that of Riehl et al., (2000) begins to call attention to the need for scholarship within education administration. While still focused on K-12 or public school administration, the common principles espoused in the work provide some basis for understanding scholarship from an administrative perspective.

Specifically, Riehl et al. (2000) proposed five principles for consideration regarding research in educational administration. First, new knowledge should be presented to the audiences of educational administration research. Second, educational administration research should address problems significant within education. The efforts found in "identifying, analyzing, and solving significant" (p. 402) problems within educational administration helps provide practitioners, i.e. administrators ideas from which to draw upon in their practice (Riehl et al.,

2000). The third principle is that appropriate warrants, i.e. empirical evidence, should be provided for assertions and conclusions made regarding educational administration through research (Riehl et al., 2000). This principle seems self-evident when discussing the idea of research, in that any claims made from research should be supported by the data and subsequent results. The final two principles are intertwined, that of communicating effectively to its primary audience and having the work subject to public evaluation (Riehl et al., 2000). If a work is successfully communicated to the audience it is then available for review and evaluation by the proper public for the research itself. Of course the premise behind the principles was in providing criteria for academics doing work in a practitioners' world; in other words, this too was an article written for faculty about scholarship on educational administration. Although to the credit of the authors, they did call for more practitioners, i.e. administrators, participating in research on education administration.

Gaps in the Literature

The focus in the scholarship written on higher education administration has been on the practice of administration, and rightfully so. The intent of scholarship is to inform practice (Komives, 2001); accordingly the majority of all research on higher education administration focuses on the various functions of administration. However, that does not mean that administrators do not or should not produce or participate in scholarship; thus the experience of those that can and have produced or participated in scholarship can prove vital to the future growth of administration and other administrators. With that idea and the foundation of

Boyer's domains of scholarship completed a targeted literature search was conducted for scholarship in and scholarship on administration to see if a scholarship of administration could be found in the literature.

There are a number of notable works on the history or knowledge base in public education administration including: Callahan (1962); Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Bennion (1987); Culbertson (1988); Donmoyer (1999); Riehl et al. (2000); and Willower and Forsyth (1999); and These works focus on scholarship in educational administration from a public school or school administrator perspective and do not deal with the issues situations or content relevant to higher education administration. According to Riehl et al. (2000), "in contrast with the growing body of teacher research, there is little evidence of similar growth within education administration" and "there is little discussion of research conducted by administrators themselves" (p. 399). The "little discussion" Riehl et al. (2000) were referring to is more than what exists in higher education administration. No similar works to those on K-12 or public school administration could be found outlining the history or meaning of scholarship within higher education administration as a broad field or as a specific activity. Riehl et al. (2002) asked, in their article on research and scholarship in administration, why there is no tradition of administrator research paralleling teacher research and what can we do to shift the image of a scholar.

The idea of a scholarship of administration is potentially significant but has seen little research, despite the magnitude of the role played by administrators in higher education. As previously mentioned scholarship and the discussion of

scholarship has in many ways been largely ‘confined’ or more appropriately ‘defined’ by the professorate. In a search on Google Scholar more than 3,900 articles or citations were found using the terms *Boyer* and *Scholarship of* in the search within just the social sciences field, since 1990 were retrieved (Google Scholar, 2010b). Of the four domains detailed above, the scholarship of teaching had the most hits, 2,130, (2010c) more than doubling the next highest domain written about, discovery (952) (2010d). Application (2010e) was the next most common result with 796 hits and then came integration (2010f) with 767 hits returned. Even my search for Boyer and the scholarship of engagement (2010g), a debated fifth domain of scholarship, found 465 hits. However, a search for the scholarship of administration (2010h) came back with only 8 entries. Thinking maybe the word *Boyer* was limiting my search; I removed him and got back 24 entries (2010i). A review of those 24 entries revealed they were all about Writing Program Administration, which fails to capture the meaning and experience of producing scholarship as an administrator, the focus of the study as it focuses exclusively on writing program administrators. Writing program administrators include those administrative professionals who run the various writing labs, writing centers, or any other writing program at a college or university (McCloud, 2007). Much like the tradition of the scholarship in student affairs, scholarship in writing program administration focuses on the practices of the field and not on the act of doing scholarship in the field.

Essentially, the literature review process produced no previous scholarship on the lived-experience of producing scholarship as a higher education

administrator or the associated meaning thereof. This lack of available research on producing scholarship as a higher education administrator advances the historical division between faculty and administration; additionally the gap in the literature continues to further the unnecessary bifurcation between administration and scholarship. It is my belief that a phenomenological hermeneutic look into the meaning of the lived-experiences of higher education administrators producing scholarship can begin the dialogue needed to create a scholarship of administration for all administrators.

Phenomenological Hermeneutics

Edmund Husserl elaborated the idea of *Pure or Transcendental Phenomenology* in full in the 1913 book, commonly known as *Ideas I, Ideen au einer reinen Phänomenologie und Phänomenologischen* and in the essay series *Logical Investigation* (1913/1962), which began that same year.¹ Husserl envisioned transcendental phenomenology as a new philosophy and science apart from the empirical research methods of the time. According to Husserl, “*pure or transcendental phenomenology will be established not as a science of facts, but as a science of essential Being* (as ‘*eidetic*’ Science), a science which aims exclusively at establishing ‘knowledge of essences’ (*Wesenserkenntnisse*) and *absolutely no ‘facts’*” [emphasis in original] (p. 40).

Essentially, Husserl was using the philosophy of phenomenology to overcome the objectivism inherent in empirical and psychological work (Husserl,

¹ Note that Husserl’s 1913 book was first published in English in 1931, under the title *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*.

1913/1962). In Husserl's phenomenology "the meaning of words could no longer be confused with the actual psychic content of consciousness—e.g., the associative images that a word evokes" (Gadamer, 1998, p. 244). Rather than the conscious images a word evokes, Husserl (1913/1962) insisted that phenomenology necessitated a "*new way of looking at things...one that contracts at every point with the natural attitude of experience and thought*" [emphasis in original] (p. 39). For Husserl the process of acquiring this new perspective comes about through *phenomenological reduction* (Husserl, 1913/1962).

Phenomenological reduction begins with what "we see" or the experience documented from the natural standpoint (Husserl, 1913/1962, p. 101). It is then what occurs within the "centres (sic) of experiences (*Erlebnisse*)" (p. 102), which become the focus of study in phenomenology (Husserl, 1913/1962). Instead of measuring something in the mathematical sense, an exploration of the consciousness occurs, thus providing insight into the meaning of the lived-experience for each individual participant.

Parallels can be seen in Husserl's idea's for exploring the lifeworld and Dilthey's investigations into conscious life (Gadamer, 1998). Both Husserl and Dilthey's methods of research have life experience as a starting point and both seek to derive the historical world. Husserl sought to derive the world in terms of the constitution of the historical world whereas Dilthey sought to derive the world in terms of the structure of the historical world (Gadamer, 1998). Structure for Dilthey meant that there was a relationship between the whole and its parts in all of life defining the structural coherence of life and providing a foundation for

Dilthy's psychological phenomenology (Gadamer, 1998). Alternatively, the constitution of the world is derived from life as found in the self-consciousness, or the lived-experience in Husserl's transcendental phenomenology. Husserl also sought to make clear the differences between the transcendental phenomenology he was describing and the psychological phenomenology espoused by Dilthy. Husserl explicitly stated, based on *principle*, that phenomenology was not a "sub-domain of empirical psychology" (1913/1962, p. 37). Despite these differences between Dilthy and Husserl, they share a common epistemological stance where the concept of life itself comes from the data of the consciousness (Gadamer, 1998). However, for both Dilthy and Husserl the epistemology is where phenomenology ended, as neither truly addresses the ontological framework necessary to carry out the aims of transcendental phenomenology, which was accomplished by Heidegger in his hermeneutical phenomenology (Gadamer, 1998). Essentially, Heidegger's revival of the question of being, re-introduced ontology to Husserl's transcendental phenomenology that previously had an only epistemology, thus providing a method for analyzing and deriving meaning from the texts produced in the exploration of a lived-experience.

Heidegger revived the question of Being, through the exploration of the *Dasein* (Gadamer, 1998). The *Dasein* is a term Heidegger used to refer to the aspect in humans which has the ability to inquire into its own Being and wonder about its own existence (Van Manen, 1990). For Heidegger, the *Dasein* was being-in-the-world and "understanding is the original characteristic of the being of human life itself" (Gadamer, 1998, p. 259). The characteristics of human life

Heidegger reintroduced provide the ontological grounding necessary for phenomenology to work as a human science. However, Heidegger's work would never have been accomplished according to Gadamer (1998) had Husserl not,

Made it an absolutely universal working method to go back to life and hence had abandoned for good the narrow approach of simply inquiring into the methods of the human sciences. His analysis of the lifeworld and of the anonymous creation of meaning that forms the ground of all experience, gave the question of objectivity in the human sciences a completely new background by making science's concept of objectivity appear to be a special case. Science is anything but fact from which to start. (p. 258-259).

This study blended the principles of Husserl's phenomenology with that of Heidegger's hermeneutics for the reasons described above, in an approach similar to that described in Ricoeur's (1976) interpretation theory and Lindseth and Norberg's (2004) phenomenological hermeneutical method. The following chapter explains this combination of phenomenology and hermeneutics in full.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this phenomenological, hermeneutic study was to explore the meaning found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship for five higher education administrators. This chapter describes the research design and methodology used for this study, which focuses on a single overarching research question. What is the meaning of the lived-experience for administrators in the production of scholarship? From within this question two research objectives emerge from the phenomenological, hermeneutic orientation of the study (Van Manen, 1990).

1. Understanding the appearance of the lived-experience of producing scholarship for five higher education administrators.
2. Explore the essence or meaning of the lived-experience of producing scholarship for each of the five higher education administrators.

Appearance is associated with a more immediate description of the lived-experience or lifeworld for the participants. In contrast the essence of an experience is captured through a mediated description of the meanings found in the immediate description of the lifeworld (Van Manen, 1990). Within this study, the immediate description of the lifeworld was captured via interviews, and the mediated description of the meanings found therein came from the subsequent analysis and interpretation of the words captured in the interviews. This chapter includes sections on the research philosophy and methodologies that were used in the study, a description of the research design, and a section on data collection

and analysis. The chapter concludes with a discussion of reliability and validity as it relates to qualitative inquiry and this study. Before delving into the underlying philosophies and methodologies of the human science approach proposed for the study, it is important to explore what brought me to the use of a human science phenomenological approach to the study.

The decision to explore the lived-experience of producing scholarship as an administrator was not easy to reach. With an essentially blank slate upon which to work with regard to scholarship on scholarship in administration, finding the right method of inquiry was critical to the development of the study. With a grounded theory pilot study preceding the proposed study, applying grounded theory was the immediate approach considered. However, as the literature review unfolded, I noted an absence of any true description of what administrators face in producing scholarship. I determined that it was not possible to theorize adequately, define, or classify scholarship in higher education administration, if I did not first understand the experience itself. This led to the idea of capturing the lived-experience of administrators who produce scholarship. Finding a methodology that could capture the nature and essence of that lived-experience led me to a human science approach and Van Manen (1990), and ultimately Lindseth and Norberg (2004), who offer a more modern hermeneutic phenomenological *method* for researching lived-experience, which was employed in this study.

A sense of *method* is extremely important to the overall scientific contribution of a phenomenological study (Giorgi, 2006), as well as to the basis

for reliability and validity in this study. Van Manen (1990) created a foundation for a modern hermeneutic phenomenology; however a logical method to the research is not provided. Just as Heidegger made phenomenology an actionable science with hermeneutics, Lindseth and Norberg (2004) provide a systematic method for applying hermeneutic phenomenology to a modern lived-experience.

Research Philosophy: Hermeneutic Phenomenology a Human Science

The phenomenological and exploratory nature of this study led to a philosophical decision to pursue qualitative inquiry. To support this selection, I refer to the research philosophy of phenomenological inquiry as described by Van Manen (1990) and the method for implementing hermeneutic phenomenology by Lindseth and Norberg (2004). Van Manen's hermeneutic phenomenology builds on the work of Gadamer and can be traced back to the origins of phenomenology by Husserl, as well as to the origins of the connection between hermeneutics and phenomenology by Heidegger (1990). Lindseth and Norberg (2004) provide an actionable, systematic, method for employing hermeneutic phenomenology based on the interpretive approach of Ricoeur. To understand fully the research philosophy that will be used in the study, I must first make the distinction as to what is human science, the basis for hermeneutic phenomenological investigation, and then explore how hermeneutic phenomenology is appropriate for the current human science inquiry.

Human science is distinct and separate from natural sciences. The distinction between "natural" and "human" sciences can be traced back to Dilthey, who contrasted the natural and physical sciences or *Naturwissenschaften* and the

human world or *Geisteswissenschaften* in developing a methodological approach for the human world (Van Manen, 1990). *Geist* characterizes the human world via the feelings, thoughts, emotions, purposes, and actions of the individuals within the world, which finds “their objectification in languages, beliefs, arts, and institutions” (Van Manen, p. 3). For this particular study, the objectifications were found in the words captured via the participant interviews and in the nature of actions, expressions, and consciousness found within those words.

The transcribing of the interviews turned the spoken discourse into a textual discourse (text) for analysis. The term discourse, linguistic usage or a language event (Ricoeur, 1981), is purposefully used, as the interviews represented a language event that meets the four traits of discourse as described by Ricoeur. First, the interviews were a temporal event (Ricoeur, 1981) meaning the event occurred in what was the present time. At the same time, however the interviews were fixed in that time through the recording of and subsequent transcribing of the speech-act event. Second, the interviews and transcripts represent discourse because they have a subject (Ricoeur, 1981). There were two speakers within each interview, the participant and the researcher. Therefore, each interview, which was captured in transcripts, reflected a speech –act in the form of the dialogue between the participant and I. The occurrence of a speech-act was important because this means the texts reflect the voices of the two speakers, supporting a revisiting of the discourse through the act of re-reading the transcripts. Third, the interviews, like discourse, were about something (Ricoeur, 1981); in this study, the something that was the subject of the interviews, the

meaning found in the lived-experience of producing scholarship for five higher education administrators. Fourth, the interviews occurred within two worlds, that of the interviewee (the participant) and the interlocutor (the researcher) to whom the participant's speech is addressed (Ricoeur, 1981). As discourse, the interviews and subsequent transcripts were textual representations of the lived-experience of the participants and were a textual representation of an event tying hermeneutics and phenomenology together in this study.

The uncovering of the essence of being within the text occurred through the parallel processes of phenomenological *epoche* with regard to lived-experience and hermeneutic *distanciation* associated with historical efficacy (Ricoeur, 1981). The phenomenological *epoche* occurred when meaning found within the text was interrupted so the meaning could be signified as a meaningful lived-experience and was brought to light. Likewise hermeneutic *distanciation* occurs when a critical moment of belonging found within the text interrupts the reading of the text to be signified by the reader (Ricoeur, 1981); in other words the interpreter stops within the text to take note of the identified critical moment of belonging. What was ultimately *epoched* or bracketed and *distanciated* were the judgments made about the factual, critical moments in the text (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004). When I identified something of meaning, I took note of that thought to later test it within the analysis/interpretation phase. The *epoching* or *distanciating* of my judgments opened my own experience to the facts in the text and made the meanings of the experience for each individual understandable and implicit (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004). The common aim found in both *epoching*

and *distanciating* is revealing previously overlooked meanings found in action that is interpreted through text. The shared aim in phenomenological *epoching* and hermeneutic *distanciation* provided a strong connection at a conceptual level between hermeneutics and phenomenology.

In phenomenological research questions arise about the human world and the way humans experience the world. Thus all phenomenological research should begin in the human world. “This is the world of the natural attitude of everyday life which Husserl described as the original, pre-reflective, pre-theoretical attitude” (Van Manen, 1990, p. 7). Within the proposed study, everyday life was found in the experience of producing scholarship as a higher education administrator. The exploration of the challenges and rewards of producing scholarship within everyday life for administrators helped keep sight of the pedagogic praxis found in phenomenological research and human science. “The end of human science research for educators is a critical pedagogical competence: knowing how to act tactfully in a pedagogic situation on the basis of carefully edified thoughtfulness” (Van Manen, 1990, p. 8). To that end the goal of a deeper understanding of scholarship could help other administrators act more ‘tactfully’ in the undertaking of future scholarship.

Research Design: Hermeneutic Phenomenology

Van Manen (1990) described four claims in phenomenology, which make it scientific in what he terms a broad sense. Those four claims are that phenomenology is “a systematic, explicit, self-critical, and intersubjective study of its subject matter” (p. 11). This research will be systematic in following the

phenomenological hermeneutic method by Lindseth and Norberg (2004). The method Lindseth and Norberg (2004) propose and employed in the study included conducting interviews, creating transcripts of the interviews, conducting several readings of the subsequent texts in search for a naive understanding, performing structural analysis to identify themes and sub-themes and validate different naive understandings, and ultimately developed a comprehensive understanding of the text and the meaning found within for each interview. Lindseth and Norberg's approach is based on the work of Ricoeur (1976), whose own process of the hermeneutic arc heavily influenced how the phenomenological hermeneutic interpretation was applied in the study.

The interview process was explicit through the specific modes of questioning employed within the interviews around a singular focus of the lived-experience of producing scholarship for administrators. The lived-experience of producing scholarship is open to interpretation, because as human action, the meaning found in the action is suspended until an interpretation is made of the action or event (Ricoeur, 1981). Therefore, what represents the act of scholarship cannot be defined until the meaning of the action is explained. Thus both the meaning of scholarship and what scholarship was for each participant was explored and revealed in the interpretations in the study.

The embedded meaning of structures found in the lived-experience of the participants was explored through the research. The research was self-critical in that it involved a feedback loop between the participants and the researcher to ensure the clarity and exactness with which the stories of the participants are

articulated. Specifically, the interpretations of meaning for each participant were shared with each participant for his or her own clarification and approval.

Finally, this research was intersubjective, meaning that the work was based on multiple dialogic relationships developed around the phenomenon. Relationships existed between the participants, the developing text, and me as the researcher.

The second dialogic relationship occurs now that the study is completed, as you, the reader, become an active participant in the dialogue to further understanding of the phenomenon of scholarship within administration. This second dialogic relationship created by the finished study is in essence a hermeneutical conversation, as my interpretation of the text will allow for understanding by the reader (Gadamer, 1998). The fact that you are reading this now and considering the interpretations proffered in comparison to your own experiences furthers that ongoing hermeneutic conversation. This shared familiarity in the everyday practices of life then contributes to the pedagogical contributions of the work and your actions and reflections as the reader (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004).

Research Question

This study was guided by a single overarching research question: What meaning does the lived-experience of producing scholarship have for higher education administrators? This research question led to two research objectives consistent with a phenomenological, hermeneutic orientation: (a) understanding the appearance of the lived-experience of producing scholarship, and (b) exploring the meaning of that experience for five higher education administrators. Phenomenology is concerned with experience, i.e., the appearance, while

hermeneutics is focused on making sense of the experience, the interpretation of meaning (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). Completing the first research objective of creating an understanding of the scholarship experience involved determining what scholarship was for each participant. Once I knew what scholarship was for each participant I was able to explore the meaning thereof, accomplishing the second research objective and addressing the research question in the study, what is the meaning of the lived-experience for administrators in the production of scholarship. I should note here the importance for the domains of scholarship identified by Boyer (1990). Within phenomenological hermeneutics it is important for everyone who might participate in the ongoing dialogue have some shared understanding or familiarity of the world in which the experience occurs (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004; Ricoeur, 1976, Van Manen, 1990). The domain of scholarship, i.e., the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of discovery, within each participant in this study practiced provides a foundation for that shared familiarity of the world experienced by the participants. It was the experience within this world of scholarship for five administrators that was explored in the study.

Population

The population for this study was any higher education administrator, as defined in Chapter 1, who is actively producing or has produced scholarship. The size and breadth of this population was unknown, as no published research was located that revealed the number of administrators who produce scholarship or where those administrative scholars were located. With an unknown size and

location of the population of administrators producing scholarship, a purposeful sampling approach to identify and recruit participants was necessary to ensure achieving the desired sample size of five participants who met the proposed criteria. The specific characteristics required of the participants was that they must have been an active administrator in academic affairs, student affairs, or business affairs at a post-secondary institution, and they must have been producing or had produced scholarship, as defined by Boyer's (1990) four domains of scholarship, within the last two years.

Participant Selection and Recruitment

The approach to identifying and selecting participants for this study followed a convenience-based, purposeful sampling technique that ultimately is very similar to a case study in that there were specific boundaries for the sample (Merriam, 2009). Since the total population was unknown prior to the study and the locations of potential participants were not specific, the decision was made to limit participants to the colleges and universities in the Southwestern United States. From there, the decision was made to look for participants at only public institutions to narrow the administrative context from which the potential participants could be selected.

With the recruitment boundaries determined, the *2009 Higher education directory* and institutional websites were used to identify potential administrator candidates. When possible, online biographies of identified administrators were reviewed to try to identify administrators with evidence of scholarship.

Ultimately, a recruitment e-mail was sent to 44 administrators at seven different

public institutions in the Southwest (See Appendix B for sample recruitment e-mail). The e-mail to each potential participant was accompanied by three attachments (See Appendix C for attachments): the confidentiality statement for the study (See C1 for confidentiality statement), a table I developed reviewing each of the four domains of scholarship (1990) (See C2 for table of scholarship domains), and a personalized information letter (See C3 for information letter). If a response was not received after two weeks, a second e-mail inquiry was sent to each identified potential participant. Altogether, 29 of the 44 solicited administrators replied. Of the 29 who replied, 12 believed they were a fit and were interested in the study, 9 stated they did not fit the study parameters or were not doing scholarship, four were unable to meet, two potential participants were retiring and did not want to meet, and two other potential participants said that, while fitting the parameters of the study, they were simply too busy to participate. Of the 12 administrators who indicated interested in the study, 5 failed to respond to any subsequent e-mail inquiries about advancing the study, leaving me with 7 identified and willing candidates. Of the 7, 5 were at the same institution and comprised the sample for this study.

Informed Consent and Confidentiality

The basis of informed consent is working to ensure that the participants in a study are aware of any risks, benefits of participating in the study, as well as what the purpose, design, and main features of the study are (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The major concerns within informed consent are how much information to give and who should provide the consent (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). In this

study, the consent came directly from the participants. Consent was not needed from the administrators' supervisors, because the information sought in the study was not about the institutions; it was about the experience of the individual administrators. The information letter provided to the participants included information regarding the interviews and the nature of their participation in the study (see Appendix C). An information letter was used because the low risk factor of the study meant that signed informed consent was not required; therefore, the participants' acceptance to participate in the study signified informed consent.

The information letter introduced the primary investigator, my dissertation committee Co-Chair Alfredo G. de los Santos Jr. and me.² The letter also introduced the purpose and intent of the study, the parameters of participation including time required and contact information. The potential benefit of a better understanding of producing scholarship was also noted, as was the lack of any foreseen risks or discomforts associated with participation. Confidentiality for the participant and the institution as well as the voluntary nature of the study for each participant was re-iterated. Finally, the letter stated the method of the study and that the results would be used in this dissertation and may be published or presented, but neither the participants' names nor their institutions' names are used. A confidentiality statement (see Appendix C), outlining the safeguards that

² Our institution's IRB requires that the primary investigator of record be a faculty member. (See Appendix D for copy of IRB Approval form)

were used in the study to ensure confidentiality, also accompanied the information letter.

Data Collection: Semi-structured Interviews

Individual semi-structured interviews were the primary source of data collected in the study. The interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder. Handwritten notes from the interview sessions aided in interpretation. The interviews were conducted face-to-face or over the telephone. The interviews were semi-structured in that they consisted of both open-ended structured questions and open-ended un-structured questions (Merriam, 2009). The structured questions were used to set up the un-structured questions, which explored specific examples and instances pertaining to producing scholarship as an administrator. To this end, the typical and specific grand tour questioning techniques (Spradley, 1979) were employed.

According to Spradley (1979), typical grand tour questions focus on the typical experience of the participant. For example within this study, I asked, “What has been your experience with scholarship in administration?” The idea was to get the participant to generalize about the experience of producing scholarship. Providing the context for employing the specific grand tour questioning technique.

A specific grand tour question focuses on a specific event (Spradley, 1979). Following up on the previously alluded to question about the typical scholarship a participant produced, I asked participants about their most recent scholarship and to describe the experience for me, asking the participant, “Could

you give me an example of some scholarship you have done recently?” This approach opened a gateway to explore a specific scholarship experience. An interview guide, based on the participant’s indicated domain of scholarship, was provided in advance to each participant and was used to guide the interview (See Appendix E).

I transcribed each of the recorded participant interviews to create the texts for data analysis. Each interview was interpreted individually, because each text was a singular being (Ricoeur, 1976). In other words, the interviews will never occur again. I could interview the same participants about the same topics and get similar answers, but the experience reflected in that interview and the texts generated would be separate data for interpretation. Thus each interview represented a singular occurrence or reflection of experience for interpretation, allowing each new dialogue to add to the broader understanding of the experience of producing scholarship as an administrator and furthering the pedagogy of scholarly practice within administration

Data Analysis Process

This phenomenological hermeneutic study was informed by a variety of scholars and scholarship in both phenomenology and hermeneutics, such as Husserl (1913/1962), Gadamer (1998), and Van Manen (1990). One commonality among the three is a resistance to a defined method. In contrast, Heidegger, as cited in Gadamer (1998) and Ricoeur (1976, 1981), as well as Lindseth and Norberg (2004) espoused a specific approach to data analysis, or *interpretation*, as the process is known, in phenomenological hermeneutic

research. This does not mean all studies must follow a set method; however a dissertation is a method-centric work and having a specific path for analysis helped to ensure the validity of the overall work and the quality of the dissertation.

The data analysis process in this study was based on the phenomenological hermeneutic approach articulated by Lindseth and Norberg (2004), and the work upon which their method is based, that of Ricoeur and his interpretation theory (1976). The intent in the text interpretation process is to “move from understanding to explaining” (p. 74) and then from the explanation to a more depth understanding or comprehension of the meaning of the text (Ricoeur, 1976).

The movement from understanding to explaining and back to understanding occurs in what Ricoeur (1976) termed the hermeneutic circle, cycling from guess to validation to uncover the most probable interpretation. The circular process occurred in this study through a naive grasping or guessing as to the meaning of the text as a whole.

Next, explanation is used to validate the probability of the naive understanding. In this case, explanation was a structural analysis producing themes and sub-themes to validate against the whole of the text in support of the explanation. Once the most probable interpretation was identified, the structural analysis bridged the explanation toward a comprehensive or deep understanding of the meaning of each text. Following the method described by Lindseth and

Norberg (2004), three distinct phases were undertaken in this study: naive reading, structural analyses, and comprehensive understanding.

Naive reading and understanding. The first step in the phenomenological hermeneutic interpretation process was developing a naive understanding of each text by reading the text, which was followed by reading for validation of the understanding by testing the possible explanations. During the reading process, the whole text was read several times and a guess, the naive understanding, was ventured as to the meaning of the whole text (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004). The intent was to move closer toward a phenomenological attitude, where the interpretation has to be validated or invalidated (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004).

The falsification or validation of initial interpretations, e.g., the naive understanding(s), through the “logic of subjective probability” (p. 79) lends weight to certain interpretations by arguing the interpretations from both a dogmatic and skeptical perspective (Ricoeur, 1976). While many interpretations are probable, not all interpretations are equal. The validation of interpretations served to identify the most probable interpretations of meaning found in the text. Specifically, in this study, the field notes, margin notes in the text, and the continued reading led to a series of possible explanations as to the meaning of the lived-experience of scholarship for each of the five participating administrators. Those series of naive understandings were each then considered as the text was re-read multiple times, with each of the possible explanations in mind. Then, based on the re-readings, notes, and comparisons of the different explanations, a

singular explanation for the meaning of the lived-experience was determined and the meaning was verified via the second step in the three-step analysis process, conducting a structural analysis.

For this study, the structural analysis was performed via a thematic analysis of each text using the validated naive understanding developed to explain the meaning behind each experience. The goal of the structural analysis process, detailed further below, is to validate or invalidate the naive understanding proffered for each text (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004). It should be noted that for each individual text, the initial naive understanding was rejected as invalid through the structural analysis process. This circular reification of the subjective understandings and objective explanations also served as a form of hermeneutic *distanciation*, which adds to the overall validity of the work.

The *distanciation* (Ricoeur, 1976) occurred as my bias was inherently ground into the initial naive understanding which was falsified for each participant in the analysis process. When the most probable meaning expresses the reality intended by the utterance itself (understanding) and the object intended by the utterer (explanation), I will have what Ricoeur (1976) terms as a reference, “the full exteriorization of discourse” (p. 80). This is what ultimately was found following a second round of naive understanding development, which followed the invalidating of the initial naive understandings. The majority of the second explanations were validated by the subsequent structural analyses and reflect what was communicated with each participant in the ongoing analysis and interpretation process.

Structural analyses. The second step in the three-step analysis process as described by Lindseth and Norberg (2004) was conducting structural analyses of each text, verifying the naive understanding for each text. Essentially, using the naive understanding as a lens for understanding and interpreting meaning, thematic analyses were completed with each text. In the thematic analyses, the goal was to develop themes and sub-themes that served to validate and support or invalidate and negate the interpretation of the naive understanding (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004). In this process, each text reviewed as a whole was broken down into what Ricoeur (1976) called utterances and Lindseth and Norberg (2004) called meaning units.

Sentences, paragraphs, and other phrases were identified and separated so that each meaning unit was decontextualized from the whole of the text (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004) and could have meaning by itself independent of the rest of the text. The meaning units were then grouped into themes and sub-themes that were used for reflection against the whole of the text and served to validate or, as was the case with each of the initial naive understandings developed, invalidate the explanation from the naive understanding. The themes and sub-themes that validated the subsequent second naive understandings then served as the platform for moving toward the final stage of analysis and the development of a comprehensive understanding of the interpreted whole.

Comprehensive understanding. The thematic analysis completed in step two served to construct the segments of action in a new way, forming what Ricoeur (1976) termed a new narrative for explaining the meaning of a text. The

new narrative or story is based on the validated meanings constituting the early stages of comprehensive understanding found in the interpretation of the data. For each text the themes and sub-themes were summarized to reflect on the research question, the meaning of the lived-experience of producing scholarship as an administrator. The text was read as a whole again, with the new summary in mind to again validate the explanation.

Additionally, further literature was explored as needed to enhance understanding related to the explanations emerging from the interpretation. For example, it was necessary to do some basic research on identity theory, since identity was a key factor in the explanation and meaning for one of the participants. The comprehensive understanding ultimately reached for each text and participant is reflected in Chapter 5 of this work.

None of the data analysis process occurred alone in a vacuum. Feedback and clarification was sought from the participants and other administrative colleagues during the entirety of the data collection and analysis processes. Follow-up e-mails and communication occurred with the participants. It should be noted that while the data analysis process was outlined in a linear fashion within the proposal, the process was not that linearly in execution. Rather, data analysis was ongoing and iterative. For example, my initial naive understandings began as early as during the interviews in my handwritten notes during the conversation.

Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Human Science Research

The concept of *trustworthiness* has four aspects: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Specific strategies are recommended by Guba and Lincoln to achieve trustworthiness, such as peer debriefing, audit trails, member checks during and after the study, negative cases, and structural corroboration (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, in *trustworthiness* much of the focus occurs after the study during the verification process, hence too late to address threats to reliability and validity that may occur during the study (Morse et al., 2002). Rather than the post-hoc evaluation described in the concept of trustworthiness, a *verification* process was employed in the study to ensure reliability and validity. Verification is the process of confirming and being certain in the research, and is based on the principles of qualitative inquiry, which is self-correcting (Morse et al., 2002). Ultimately the sophistication and elegance of the work will leave the assessment of the rigor, trustworthiness, and transferability of the study up to you, the reader; that said, steps were taken to ensure reliability and validity.

Reliability and validity are stalwart terms when it comes to positivist, scientific inquiry. Reliability and validity are generally associated with research processes, such as predictive validity, construct validity, and face validity (Kvale, 1996). However, interview research, as was the case with this study, typically has too few participants to generalize. With a different attitude toward validity and reliability, some qualitative researchers have ignored the concepts altogether, while others have relied upon the previously mentioned concept of trustworthiness from Lincoln and Guba (1995). Rather than avoid the concepts of

reliability and validity, I embraced the ideas and worked to validate the study through verification and responsiveness as the researcher.

Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) suggested that validation depends on the quality of craftsmanship during a study, via continual checking, questioning, and interpreting the findings. Craftsmanship is essential to the credibility of the research and is found in the researcher, his or her moral integrity, and the methods of study used (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Kvale and Brinkmann provided three aspects of validation, which is to check, to question, and to theorize. By using the three aspects of validation, the emphasis moved from the end product to more of a quality control process at work during the investigation. Kvale and Brinkmann recommended addressing validity concerns at seven stages during a study: thematizing, designing, interviewing, transcribing, analyzing, validating, and reporting. Each stage represents a different point in the research process and steps were taken to ensure validity at each point. Morse et al. (2002) suggest several verification strategies that were employed in the study to ensure validity during each of the seven stages identified by Kvale and Brinkman (2009) (see Appendix F).

Methodological coherence was the first verification strategy and occurred through the alignment between the question asked, the method of research employed, the collected data, and the analytic procedures used in the study (Morse et al., 2002). Alignment and coherence between the methodologies used in this study were verified through the accomplishment of achieving the research goals in a coherent manner.

Similar in spirit to Schofield's (1993) suggestion to use theoretical sampling, Morse et al. (2002) stated that the sample used must be appropriate. As with what is achieved in theoretical or purposeful sampling, an appropriate sample meant that the participants had knowledge of the topic of study and represented the phenomenon of interest. An appropriate sample "ensures efficient and effective saturation of categories, with optimal quality data and minimum dross" (Morse et al., 2002, p. 12). Optimal quality data and saturation of categories increase the likelihood of producing thick and rich data, which in turn can also increase the transferability of the findings and conclusions.

A third strategy that was employed to increase validity was collecting and analyzing the data concurrently (Morse et al., 2002). Concurrent collection and analysis of data allows for the checking and questioning of the data suggested by Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), which can lead to a greater understanding of the essence of the data and a symbiotic relationship between what is known and what needs to be known about the phenomenon of study (Morse et al., 2002). For example, it was the ongoing analysis and data collection that helped me come to the realization that while the participants were performing scholarship as defined by Boyer's (1990) domains, Boyer's definition was not what scholarship was for each participant. The concurrent dialogue with both the data collection and the data collected furthered the depth of the theoretical interpretations represented in the study.

Thinking theoretically was the fourth verification strategy offered by Morse et al. (2002). As new ideas emerged from analysis of the data, verification

occurred through subsequent validation within the analysis process and through participant checks of the analysis and interpretation. Although creating theory was not the goal of this hermeneutic phenomenological research, the concept of thinking theoretically is very similar to the concept of structural analysis, which was one of the analysis techniques used in the study. Structural analysis provided a way to identify and formulate themes by viewing the text as objectively as possible (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004), which validated and negated early interpretations that came from a naive reading of the text.

The final verification strategy offered by Morse et al. (2002) was theory development. Again, although theory was not the aim of this study, the final stage in phenomenological hermeneutic analysis is developing a comprehensive understanding of the texts, based on the naive understanding and the validated themes. The focus during this final state was on the possibilities of living in the world of the text, not on what the text says (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004). In other words, consideration was given to the future benefits of the results of the study, providing validation, that the explanations made sense pedagogically.

The rigor flowing from the verification strategies was ultimately dependent on one thing, me. My responsiveness, skill, flexibility, and insight as the investigator, define the ultimate reliability and validity of the work. If I was able to remain sensitive to potential meanings, was willing to disregard unwarranted understandings, and remained open throughout the research process by applying the previously described verification strategies, I ensured rigor in the study and therefore, reliability and validity, which is evident for you, the reader.

Chapter 4

INTRODUCTION TO ADMINISTRATORS

Five sections are presented in this chapter, one section for each administrator. Each section includes four parts: a summary of curriculum vitae, the interview setting, some background in education and administration for each participant, and a brief explanation of each participant's scholarship as defined by Boyer's domains (1990). The summary of the curriculum vitae highlights each participant's overall experience in education and serves as a common foundational introduction of each administrator. The interview setting is commentary based on the field notes taken before, during, and after each interview, serving to provide an understanding of the nature of each interview. The background in education and administration is provided to further understanding of each participant's career path in administration and current administrative role. The information in the background is based primarily on interview data and is presented as much as possible in the words of each participant. Pseudonyms are used for identifiers, such as names, professional titles in order to protect anonymity of the participants.

Introduction to Dr. Nancy Greene

Summary of curriculum vitae. Dr. Nancy Greene is an educator with over 30 years of teaching and administrative experience at university, community college, and K-12 institutions. Her interests and areas of expertise include community colleges, learning communities, civic participation, service learning, and community college-university partnerships. It is this final area of

professional expertise, developing partnerships between universities and community colleges, where Dr. Greene currently works as an administrator. Dr. Greene is currently Vice Provost for Intercollegiate Connections, where she works to establish and maintain a positive and productive relationship with community colleges across the region. Dr. Greene's career has gone back and forth between administration and teaching, moving from the K-12 level and into higher education along the way. Dr. Greene has received a number of awards for innovation and leadership, has performed community service across a number of associations and organizations, and has provided professional services to a number of both state and national education associations in participating and leadership positions. Dr. Greene's practice of scholarship is a mix between a scholarship of application (Boyer, 1990), reflected by her presentations at conferences on community colleges and the scholarship of teaching and in her professor of practice role at the university where she teaches on community colleges and community college-university partnerships.

Interview setting. I met with Dr. Green on a beautiful weekday afternoon. Her office was in an old healthcare facility that was not on the university campus. The seclusion of the location provided a quiet and personal setting for a university administration building. Her assistant, whose desk was in an office that was located between those coming in and Dr. Greene's office; greeted me. Dr. Greene's office had two doors. One was the pocket door entry from her assistant's office; the other door, leading back to the hallway, had a chair in front of and did not appear to be in use. In her office we sat together at a small

round table where I conducted an interview of approximately one hour. The interview was an interactive and informative conversation, with Dr. Greene getting up several times to grab a book or some other publication from her shelf to share with me. Her assistant brought us a pitcher of water, which we shared as we sat and spoke about her career as an administrator and the role scholarship has played and continues to play in her career.

Background in education and administration. Dr. Greene said she always thought she would end up in business, in particular with her older brother saying that:

All my siblings have done well in their respective fields. But I always thought I would end up in business with him... My brother was a little older than I. He was in his MBA as well and he just kept saying. "Get done. Come out to California. We are going to have such great fun. You know we are doing all these different things." Of course, he has done very, very well.

With a path clearly head toward business, and a brother who is CEO of a multi-national corporation, ending up in education seemed unlikely and, indeed Dr. Greene described it as such. She described her journey into the field of education as:

One of these flukes, these moments in time. I was in an MBA program. Ran out of money. Looked for a job. Found one at a school. Had never considered working at a school. Didn't have an undergraduate degree in education or anything like that. Began working at the school. By the time

I left I had been there seven years. Had served as a faculty member. I had enough undergraduate credits in areas like math and business I was able to get credentialed to teach at the secondary level. And then realized they really needed someone who could get them organized, the finances, the employment issues, the planning issues and so forth. And I took an administrative role as the principal. First as dean and then as the principal of this local boarding school.

The realization Dr. Greene described above helped her find a business space within the world of education, noting, “*schools need people with good skill sets and planning. You know all those things as well as finance and budget.*”

However, in speaking with Dr. Greene, although her career beginning in education may have been a fluke, she made a choice to remaining in education.

Because the reality is I already know I can work in all sorts of environments that aren't universities or community colleges. That's the hard decision. Do you want to stay in education or not? But if you like a constant teaching and learning and kind of an invigorating environment...

Illustrating her joy for a constant teaching and learning and invigorating environment, this is what she said:

You know what I just love? Did you ever listen to great courses from the teaching company? It's a particular set of tapes; I wish I had one here to show you. Because they are so cool I love them. What they basically do is they tape great professors who teach in universities all over the country

and they help them can their courses. And they call themselves the teaching company and you buy a university course on tape.

The above was one example of several teachable moments that Dr. Greene took advantage of within the interview. This particular experience provided some early insight into the connection between teaching, learning, administration, and scholarship that exists for Dr. Greene. Her efforts to teach during the interview also serve as a reminder of the fact that her career path was not linear and moved back and forth between teaching and administration which she did not see as the norm.

Yeah, so mine (career path) is not so linear, I think most people do. They either are an administrator for a long time, they retire, and they start a teaching career. Or conversely they are a teacher for a long time and then they move up into administration and they retire from administration. Mine has gone from faculty to administration, to faculty, to administration. Kind of like a checkerboard.

Although she continued to teach as an adjunct, the checker board pattern has slowed as Dr. Greene has spent the last 15 years primarily as an administrator, first in academic affairs, then as a community college president and finally in her current position as Vice Provost of Intercollegiate Connections. The path to the current position for Dr. Greene mirrored in many respects her initial move into education; it was mostly a matter of timing.

I had been giving retirement some thought. But I really wasn't sure what I wanted to do. I was retirement eligible and the Provost and I had lunch

and kind of talked it over and she proposed this new challenge and as we talked about it more...it just kind of sealed it for me. I was ready for a big new challenge and it was just well timed. So, yeah, it was just one of these things that comes up in life. You are not necessarily planning on it. I wasn't planning on my first position in education; I would have ended up in business.

In her current role Dr. Greene is able to connect her business acumen, educational interests, and community college knowledge for the betterment of the state. In speaking of her role, she said that:

To fundamentally change the relationship of the university and the community college system in the state. We have a lot of community college students in this state. A very tiny percentage of them ever move on to university work. This is not a good thing for the state or the students.

And while Dr. Greene's position within the university is administrative, she does still have it in her contract to teach and is a professor of practice within the institution.

My primary role is administrative in nature. But last fall I taught a course in community college transfer. Last spring I taught the overview of community colleges; it's kind of a history and issues in community colleges course. I'm working with some doctoral students this fall when they are working on their own research. I will teach again in the spring. I don't know what I will be assigned to yet, but it will all be stuff in areas that I have worked. So I am called a professor of practice. That is

different than a normal tenure track professor position. The assumption is, by way of your vast experience, you are authorized to teach in this area on behalf of the university.

This was a specific stipulation that she sought out and received in her contract. In the interview she said that,

It was a conversation I brought up and fortunately they said that is a great idea, because they don't have a lot of retired presidents teaching for them. They do have a few folks, who are retired out of the community college system, but not at the CEO level. So that is something, as they began thinking about they, they were like, "Oh yeah. Let's do it."

It was her teaching experience based on professional practice and experience reflecting the scholarship of teaching domain (Boyer, 1990), which originally qualified Dr. Greene for the study, although it was not the only scholarship she did as detailed below.

Dr. Greene and the scholarships of teaching and application. The scholarship of teaching is about recognizing the work done in educating students as scholarship. According to Boyer (1990), the scholarship of teaching starts with knowledge and I carried out in good teaching and ongoing active learning. Examples of activities that would include directing student reach projects, developing course content or materials, presenting or experimenting with new instructional techniques or publishing on classroom experience.

The scholarship of application is the engagement in applying the theories and principles found in scholarship to solve problems or improve situations

(Boyer, 1990). Modern look at service, considering service to both the lay public, in a role such as consulting or expert testimony, and service to the institution itself, with work on committees, such as self-studies, departmental sub-committees or search committees (Braxton et al. 2002). Example activities might include departmental committee service, expert testimony, off-campus consulting, or studies conducted for local government or organizations.

In response to my original inquiry looking for participants in my study, Dr. Greene responded indicating that she was participating in scholarship through the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application.

Within the past year, I have taught two classes in my direct area of expertise, community colleges, which aligns with Boyer's Scholarship of Teaching category. Further, I have served on a number of committees and in other institutional capacities, which align with Boyer's Scholarship of Application category.

With that e-mail reply setting the stage, I went into the interview expecting to learn all about how Dr. Greene was educating students and carrying out good teaching to fulfill the scholarship of teaching and how she was sharing her years of expertise for local and national level organizations in alignment with the scholarship of application and Dr. Greene did not disappoint. The two courses Dr. Greene was referring too in here e-mail were certainly both in areas of expertise relating the community college and the transfer and articulation process.

CC580, Community College 580 it's a graduate course that's basically an overview of community colleges. We used a book called, I don't know if

you seen it before Minding the Dream. It is an American Council on Education publication. (Going over and getting the book). These are the two I will be using in my course this spring. This is the more traditional (Kaplin & Lee, Community College Text). Then HED/691 which was a Higher Ed course taught for doctoral students and we were studying specifically the transfer process. And so we did, we did some really interesting things that actually very helpful to me.

Dr. Greene's expertise was central to other contributions beyond teaching and bordering on the scholarship of application, like guest lecturing.

So EDU/250 is a course taught within the Community Colleges that I regularly guest lecture in. It's an overview of community colleges, for, and it is required by state law for people that are going to be teaching in the community college. It goes over a little bit of the history, the governance, the demographics of students, the types of typical student services, teaching techniques. It is just a big overview of community colleges. So several people I know teach that course regularly ask me to come in and do. I kind of have, a couple of set topics that I do and they seem to enjoy it to.

Dr. Greene's expertise with community colleges also reaches into conferences and presentations.

I did present at a transfer conference in Texas. By going to conferences you learn a lot about what other schools are doing, but it does force you, when you have to prepare for an audience with a lot of other college

faculty and administrators to think through what is working and what is not. You know, why don't you know that piece of data when they ask you that, "well gee that is a really good question and I am going to find out the answer to that." So I did do a little bit of that this year. And I think it makes sense to do more of that over time.

Clearly based on her descriptions Dr. Greene is participating in scholarship as defined by Boyer's domains (1990). However, in analyzing the text of our interview, it became apparent that like the other participants, what scholarship was and means to Dr. Greene is not confined in Boyer's definition. Rather, for Dr. Greene, like the other participants, scholarship means something much more personal. For Dr. Greene, the meaning of scholarship is related to her values and her outlook on life.

Introduction to Dr. Keith Grayson

Summary of curriculum vitae. Dr. Keith Grayson is Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Professor in a traditional social science discipline. He has been an educator in higher education for 40 years and has been a Professor for more than 25. During his career Dr. Grayson has served at multiple levels within academic affairs administration, from department chair, to school director, to dean, to his current position as vice provost. Professor Grayson has an extensive history scholarship in its traditional faculty form, scholarship of discovery. He has received over 20 grants ranging from \$14,000 to nearly \$1 million, has authored two books, edited another, has 40 refereed articles, over a dozen non-refereed articles or book chapters, as well as a number of unpublished

manuscripts, reports, and presentations. Dr. Grayson has served in an editorial capacity for a number of journals, is a member of several sociological and criminological associations and has served on a number of state and national level boards for those associations. Dr. Grayson's current scholarship continues to be in the form of discovery with his latest presentation and publication both coming within the last year.

Interview setting. It was a stormy summer afternoon when I met with Dr. Grayson in his office within the Provost's suite in an up-scale university administration building. After a short wait outside the frosted glass doors leading to the Provost's suite, and being asked at least four times if I had been helped, I followed a labyrinth of cubicles and hallways to a small office, one of several offices along a hallway in the back of the building. Across from the hallway of offices was an area of cubicles and workstations for the staff supporting Dr. Grayson and the other vice provosts in the suite. Upon reaching Dr. Grayson's office and before our afternoon interview began, he offered me some coffee. We both got a cup before settling into his office. The interview took place at a small round table, opposite his work desk, with his back to the window and the storm brewing outside. The conversation was informative and enjoyable, as Dr. Grayson took me through his career and beliefs regarding the role of scholarship and administration within a university.

Background in education and administration. In many respects, Dr. Grayson is both the most traditional administrator and also the least traditional administrator participating in the study. As described in the literature review,

higher education administration is a field straddling both traditional administrative work, such as business affairs and operations, as well as more academically oriented work like that found in academic or student affairs. Depending on the area of administration in which someone works in higher education, the path can vary with potentially little academic background in a more business or operational administrative position all the way to a more traditional scholar or academic, which is often found in leadership positions within academic affairs. Dr. Grayson took the traditional route, assuming one's school of thought is that an academic route to administration is the traditional route, as is Dr. Grayson's belief:

I think coming through a faculty side is the traditional route. I think if you look at, umm, everything from the President on down to the department chairs, on the academic side. Now if you are talking about the non-academic side, that's an entirely different game. But if you are talking about people in academic affairs, most of us were at some point or another full-time faculty; most of us are full professors, and were before we got into an administrative position for a variety of reasons. We can talk about that later, but. Umm, now when you get into assistant deans and associate deans who might be professionals, who are brought in to work specifically on enrollment management problems or budget problems or then you are bringing in, like here at the university level, we have the vice president and chief legal counsel. He is an attorney; he has never been a professor. He is a lawyer. We've got our CFO who is in

charge of our budgets; as far as I know he hasn't been in a faculty position. So you start getting into those kinds of things.

Dr. Grayson clearly understands that there are various roles within university administration, but his perspective is clearly one of an academic within administration, making it clear on more than one occasion in the interview that he is not just an administrator and that academics and scholarship play a major role in this distinction:

I still consider myself a scholar, not just quote, un-quote, not just solely an administrator. And when I go downtown to my office and I am surrounded by 18 to 20 colleagues and 40 graduate students, I don't want them to think I am a total stranger or like, "What are you doing here," kind of thing. I want them to be like, "Oh yeah, he is one of us." He is doing what we are doing. Now that is my priority, but keep in mind that is nowhere in my contract as vice provost or for that matter for deans.

The theme of being more than an administrator was prevalent throughout the interview, providing the sense that, although an administrator for half of his professional life, Dr. Grayson was reluctantly serving the institution and sort of taking one for the team. This belief was manifested in Dr. Grayson's thoughts regarding how most traditional academics move into administration:

I think most administrators kind of back into it. I think that especially, because you start out, usually your first administrative position is a department chair and often times it is a reluctant person moving into that

position. It's kind of like someone has to do it and we don't want X to do it; so you have got to do it and throw yourself on the sword.

Dr. Grayson's belief of backing into administrative positions as an academic was not founded on beliefs or hearsay, but rather his own experience, sharing in the interview how he had been backed into administration. He stated:

In my particular case, since you asked, I was a faculty member, I was at the university A...what's not on my CV is I took a leave...and went to university B and held a faculty position as a visiting position at B while I weighed whether I wanted to stay there or go back. I couldn't hold tenure at two universities. So basically I took a leave from one university while I took a job, without tenure at another. And after a while I decided I wanted to go back to my university, A, so I called the Dean and said, "You know, I really don't like university B that much; I'm coming back." He said, "Well, I don't want you back, unless you come back as the chair" and that was that, and I had no choice. So I came back as a chair and that is how I ended up being chair of the department. Umm, and that was actually, my Ph.D. is in sociology, so that was actually the department of sociology. So I served as chair for four years, five years, whatever it was.

This first chair position led to another position and, by nearly a decade later, Dr. Grayson had spent most of the 1980s as an administrator. However, after two five-year stints in administrative positions, he perceived that his time was up.

So the entire 1980s basically, I was an administrator, and then my term was up, I mean I had done it. You get tired of hitting the same wall and you run out of ideas and you use up your political chips...My point is, after about five years, you have pretty well used up your political capital, you've pretty well done what you can do to make changes, to develop, to build, and you've hired in your new faculty. You've got to have a mission; you've got to have a goal when you are an administrator to make the job interesting. If you are just there to make sure the light bulbs get changed on time, you're not really doing much.

After stepping away from his administrative role, Dr. Grayson returned to the academic world and a faculty role, which is a position he both takes very seriously and enjoys.

So anyway I stopped in 1990 and then umm, became, returned to full-time faculty, and I was happily in that role until 2005. So for 15 years, I was a full-time faculty. First of all, the best job in the universe is being - well maybe a Supreme Court judge - but after that, anyway it is a really good job in terms of all the intrinsic rewards that come with it. The kind of work you do, working with the students, whether undergrad or doctoral the whole notion of discovery and dissemination of research results, findings and kind of helping advance that thing, that you have invested your entire life in anyway. As a faculty member, whether you are a biochemist or sociologist, you have kind of bought into the paradigm of

this is something worth knowing. Otherwise why would I be spending my life teaching it to other people?

It is away from this “best job in the universe” where Dr. Grayson once again found himself in 2005 as he again backed-into an administrative position.

Then I received a phone call from the provost calling me in, asking to see me; and I went in, not knowing what was about to happen. The provost, said they “have been searching, for two years now; they have had a failed search for a dean, we haven’t found anyone we like. Would you take it on an interim basis for a year while we do another search?” And I said, “Yeah”, well; we talked about it, again higher ed. I don’t want to be the watchman; I don’t want to be the caretaker. If I am going to sit in the chair I’m going to make the decisions and so on.

This second entry into administration, like the first, led to a second position, his current as vice provost of academic affairs.

So, I thought, “Well I enjoyed serving in administration and if I was doing something in and for and with my university.” So I began my administrative career a second time in 2005. So five years later I am still here; on the other hand, all administrators serve at 90 days notice.

It is from this administrative position, that Dr. Grayson continues his scholarly endeavors. Completely unrelated to his administrative work, other than the life experiences related to the act of scholarship and the intrinsic value it provides in his administrative role, Dr. Grayson’s scholarship in his field of

criminology and sociology is an extension of his faculty role with ongoing scholarship of discovery efforts.

Dr. Grayson and the scholarship of discovery. The scholarship of discovery (Boyer, 1990) is the domain most would associate with traditional scholarship, such as experimental or quasi-experimental research, followed by publication, contributing the both human knowledge and the climate of the researcher's institution. This domain represents the very essence of academic life, from the faculty perspective, with the idea of having an academic place, the institution, where people do academic things, research, purely for the sake of academics, to expand a given field of knowledge. Examples of activities or tasks acknowledged within the scholarship of discovery include writing a book chapter on a new theory, reporting on a new theory and describing the knowledge gained typically in a referred journal, or possibly an agency report on research findings. Within all of these examples, the key is doing new research.

There are lots of things that could be written about the scholarship of discovery, especially regarding an academic with a record of scholarship like Dr. Grayson. However, the truth to his scholarship over the last two years can be summed up in a single utterance from our conversation.

I just actually in the last week, I was in England presenting a paper at the British Society for Criminology, but it took me two years to write that damn paper. To get the data, to collect the data, analyze the data, write the article, and write the paper. And it is the lowest priority in the job. It

may not be my lowest priority, as a person, because I still see myself as a faculty member.

Although clearly the gathering and analysis of data, to draft a publication and present it at an international conference is work within the scholarship of discovery and seems to be about adding knowledge to the field for the sake of knowledge, but for Dr. Grayson, the driving force is his identity as a scholar which dominates the meaning of scholarship for him.

Introduction to Dr. Kevin Simpson

Summary of curriculum vitae. Dr. Kevin Simpson is a Vice President for Student Services and Development. Dr. Simpson has worked in progressively responsible positions within student affairs and residential life for over 30 years since beginning as a hall director in 1980. Moving from small to large institutions and back and forth again, Dr. Simpson has been an Assistant Director of Resident Services, a Dean of Students, an Associate Vice President of Student Affairs, and a Dean of Student Development. As Vice President for Student Services and Development, Dr. Simpson oversees admissions, student financial assistance, the university registrar, and student initiatives and technology services. Dr. Simpson also has taught at the university level for over 15 years, first as an affiliated or clinical professor and now as an associate professor in higher education. Dr. Simpson has consulted on enrollment management at several institutions, has five peer-reviewed publications, has served on a number of institutional-related committees, as well as some local boards, and has membership in several national

associations. Although Dr. Simpson has several peer-reviewed publications, his current work in scholarship has been the scholarship of teaching.

Interview setting. My interview with Dr. Simpson had some qualities that made it different from the other interviews in my study in that Dr. Simpson and I already knew each other prior to the research. I took a class in governance from Dr. Simpson earlier in my program of study and I previously had interviewed Dr. Simpson as part of the pilot study that preceded this research. It is from this previous state of familiarity in which I met with Dr. Simpson on a rainy day very similar to the day I met with Dr. Grayson. In another similarity the interview took place in the same up-scale administrative building as my interview with Dr. Grayson, only several floors below the meeting with the Vice Provost. Unlike the two previous interviews, or the two to follow, I met with Dr. Simpson outside of his office in a meeting room that was big enough for a six to eight-person meeting. The room itself was a trapezoid with three glass windows, two facing the busy street and one facing courtyard below. We sat across from each other at a nice conference table, and spoke for about an hour.

Background in education and administration. Dr. Simpson's story and background in administration is likely not that different from any number of current senior leaders in student affairs, entering the profession at the inception of the modern field as we know it today. In fact, in many respects his story is very similar to Mr. Larry Davidson's, who is also in student affairs and is my fourth participant. However, while the timing of entering the field at the onset of a new paradigm was significant, for both Dr. Simpson and for Mr. Davidson, it is

actually the path to the field that really helped define each administrator as an educator. For Dr. Simpson, that path began as a first generation college student, unsure of where he was going, but knowing he was going to be an administrator.

I had been on a path to be an educator. In what form, it was less defined for me. I was a first generation college student. My parents didn't, they offered support, but they didn't offer much career advice. And not unlike a lot of first generation college students, you don't have a real clear sense of the full scope of career and employment opportunities. You understand kind of the basic categories: doctor, teacher, nurse, lawyer, etc. But education was an important value in my family.

This lack of a defined path within education was exacerbated by the fact that the field of higher education administration was in its infancy in many respects.

But not unlike, I think, a lot of people, in education, higher education administration; there isn't a definitive path. There is a more definitive path, in terms of graduate study and even you know career planning certainly than there was when I got into the business. It just had not evolved to the extent that it has now, whether it's in student affairs, business affairs, or even academic affairs in many respects.

Similar to Dr. Greene, Dr. Simpson, was trying to go to school to do something else when he sort of fell into a career in the budding field of higher education administration.

I literally was broke when I graduated and wanted to go to law school. I had just applied for a hall director job and a graduate assistance-ship, at an institution just to hold me over and sort of make academic progress while I was in the best case saving money to go to law school... I ended up being hired in both the admissions office, for 20 hours a week, and into residential life as a hall director. They had a 1950s housing operation and it's whatever, the early 80s. And now all those things that graduate students learn about with respect to student development theory and theoretical frameworks through which to work with students and make decisions administrative or otherwise that was an emerging body of knowledge and research coming into the field really at that point. There were not many highly developed master's or PhD programs in the country; there were a few, but not a lot. And the number of graduates they were producing was not nearly the number that programs produce today. So I was kind of caught up in all that. And that's really what set me on this administrative path from that point.

Ultimately, what caught Dr. Simpson up in this new movement in higher education was some mentorship and perspective on the field. Dr. Simpson's boss at the time was someone who according to Dr. Simpson had a broader vision, than a lot of other administrators in higher education, for the emerging profession of higher education administration as a field.

I was hired by and to some degree mentored by someone who to me symbolically at least reflects a kind of maturational point in, for higher

education in administration. I was hired by an associate dean of student affairs who was also director of admissions. In his associate dean role he had responsibility for housing, you know residential life, etc. But he had just returned to this institution from, ah, an 18-month sabbatical he had taken, just for the sole reason of going to another institution to get his PhD in Higher Education Administration. So he came back with this frame of reference and set of professional aspirations not only for himself, but also for the institution. And he was out to sort of professionalize, in a healthy and positive way, the administrative bureaucracy of that institution.

This early entry and understanding of higher education administration provided the foundation, and it was housing that provided what Dr. Simpson termed his launching pad.

After that is a series, which I think is true for a lot of people, a series of positions, starting in housing, which is a big launching pad for people, just because they employ a lot of people; most programs do. And it is pretty good fundamental preparation for the breadth of responsibilities because you deal with judicial issues, you deal with financial issues, management obviously is an important piece, facilities management, counseling, crisis intervention – all of that stuff happens in that venue.

From the conventional launching pad of housing, it was actually breaking out of his comfort zone in student affairs and student life that ultimately provided the impetus for higher-level administrative positions.

I have done some uncharacteristic things probably professionally that have proved very valuable and helpful for me. I was asked to be the administrative director, the associate director of the student health center at the time when the existing director had died... So it was highly disruptive to the organization; I was not a physician; he was. They had a chief psychologist to replace him as the senior medical doctor, but they had no one reliable, competent, in management, fiscal oversight, or even just routine administration. So I was asked to take that on as a special assignment, which is what got me out of the housing track and I did that for 13 months. It was a very good, a very difficult situation, obviously to follow, not only a very popular, long-standing administrator in a complicated organization within an institution, the student health center. It's a comprehensive health-care facility, with more than 10 health care providers, physicians, a full complement of records, nursing staff, an x-ray tech and all this stuff, none of which I knew anything about. What I realized was that administrative skills are transferable, even in sort of foreign environments; and we had good success at that period of time. And that kind of found its way into senior administrative opportunities. Senior administrative opportunities did follow for Dr. Simpson, as he

shared in the interview:

I became a dean of students, or chief student affairs officer a year after that, went to another institution for a president, who was a first time president, who hired a totally new executive team, which was a terrific

experience. So you have a new VP for academic affairs, business affairs, student affairs, and public affairs. Working for a new president, it was, that was also a great learning experience. Came early in my career, I was 31, in a good environment, where the size of the campus was manageable enough to be a kind of dean of students in the way that people have come to interpret that phrase, that term.

So at a young age for higher education administration, Dr. Simpson was on what he termed an “*accelerated administrative track.*” However, priorities and personal decisions caused Dr. Simpson to slow his progression on that accelerated track.

I did that for a couple of years, I had a great time, I had a great boss, and I made a personal decision also, because we were just starting a family, to step off that track. I had no aspiration at that time to be a president of a university. And in my estimation at 32, I assumed I had at least another 30 years of this work ahead of me and if I was in a, you know a senior executive position, you know then I am either going to move every five years from one institution to the next, because you always want to a different or greater challenge, or I was going to try to make a decision where I wasn't going to have to move, however often, and be a good father as well, as be a good higher education administration. Again, I also had a chance to come back to a place where I had been before and so I did that. Which in terms of balance, that had a lot to do with my decision-making at that point.

The decision to move off of an accelerated administrative track was a personal decision that Dr. Simpson seems content with at this point in his career, having stated:

I didn't have a career aspiration at the very beginning to be a president or an executive vice president or whatever. I wanted to be a contributor in my field and the field of education seemed to me to be broad enough to allow me to do that... And the way that it has come together for me, I have been fortunate to not only work with and for good people; but I also feel like I have been fortunate to have the kind of opportunities before me where I could make choices, about what I felt that I valued most and that has had a lot to do with what in retrospect, with what I guess a vitae looks like.

So rather than continue to move up in the broad field as an executive leader, Dr. Simpson, dug into his field and evolved as an academic in the field of higher education administration.

Stepping off what then was kind of an accelerated administrative track created more room for me to evolve on the academic side, and to do some other things. I did a little more enrollment consulting early on, when I had more time. I started teaching, when I came back in 1992, in the college, I submitted my credentials, I did some writing during the first 5 or 6 years and then I applied for tenure and retreat rights in the college I guess maybe in 1998 or 1999, I'm not certain, 6 or 7 years into the teaching responsibilities with this college.

At the time, the security of tenure was of greater value than the drive to be a senior executive.

Getting an academic home in the college, as a continuing employee of an institution was important to me, and in my view is not insignificant. And I say that because there are various ways to garnish that. Some people, some senior officers, and you may find this in your research, some senior officers who start in the administrative track and want to work their way into academics or teaching, work their way into academic roles, negotiate that when they move from place to place. So they are credentialed, they have their PhDs, they have past teaching experience; but as they move from one institution to another, they may negotiate a faculty appointment as part of their hiring. I wasn't moving; I was in one place and earning my stripes within the college while I was an administrator. So applying for, you know, a tenured position with retreat rights as an administrator, was a little atypical, I suppose. But this was important to me, because it gave, and now you can see how it all fits together for me, it gave me and my family security with respect to place, if it is something we choose over position or income at a different point in time...coming full circle to the earlier part of our conversation. If I don't stay active, if I'm not teaching, if I don't have an ongoing academic interest, then tenured home is really less relevant.

In the end, however, Dr. Simpson did eventually become an executive leader, but was also able to contribute academically through teaching.

Dr. Simpson and the scholarship of teaching. As was evidenced in the review of his curriculum vitae, Dr. Simpson has a history of scholarship that includes both teaching and application, which on occasion has led to publication. It was his active teaching work, however, that qualified Dr. Simpson for the study, under one of Boyer's domains: the scholarship of teaching.

I have taught historically, in the main once a year, on occasion, per semester. Currently, governance has been the focus. Historically, that has included, on multiple occasions, introduction to higher education, student development, critical issues in higher education, umm, the American college student. I think that is probably the extent of it.

When asked about defining his teaching as scholarship, it was Boyer's domains (1990) that Dr. Simpson deferred to.

I'd answer that question by deferring to Boyer's paradigm, talking about the scholarship of discovery or the scholarship of teaching and you know how does that dynamic in any of the four spheres, how does that dynamic manifest in a tangible way around the act of what we are regarding as scholarship.

As Dr. Simpson continued speaking about scholarship, whatever definition was provided by Boyer's domains faded and a unique personal definition of scholarship as the core began to emerge. This unique view of scholarship as core and the meaning found therein is explored in Chapter 5.

Introduction to Mr. Larry Davidson

Summary of curriculum vitae. Mr. Larry Davidson has over 30 years experience across the student affairs spectrum, with experience in housing, residential life, judicial affairs, student activities, Greek Affairs, and minority student services to name a few areas. Mr. Davidson is currently Associate Vice President of University Residential Services, which includes responsibility for auxiliary operations of housing, residential life, dining, and the student union. Mr. Davidson has worked progressively through student affairs from Residential Director, to Director of Residential Services, to Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs and Student Life. Mr. Davidson serves and has served a number of university committees, is a member of and served on the boards of several housing related associations at the regional, national, and international level, has done a number of consultations and presentations to other universities on housing, has received a number of honors and awards for his service and has produced several publications and presentations on housing and residential life. Mr. Davidson's current scholarship is in the Scholarship of Application, as he works through his professional affiliations to develop and share knowledge on housing and residential life at universities.

Interview setting. I met with Mr. Davidson on a beautiful mid-summer day. Mr. Davidson's office was deep in the bowels of a large student services building. Frankly as a graduate student, I had little familiarity with the building, but it was bustling, both outside of the interior waiting area and inside the waiting area. This was by far the most student-oriented waiting area I had sat in. The

waiting area was designed for students to help themselves to what they may need. With dozens of pamphlets and packets with information, everything from study abroad, to transfer credits, to living and learning community options. There was a TV with university information and infomercials playing. It was sort of a doctor's office for the teenager and appropriately different from any of the other buildings where I conducted interviews. From the hustle and bustle of the waiting area, Mr. Davidson took me back through the corridors and cubicles to his corner office on the first floor, completely on the opposite corner of where I had entered the building. His office had two windows for walls with a sidewalk on the other side of one window wall and a flowerbed outside of the other window wall. We sat together at a small circular table directly in front of his desk. From that table we carried on an approximately 50 minute interview and conversation about Davidson, scholarship, and housing.

Background in education and administration. In many respects, Mr. Davidson's story is not all that different from Dr. Simpson's; they both arrive at school thinking about being educators, but not sure how to contribute. And they both entered the profession of student affairs in its infancy while a student and realize they can contribute to education through administration. However, while Dr. Simpson was on his accelerated administrative track toward a senior level executive leadership position, Mr. Davidson's track was far more focused from the beginning of his career through his current position with a primary emphasis on student housing.

The origins of Mr. Davidson's focus on housing can be found in his first housing experiences as an undergraduate student.

Started in under-graduate. I had a really excellent experience my first year living in residence halls. Had always thought I was going to go into education, but always thought of education in terms of teaching and I realized that education is much more than just the classroom.

As an aspiring educator, a little push helped solidify the realizations Mr. Davidson was coming to as an undergraduate student.

And I was encouraged by my hall director at the time, to get involved in fall welcome and then become president of my hall council. Ultimately I became president of the residence hall association. And I just had a good series of administrators who were strong mentors and helped me realize that I could achieve my goal of being an educator by working in the housing profession. So actually as an undergraduate, realized I wanted to go into housing as my career.

Mr. Davidson then aligned his education with what he saw as the necessary skills for his chosen career.

It was the 70s; you could do a lot of weird stuff academically. So I got an interdepartmental, interdisciplinary major in liberal arts, psych, soc, and home economics. Those things seemed to be what I would need in the housing profession, housing and dining both, because the two things are coupled together; they're not separate. So I took a lot of food science courses and some other things, knowing that I was going to go to grad

school, that if I wanted to pursue a career I needed to at least get a master's degree.

His decision to focus on housing was confirmed through his experience in his master's program.

I worked in housing the first year, but then the graduate program wanted to have us experience things outside what we thought we were going to do our career in. So I was also in student activities and orientation. I realized that I like housing better, went down that road.

With a career path firmly focused in housing, Mr. Davidson went through a series of progressively responsible positions within the field of housing. With each new position, Mr. Davidson had experiences paralleling the ongoing historical progression of the housing field at large, marking his place in the field. However, to understand his place within the field, a little history beyond him was necessary.

Do you want a little history about housing? No, because it's really sort of interesting and it has framed a lot of my experience and it ties back to the stuff that you want to talk about. Student housing during the golden years of higher education as it is sometimes referred to, post World War II with the G.I. Bill there was a huge demand for housing. Because the local communities where most colleges and universities were located relied on the townspeople to provide housing and boarding housing and stuff like that, but there was such a huge influx that institutions started building more housing in the late 40s, early 50s. And what institutions did is they

turned to quartermasters that were now no longer in the services to make it housing happen. That's why a lot of the housing facilities from that time are very block like. Very barrack like. The dining halls were very stainless steel. So they could be sprayed down. You know, big old bathroom, shower room stuff like that.

That was the environment that existed when Mr. Davidson entered higher education and the next change in housing occurs.

The next big wave came in the sixties when the baby boomers, like myself started arriving at higher education and there was another big move to build housing. The federal government was actually providing no-interest loans for public institutions to build housing. And that's the period when housing was built with all the furniture built in, because it could be covered under the loan, because it became part of the structure and not part of the FF&E, furnishing and finishing (expense). Umm, and it was about this time when all the social activism was going on, it was a societal shift that housing as a profession, an educational profession started to emerge. Before it was just putting people in beds, now it became, ooohhh, learning takes places here. So that's how the whole profession started.

And though he didn't realize it at the time, it was here at the birth of the modern profession where Mr. Davidson found himself.

So, in actuality, even though I didn't realize it at the time, I was at the beginning of this profession, as it's now defined. Which is very

interesting. So a lot of my colleagues and I have spent a lot of time talking about that.

Eventually, Mr. Davidson found himself as a Director of Housing when his exposure to life beyond the student life aspects of housing helped him come to new realizations about the field.

As the Director of Housing that's when I got more exposure on the business side of housing, in terms of coming up with budgets, room rates to take to the board, those sorts of things. And, it probably, it was in that period of my career that I realized that creating environments for students to live in and engage with other students in was really much more than the programming that takes place in the building. How do you create an environment that encourages engagement, encourages development, those sorts of things, but how do those spaces interact with the rest of campus?

This question about creating the right environment for education has been much of the focus of the rest of Mr. Davidson's career, throughout a number of progressively responsible positions in student housing and student affairs. Ultimately, regardless of institution, it has been his commitment to housing and to an affiliated housing association that has defines Mr. Davidson's scholarly contributions.

Mr. Davidson and the scholarship of application. The scholarship of application is the engagement in applying the theories and principles found in scholarship to solve problems or improve situations (Boyer, 1990). Scholarship of application takes a modern look at service, considering service to both the lay

public, in a role such as consulting or expert testimony, and service to the institution itself, with work on committees, such as self-studies, departmental sub-committees or search committees (Braxton et al., 2002). Example activities might include departmental committee service, expert testimony, off-campus consulting, or studies conducted for local government or organizations.

In listening to, reading, and analyzing Mr. Davidson's experiences in working with an international housing organization juxtaposed to the definitions of the scholarship of application found in the literature, his work with this organization exemplifies the scholarship of application. His contributions and leadership within the organization have led to a book, several summits, and several institutional pilot programs implementing the ideas and theories related to housing that have come out of the work Mr. Davidson has done and led. In Chapter 5, Mr. Davidson's thoughts and feelings about housing as education, his scholarship in housing, and the meaning of scholarship as creating a residential environment that encourages engagement and development in relation to an institutions core are explored.

Introduction to Dr. Steven Roberts

Summary of curriculum vitae. Dr. Steven Roberts is Senior Vice President for Research and Development Services. Dr. Roberts has worked in and around research and higher education for nearly 30 years both in the public and private sector. Within the public sector Dr. Roberts has held both a tenure-track appointment in public affairs and administration and an affiliated appointment in

computer science and technology. On the private side, Dr. Roberts founded and ran several research and technology-consulting firms working in management, energy, and environmental issues. Dr. Roberts has served on a number of boards at the local, state, and national level. He has authored over a dozen peer-reviewed publications and dozens more non-peer reviewed reports and white papers. Dr. Roberts currently holds a Professor of Practice appointment in addition to his administrative position. His current research is within the Scholarship of Discovery domain and focuses on large-scale information management.

Interview setting. It was a hot summer day when I walked up the four flights of stairs to meet with Dr. Roberts. Everything about the Green-certified building said energy conservation, from the abundant natural light throughout the building to the glass of water I was given by the receptionist. The waiting area had a number of magazines and journals available, like the *Harvard Business Review* and the *Academy of Management Review*, giving the area the feel of business. Dr. Roberts' office where the interview took place had a large desk with a couple leather chairs in front. We sat at a small but nice round table a few feet in of the leather chairs and spoke for about 30 minutes about research, scholarship, and the administration thereof.

Background in education and administration. Dr. Roberts' path to administration is probably the most non-traditional of all of the participants in the study, but reflects a path becoming more common in higher education today, that of moving from business and industry leadership into higher education

administration. Although Dr. Roberts' path was not that straightforward, he was originally an academic before all else professionally.

Career path wise, got my PhD in 1986, I had actually joined the faculty at the university in 85 as a lecturer and then as soon as I got my PhD I went on as a tenured faculty member at the university in 86. My degree is in Public Administration, a PhD in Public Administration, with a specialization in Science and Technology Policy and Organizational Theory. I went on the faculty, was on the faculty there for three years and then made a decision to move into the private sector for a number of reasons, but ended up in Washington DC. I was in the private sector from 1989 until 2004 then re-emerged back in the academic sector coming to my current institution in January 2005. So I started out in the academy, went out in research consulting, and I will explain what that means in a minute because it ties very directly with what you are studying.

While not the pure professor scholar serving in administration like Dr. Grayson, Dr. Roberts has an extensive background in research in the public and private sector. While a faculty member, Dr. Roberts made publication a focus of his work and continued on some level of scholarship in his field after leaving the academy, although it did diminish on volume greatly from his days as an academic. And he intends to pick back up now that he is back in academia, as he stated in the interview.

So, just to give you my publication history, up until I left, even for a couple years after I left the academy in 88-89, I was publishing, 3 or 4 peer

reviewed articles a year. And then, as soon as I got into the private sector, that went down to probably one a year or one every other year. So it really tapered off as soon as I got into the private sector. I would probably do at least two conference presentations a year, so I was being active at some of the conferences. And now that I have come back into the academy, I'm going to sort of rev that back up again, but not at the level when I first started.

While in the private sector, research was his main area of expertise and he worked primarily in his discipline from a non-academic perspective.

I did a lot more work specifically in environmental policy and energy policy and then a lot of work in organization design and organization theory. So when I went out into the private sector I actually started research consulting firms and much of what we were doing was researching different areas. Most of that work was funded by specific government organizations or the private sector. Most of the work was not published. It was publishable but it was not published; white papers, research notes, for these organizations.

While not at the intensity of a university professor seeking tenure, Dr. Roberts shared in the interview that he was staying active as far as scholarship and research are concerned.

I was running a research firm so I was actually doing original research on a number of different topics. You know I was building data sets; I was

doing analysis off of the data sets. Again, not at the same intensity I was doing when, I left the academy, but still doing it.

And while he was active and working in the research field, ultimately, it was being even closer to ongoing research that brought Dr. Roberts back into the academy.

I think what happens is I had grown the firm to several hundred people. So I was less engaged actually in the day-in and day-out research, because I was actually the CEO running the company. I had an interest in getting back somewhere closer where I could do the work. So that was one of the motivations to do that.

Now that he is back in a university environment Dr. Roberts works in and around research all day as the Senior Vice President for Research and Development Services.

So I'm Senior Vice President for Research and Development Services, which includes research, entrepreneurship, innovation, and our multi-disciplinary institutes. I also oversee the tech transfer function. So on the research side, what it means is I help lead all the systems that facilitate research for the university. I don't do the research; the research is done by the faculty members. But I help them get their grants submitted and help them collect their invoices on their grants. I help them put the infrastructure in place for that. If they need I run all the systems that check them for their compliance with experimentation, with human experimentation and animal experimentation. Provide animals for animal

experimentation; provide oversight in terms of research compliance and integrity with all the rules and regulations for research that apply to our researchers. I have research facilities that I oversee on campus. We have eight buildings that we oversee across our four campuses and I also deal with research strategy.

Ultimately for Dr. Roberts his academic and professional interests converge and are manifest in his scholarly activities.

I would say there is a strong relationship between what I have done historically research wise and what I do in my job, which is great. Over the years I have studied research and technology policy. For example I am running a research study right now, that's a survey of other universities about how they manage large-scale research projects. So, it's pretty close.

Dr. Roberts and the scholarship of discovery. Whether his previous work as a tenure-track faculty member, a CEO in the private sector, or now as a university vice president, Dr. Roberts has carried on an active research agenda in his field of study. Dr. Roberts said of his current scholarship practices,

It is discovery... I've been publishing my whole life. So I still do publish, but it is not a requirement of my position to publish. I'm not on a tenure track position. I am on a professor of practice distinction. I get no research support as a professor of practice because again the assumption is I am bringing practice to the table, not necessarily research.

Regardless of his faculty position, related to research and scholarship, Dr. Roberts is actively working on a research agenda related to his administrative work.

The current project that I have moving toward publication is this work I'm doing in large scale project management for universities. And that is a survey-based project, so the sample has been identified, the survey instrument has been completed, the survey instrument has been distributed. We're actually in the middle of waiting for the results back from the survey. And then we'll do some analysis and get that work out the door. So that's the immediate project.

Dr. Roberts is not completely handcuffed regarding research as an administrator, commenting that he is, “able to spend time and funding within this position.” The time and funding available in his position as an administrator along with the relationship between his administrative work and research interests contribute to the unique meaning of scholarship that emerged for Dr. Roberts around the alignment of his academic, administrative, and scholarly interests.

Chapter 5

THE MEANING OF SCHOLARSHIP

Throughout the data collection and analysis process, it became more apparent that the definition of what scholarship *means* was more nuanced than the broad domains of scholarship presented in Boyer's work. Rather it seemed scholarship was more personal and held symbolic meaning for each participant. It is that meaning or essence of scholarship for each participant that is at the heart of this study. Through the exploration of each participant's understanding of what is doing for scholarship, based on his or her own lived-experience with scholarship, an understanding of what scholarship means for each participant began to emerge. My interpretation of what was experienced, the scholarship, and how it was experienced, the meaning, is the focus of this chapter. The chapter is divided into five sections, one section for each of the five participants. The five sections explain and describe what scholarship is and means for each participant based my interpretation of their lived-experience.

Dr. Nancy Greene – Scholarship and Maximizing the Value in Education

Throughout the analysis process, one attribute about Dr. Greene consistently surfaced again and again and that was the value she placed on things she cared about. Value was inherent in the words that she spoke and surrounded her feelings around her family, education, and scholarship. The last two areas, education and scholarship, are linked in that each contributes to and adds value to the other for Dr. Greene. As I explored the language of Dr. Greene, the meaning

of scholarship as a way to maximize value in education began to emerge. (See Appendix G for Inductively developed thematic categories for participant 1).

Dr. Greene and personal values. Value could be found both internally, as a sense of value could be found regarding her family and the early desires to work together and the great respect and admiration in the glowing way she spoke of her brother's accomplishments. *"Of course, he has done very, very well. You've probably seen him on commercials. That's my brother."* Similarly career decisions in her life have reflected this value Dr. Greene puts on her family, stating that,

Began in various management roles and then moved into administrative positions and then back to the faculty. When I adopted a child and went back into the faculty for about a decade. And then went back into administrative roles. So it is kind of a flip-flop, as you will often see women doing when they get to certain stages in their lives.

This decision to put family in front of a budding career clearly demonstrates her commitment to family values. Similar values can be found regarding the fit of her career and personal interests, such as her decision to take on her current position,

Yeah. After 25 years in the community college system, it was a good fit for me and it was just well timed. So, yeah, it was just one of these things that comes up in life. You are not necessarily planning on it. Because the reality is I already know I can work in all sorts of environments that aren't universities or community colleges. That's the hard decision. Do you

want to stay in education or not? But if you like a constant teaching and learning and kind of an invigorating environment.

These values extended externally and are seen in the respect she shows for other educators. For example as the first Vice Provost for Intercollegiate Connections, it would be very easy to take the credit for the work the office has already accomplished, but in speaking of the success of the office to-date, Dr. Greene deferred to her predecessor for much of the success.

The Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs here basically constructed a program, which now they have hired me to help implement the program. But I have to give him credit; he is really the mastermind who did the research behind how well transfer students do. And what are the platforms upon which certain groups of transfer students tend to be more successful in terms of baccalaureate degree completion.

Similar respect and value could be found in the way Dr. Greene spoke of her students.

And a lot of them are professionals already in education, and so they know a lot. They bring a lot to the table to start with. People like you and your colleagues I am sure in the program. I am sure you have learned as much from them as you have from your instructor.

This value and respect for students expanded beyond simply a teacher-student relationship in demonstrating the value for the kind of collegial relationships you make in teaching at the university level. Considering myself

and other students in a higher education graduate program as her example, Dr. Greene said,

Relational connections, I think, are important and are actually really helpful. I've met a whole lot of people who work here at the university being a newbie here, by way of who has been in my class. Some of your colleagues in your program are other people throughout the university. I meet people who work at community colleges because they are in my classes. Oh I worked over at XXXX community college and I don't remember that. So there is a relational element that I like a lot and that is a good connection.

Dr. Greene's values extended beyond her family and her colleagues and into her professional commitments as well. For example before taking on her current position as Vice Provost, she felt the obligation to complete her previous commitments.

They proposed the possibility of my moving over here last January. But I would have not felt good just picking up and leaving my college in the middle of the academic year. I would not want to do anything to de-rail them. So I promised to see the year through, help them get a search underway, then bow out to come over here, while they proceeded on.

Seeing the year through is exactly what she did, much like she plans on keeping her current administrative commitments,

Any time you are trying to create big culture shifts or change, you have to really commit to three to five years to get that going. And after examining

this first year, it will take us the full five years... And so, it will take us a while. So, oh I think it is just a commitment I need to make. I don't think it would be very healthy for the university or the community colleges to start something big and new and then have key people pull out.... And I promised I wouldn't do that; so I have no intention of it.

The commitments to her profession, her students and her family all serve to illustrate Dr. Greene's commitment to personal values. Similarly Dr. Greene places value on education and scholarship. As the tremendous value Dr. Greene places on education and scholarship becomes clearer, so to does the meaning of scholarship.

Dr. Greene and educational values. During the interview Dr. Greene was very open about her thoughts on education and what it should be. She specifically shared how she went about teaching and how she felt about learning and that it needed to be an interactive experience.

I've been using for years, pretty much a collaborative learning process, whereby you do form groups for most things, just to get organized for class. And I have some structures that I have used over the years for how to do that. How many to have in a group, how you set up your exercises, getting people knee-to-knee and eye-to-eye on things. Only spending so much of a class period describing and then getting them into an activity where they talk about it. Because they don't learn as much by listening as they do by having a chance to really grapple with the material. You know quite a bit of writing, some discussion boards, some reflection at the end

of every single class. You know, what do you feel was the most important thing that you learned? Where do you still feel like you are grey or muddy on this?

Two pieces stand out to me in this comment, first the process, several times throughout the interview Dr. Greene talked about the mental processes related to learning and scholarship. As our conversation continued and Dr. Greene got more specific about one of her classes, what began to emerge was the learning she was going through during the process as well.

The Community College 580 course was really interesting because we broke up into groups and they each had a small portion of the class where again they had to present and I gave them directions on how they had to present and engage us. But there were all sorts of interesting things; like I didn't know they did this at that college, you know little things that are good for you to know if you are going to be the one interacting with on behalf of the university. I want to be up-to-date in what they are offering and how they are doing it and what people are thinking. You come into contact in that case with a lot of people who work in community colleges. So from a professional standpoint, from an administrative standpoint, those are good relationships to build. And I have learned from them and I think they felt like they learned from me. And so it was a mutually beneficial process.

It wasn't the first time in the conversation that Dr. Greene brought up her learning and what she was getting out of participation in scholarship. In the

original introduction of HED 691, Dr. Greene mentioned that the class did interesting things that were “helpful to her,” just as she felt the CC 580 class as a mutually beneficial experience. This give-and-take with scholarship was also evident in the service and application Dr. Green participated in and what begins to emerge is the idea that scholarship is not just about teaching, learning, and application, but rather scholarship is a process of value and a valued process.

There is also kind of a process that happens when you are forced to write about something or reflect on the progress that you have made or not made and examine the data. What’s working and what’s not and present it to another group? So I did present at a transfer conference in Texas. By going to conferences you learn a lot about what other schools are doing, but it does force you, when you have to prepare for an audience with a lot of other college faculty and administrators, to think through what is working and what is not. You know, why don’t you know that piece of data when they ask you that, “Well, gee, that is a really good question and I am going to find out the answer to that.” So I did do a little bit of that this year.

In getting to the heart of the activities and tasks that Dr. Greene was defining as scholarship, the item that repeatedly re-surfaced was the idea of scholarship occurring at a certain level of mental processing.

That is a different sort of thing and it does force you to sit down and anytime you are force to write down what you are thinking about those things you have to sort and categorize and synthesize, you know kind of

figure out in your mind, what would I recommend if somebody said,

“What are the top five leadership books you would recommend and why?”

You know that’s a level of processing that is different.

Part of that process for Dr. Greene was about thinking and how much thought something required, which was part of scholarship that she tended to enjoy.

I liked to do that because it forces to you think about what you are doing and why you are doing it, how consistent it is with the research, how inconsistent it is, whether or not it holds up to other people’s questioning.

You know all of those kinds of things are reasons to be doing that.

Dr. Greene found great value in the mental processes of scholarship required to perform scholarly. For example in preparing for teaching a class Dr. Greene commented that,

If you are only going to spend one period on topic X, what are the critical things you will try to convey or help people to understand differently, or to learn? And then how will you be able to tell if they learned it? And there is an element of that, that’s, you know, it is very enriching and it is helpful to me personally to think things through at that level.

This value of care for the educational experience was evident throughout the interview and text. For example, Dr. Greene’s concern for how well her class went this past semester was evident in her comments about it.

I think it went pretty well. Most of the students said they really enjoyed getting into something at that level. It gave them such good preparation.

And those who signed up were considering already either for topics for their dissertation or topics related to their professional aspirations. That had value for them. It was not an esoteric exercise in how to do this. It had applicability for them.

The applicability found in sharing scholarship begins to scratch the surface of the meaning of scholarship for Dr. Greene, as do her comments on why teaching needs to be applicable, for student.

I think most students really like that. They do want to use these years. I always tell them, "You are not going to have this chance again; you might as well use this time when you are a student to get as much as you can out of the experience, because it will help you professionally assuming you are studying something associated with your intended profession."

The applicability of learning goes both ways and is one of the major driving forces behind why Dr. Greene teaches.

I enjoy it. I think it is enriching for me. It forces me to keep up-to-date on the research in the literature, which I like. You are forced to read. I learn new things from my students. They'll very often bring up new things that I wasn't up-to-date on. "Well, gee, I got invited by so-and-so to this conference, and did you know Illinois does this now?" And I will be like, "No. I didn't know that," because we all have different connections and things.

Ultimately, it is the connections that drive scholarship for Dr. Greene.

While scholarship is a process that produces educational value, it is the balance

and connections to education that scholarship provides which was central to the meaning of scholarship for her. Scholarship wasn't simply an activity for Dr. Greene, scholarship was the bond that connected her educational values.

It all kind of comes together there is no way to split it all apart; you know, it is just not that neat. It all kind of intertwines like that... I mean you can draw on so many different things and answer questions so easily; it has become your second nature that I think it makes it a better experience for the students and easier for me in some regards as well.

Through the presentations and consulting, through the administration and meetings, through teaching and learning, scholarship connects and balances competing educational priorities for Dr. Greene. And we know it is a process of value and importance for Dr. Greene, because she makes the time to do scholarship.

You would have to build in the time, and, you know, as we mentioned earlier, the economics. Although it doesn't change it a lot, staff reductions do. Where resources and time is going to go, you cut out the things that seem least important, like I don't have time to have you read those three research studies anymore, just get the curriculum stuff done. Gotta get it done because it is more tangible; it seems more urgent in the moment. But perhaps we should be constructing it based upon what somebody else's research showed them what worked and what didn't work. It's hard. I mean where do you find the balance between most of those things?

For Dr. Greene, the answer to this last question is simple: it is scholarship. Scholarship is the ultimate tie that binds, connecting the administrative, teaching, and scholarly perspectives.

There are a lot of things you learn by way of these connections that happen by way of your administrative role and your teaching role, that you are thinking about when you are doing these things that just kind of it's different. You know, sort of a constant interwoven relationship.

Through this understanding of the interwoven relationship of scholarship to education and administration and administration to education and scholarship, the understanding of what scholarship means to Dr. Greene became more evident.

Scholarship and maximizing the value of educational opportunities through scholarship. For Dr. Greene, like all of the participants in the study, what Dr. Greene does for scholarship is closely related to what scholarship means to her. If scholarship is a process that balances and connects Dr. Greene's educational contributions, then what it means is being able to maximize those contributions within an educational environment. This give and take, this academic value found in scholarly contributions, within three areas teaching and learning, improving administrative practices, and in the application of scholarly expertise.

For Dr. Greene, learning with and from the students was an important aspect of adding and receiving educational value through scholarship. For Dr. Greene embarking on the course of study was about more than teaching the

students; it was about her learning and growth as well. In this way she is maximizing her learning and the learning of her students.

HED 691 which was a Higher Ed course taught for doctoral students and we were studying specifically the transfer process. And so we did some really interesting things that actually were very helpful to me. Their research was helpful to me, because the reality is, when you are community college president at your own college in your own state, you do pay attention to a certain level of stuff that is out there nationally, but you pay a lot more attention to what's going on in your specific state and system. What we did is we had everybody identify another state that they were interested in; perhaps they wanted to work there over time, or maybe they had family there. So we set up a research construct: what they needed to find out about how the university system and the community college systems interacted in that state. It was really fascinating for me, because it's all over the map. And of course I wanted to know it better as well, so I was really interested in what they were researching. It was just now granted, you don't often get to do a doctoral level seminar where you have 12 people there, you know that is a small class. I gave them directions on how they had to present and engage us. But there were all sorts of interesting things; like I didn't know they did this at that college; you know, little things that are good for you to know if you are going to be the one interacting with on behalf of the university. I want to be up-to-

date in what they are offering and how they are doing it and what people are thinking.

While Dr. Greene is receiving the benefit of new perspectives provided by the student research, she is teaching the students about the research process and the synthesis necessary to apply research to administrative structures. This back and forth between the theoretical and practical maximizes learning opportunities for the students.

I often find with students that part of the role of a teacher is to try to get them to go look at the research or the facts related to area that they're speaking about. Well "we decided that we are going to do our performing arts program like this and now we do it like that". Well, why? "Well, I don't know because we just decided to." So is there any data that shows students learn more by doing it this way or anything like that? And you realize they've not given it any thought. They just really literally came from some other field. They don't have an education background. That is often the case in colleges and universities. People don't have any formal training on how people learn or acquire knowledge. And unless somebody asks them, it is just, "Well, I was in charge of that program; so I decided to structure it that way." And it never occurs to them to look to assessment issues or how other colleges did it or anything else. Yeah, so I think a teacher can be helpful in getting them to look at the research, helping them to synthesize it, helping them to make the right connections.

The mutual benefits between teaching and administration go beyond the content in the classroom too, allowing Dr. Greene to maximize her efficiency and effectiveness as a teacher and administrator.

So there is a benefit in being a fellow teacher with them. They view you different as an administrator because they know that you know their circumstances and you understand better their circumstances as a result of what you are doing. And you better understand who you are serving...But there is benefit as an administrator, for teaching on an ongoing basis, that's aside from the scholarship side, that's just how well you know the student body. You know and how do you know the processes. How hard is it to get assistance with blackboard. How hard is it to do this or to do that? How much time does it take you to prepare for your classes, where you begin to understand better the challenges of other employees, because you too are doing those things?

The same value add and reciprocal learning that Dr. Greene maximized through the scholarship of teaching and administration experience, can be found in the cross over between administration and Dr. Greene's scholarship of application. When talking further about her conference presentation on community college transfer she eventually shared that she . . .

... Had an ulterior motive. I wanted to learn more about the Texas system. It was being hosted in Texas. The university was thinking about examining relationships with Texas community colleges. The conference is really quite well known; I've heard about it for years. But I have never

been to it, conference on transfer and I thought I will go to that, I'll present, at the same time I will attend things with some people. I made my short list, not necessarily based upon what they were talking about, but who was giving the presentation and that would give me the opportunity to say, "Hi and do you want to talk for a few minutes and so forth." And then I followed up and flew to Texas to meet with a number of them and now we have articulation agreements with some of those colleges.

This was an instance where participation in scholarship, added not only to the field through her contributions at the conference, but also added value to her home institution in developing the relationships with those other colleges. Also given the current state of things regarding school funding, the double-dip approach of accomplishing institutional goals while producing scholarship can make continued scholarship possible for Dr. Greene and maximizes the potential return on investment for both her and the institution.

To do some of my administrative role while at the same time doing some of this other role, I will probably continue to do it. As you know the university has some budget constraints that will make that more difficult. I want to maximize the use of my budget and wherever possible and look for places where I can double dip and get my work done and also do some things like that. I will just have to wait and see how many of those appear to align with one another. Because you know budgets are tight, it's not an easy time to gallivant off to a conference and present; you have got to be sure you are maximizing your scarce resources.

Together, Dr. Greene's scholarly contributions as a teacher and as an administrator further the maximization of her expertise. For example, to have a retired community college president teaching for the university is a huge plus.

It was a conversation I brought up and fortunately they said that is a great idea because they don't have a lot of retired presidents teaching for them.

They do have a few folks who are retired out of the community college system, but not at the CEO level. So that is something, as they began thinking about they, they were like, "Oh, yeah. Let's do it."

As the resident expert on community colleges her expertise and insight is to be shared up the chain of command to the president and provost of her institution.

Dr. Chan and Dr. Carmichael rely on me to keep them up-to-date with what is happening in the community college world, so that when they are having interactions with other colleges and they know the President of Western has left to take this new position. I do those things. I need to be the eyes and ears about what is happening in the community college world on behalf of them, because they've got a ton on their plate dealing with all of their day-to-day stuff.

At the end of the day, whether dealing with the university president, the provost, an employee, or a student, Dr. Greene understands and appreciates the value that her participation in scholarship adds to the teaching and learning experience.

Yeah, the ability to have some level of expertise and synthesize it into the key things that you might convey on to the next generation of leaders.

Here are key things that you need to know, as you prepare yourself to go out and take on additional roles. And I think is a level of scholarship you can't read that from a book.

Ultimately, Dr. Greene wouldn't have it any other way.

Although I do love teaching and learning and I do think it does influence whether or not you like working in education. Because the reality is I already know I can work in all sorts of environments that aren't universities or community colleges. That's the hard decision. "Do you want to stay in education or not?" But if you like a constant teaching and learning and kind of an invigorating environment.

Dr. Grayson - Scholarship and Maintaining a Scholarly Identity

While Dr. Grayson's most recent article was on the capacities of institutional control as related to inmate misconduct, his reason for doing the research and writing the article was more personal than just contributing to the field. Rather, that contribution was part of a concerted effort by Dr. Grayson to remain relevant in his field and discipline of criminology. Ultimately, this quest to remain relevant personifies the meaning of scholarship for Dr. Grayson as a full-time administrator, which is maintaining a scholarly identity as a professor. To understand and appreciate the reality of this meaning a better understanding of Dr. Grayson's scholarship, which is fundamentally different than the scholarship of the other four participants in that his scholarship has nothing to do with his

administrative position in higher education, is needed. (See Appendix H for Inductively developed thematic categories for participant 2).

Discipline specific scholarship in administration. Dr. Grayson said, *This is temporary...I know I am not a faculty member; I understand the fact that I am from an administrator's point of view...but I know I am going to go back there at some point. And that is always I think in the back of my mind; at any given time, I could be back full-time in the faculty.*

With that sentiment and understanding of the nature of the administrative position as something temporary, Dr. Grayson endeavors to maintain some semblance of a scholarly profile. Unlike the other participants in the study whose scholarship and expertise is directly related to their administrative positions, Dr. Grayson continues to stay in his discipline.

I don't study higher education. What you are getting at is a little bit different. For me, when you talk about scholarship, I think about scholarship in one's discipline. The paper that I just presented is called inmate misconduct and the capacity of institutional control and dealt with institutional management efforts on behavior in prisons. Unless you want to make some weird analogy about the university and its students as inmates.

Dr. Grayson's identity as a faculty scholar is so dominant; despite nearly 25 years as an administrator in some capacity in higher education, he doesn't

really view his experiences as relevant to other academic affairs administrators, who are likely faculty scholars like him.

I don't know that I have much in the way of wisdom or lessons learned or best practices, whatever you want to call it in the format that might reach those people. And I think a lot of people, because they come in the back door, i.e.: through faculty, not Higher Ed, I don't think they read those things.

Although Dr. Grayson is not averse to contributing scholarship to the field of higher education administration, it simply isn't what he does.

But, I don't know, I would be glad to do a guest lecture or better yet, be a panelist or be interviewed as part of a course. Whatever my experiences whether that can be used to generate discussion among students or among prospective Higher Ed people. But I don't want to study Higher Ed.

Presumably like other scholars who back into academic affairs administrators, according to Dr. Grayson, the key to his career success as a faculty-scholar and administrator was becoming a full professor first.

Most of us are full professors, and were before we got into an administrative position for a variety of reasons. If you take that job before you are a full professor, it is very, very hard to keep your research agenda going to get, to become full professor. In which case then you suffer this problem of you are not doing your own research, how can you be telling your faculty. And you have yet to make the leap to full professor or establish a national reputation yourself, and yet, "You want us to do it.

And you don't have a clue as to what's needed to do it. You don't understand because you have been there. You don't understand how hard it is to establish a national reputation and don't understand how limited I am in doing that with the resources that I have." "And why when I come to you and say I need more of X, Y, and Z, whether its grad assistants, or computers or labs, or whatever, you don't understand, because you have never been there. You think I can just do this and make it happen over the weekend." But once you are a dean, you are pretty much full-time. So if you want to be research-active, you've got to find a way to make it happen, while you do all the duties that are required of this. It is like having a 100 percent job and a second one for 10 or 15 percent.

What makes the extra job of scholarship especially challenging for an administrator is that you may need a record of scholarship to become an academic affairs administrator, but once you are in administration, scholarship doesn't count.

Scholarship doesn't count in administration and administration doesn't count as scholarship toward tenure, at least in most universities. Service as an administrator does not count toward promotion. So you can be the best dean or associate professor and chair or department head, and you will never get promoted because you are a good trooper unless you are producing scholarship, to prove you are worthy on the standard criteria that applies to everyone. Since faculty make those decisions, you can rest

assured that faculty are not going to give administrators a separate route to the head.

Ultimately, administration is set up much like it was in the 1920s. Either you go into faculty-research or you go into faculty-administration; never do the two meet.

It's not part of the job description. In fact I don't think the provost or the president would even know if I do or don't do, because it is not part of my performance review. When they say, "What did you do this year," I don't say, "I also wrote an article or a paper." They will know it, only because I have to notify them to take vacation days to go to the conference, because it is not a part of my job. It's not like they are going to pay to send me there. It's like, "Okay, fine. It's your time, your vacation; you are free to go." And I know that coming in.

Although not required, and in his mind not necessary to maintain, maintaining a scholarly agenda is important to Dr. Grayson and permeates his being as an educator.

No. I don't think it is relevant that I keep the agenda but the fact that I had a history of scholarship and scholarly research, which led to promotions and national visibility and so-on, I think is key to getting into the position in the first place and then maintaining that credibility. The problem is, one of those stacks over there is a manuscript that I am working on, but it is only one of several stacks. And it is the lowest priority in the job. Now that is my priority, but keep in mind that is nowhere in my contract as vice

provost or for that matter for deans. Often times, when a crunch comes, that is the very first thing that has to go. You can't stay home on Tuesday and Thursday when the President calls and says, "I have a meeting tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock," you have to be there. Umm, or the Provost walks in and says, "I need this by the end of the day tomorrow."

For Dr. Grayson, his being as an educator begins and ends with his identity a scholar, and the meaning of scholarship is found therein, as scholarship means maintaining an identity as a faculty scholar; however maintaining that identity is hard when one is a full-time administrator.

Scholarship in administration is hard. When it comes to scholarship and Dr. Grayson, he really looks at the concept of scholarship in two ways, as something you do and as something you know.

I think there is two ways you can talk about scholarship; there is the doing and there is the knowing. I can always find time to read, because that doesn't require as much effort to keep up with the journals and read in my area, even take a few notes. It's the creative part, where, "Okay. I've read these last 46 journal articles; I've got some general ideas. Now how do I find the time to write?"

It is finding that time to write that makes doing scholarship as an administrator hardest for Dr. Grayson.

But where do I get the data? How much time does it take me to go out and get the data, if I have to go out to beg, borrow, and steal from these formal agencies, or get grants? That's the stuff that is hard to do. When you're

in this job, it is pretty routine. People expect me to be here, at least during the 8-5 routine. Because Deans or associate deans or provosts or others have things, obviously I'm tethered (referring to his phone) and so I can be reached. The doing part is very hard when you are a full time administrator.

Like everything in life, time becomes the ultimate price and the hardest currency for an administrator trying to do scholarship. However, if scholarship is a priority, as it is for Dr. Grayson, time can be found in a number of places.

But it does mean I have to catch some time where I can. And sometimes I can do it during the so-called normal course of the day. I might find myself, during the day; I might be able to read an article of two when I am waiting for a meeting to start. Or at the end of the day, if I am burned out on what I have been doing, and I don't have to rush home, "It's only 4:30, but I don't want to start my next project," reviewing the by-laws for class, which is one of the things we do, we do by-laws. So I'll say, "I'll just read this journal article."

While the time in-between meetings during the day is a good place to catch up by reading an article or two, and jotting down a few notes, larger chunks of time are needed to do the major work of research, which means late nights or busy weekends.

I find, then, when I have gotten to the point that I am feeling really comfortable, like anybody else who writes in my style, then I will block out four or five hours, because all of those little two hours bits are to kind of

run ideas into an outline, or write a little piece about section a, here is section c. Now I will need four hours to put together a first draft. So, then I will take a Sunday afternoon or whatever it is and just stay home and do it. But if I want to, like on that particular article, it required that I set aside blocks of time, evenings and occasionally on weekends. But anyway, that's where I carve it out. If I am feeling in pretty good shape and not too tired, and then I'll say, "Look if it is okay with you, I am going to stay an extra two, two and half hours tonight and get some work done on the manuscript." Kind of like amateurs trying to write the novel. It took them 12 years to write their first novel and that's kind of the way it is.

Of course late nights and weekend hours mean sacrificing time away from family and other obligations, which is always something to weigh in the decision to work on scholarship as an administrator.

In addition to being married, you may not have guessed this about me given my age, I have a pair of kids at home. So there is a certain family responsibility that I am still carrying, even though I am well past that normal age. Which means 7 or 7:30, which of course means you fix dinner, you put kids in the bathtub. So there is a cost that comes with that, as you might begin to imagine.

In the big picture of things Dr. Grayson has a system that works pretty well and a wife the perfectly understands what it is he is doing.

My wife's on the faculty. So she understands and I understand when she does the same thing. As long as you don't pick the same night, it works

pretty well. But she still needs her weekends and nights sometimes, to work on her research. She has grants, so to pursue that.

Ultimately, however Dr. Grayson has a good perspective on the sacrifice he is making, one in which I can relate, as a full-time administrator, graduate student, and parent of two.

I don't want to make it sound like, it's not like, "I'm working full-time and pursuing a doctoral degree." It's not at that level of sacrifice, where you really have to forego your family time, because three nights a week you are taking classes in addition to working full-time during the day; and then, when you are not in the classroom, you are doing the work for the classroom. I don't want to make that kind of analogy.

Scholarship and maintaining a scholarly identity. For Dr. Grayson the end result of sacrifice and hard work is okay, assuming the quality is there in his work.

At any given time, I could be back full-time in the faculty. I still kind of have my self-esteem, I go to conferences, people I know, I want them to think well of me. "Oh yeah, that Grayson, he used to be." Haha.

To help further maintain his identity as a faculty-scholar, Dr. Grayson maintains a small teaching load and carries on the scholarship of teaching.

So I have an office in my old department downtown. I teach a class of about 120 students each semester, well one semester in the fall. And when I go down to the downtown to my office and I am surrounded by 18 to 20 colleagues and 40 graduate students I don't want them to think I am a

total stranger, or “Like what are you doing here,” kind of thing. I want them to be like “Oh yeah, he is one of us. He is doing what we are doing.”

Ultimately, that is all he wants, to be known as one of them.

This is temporary...I know I am not a faculty member; I understand the fact that I come from an administrator’s point of view...But I know I am going to go back there at some point. And that is always, I think in the back of my mind, at any given time, I could be back full-time in the faculty...I’m tenured. So I can do that at anytime. Especially because I want to keep my identity as being a scholar and academic and not solely as an administrator. I still do that and I still enjoy the teaching part of it; for my own kind of intrinsic rewards, for my own self-esteem. I try to do research. I find it important to me and my own self-conscious to do it; but, it is not easy to do. I have been known to maintain some profile there, but not as much as I would like. I still consider myself a scholar, not just quote, un-quote, not just solely an administrator.

Dr. Simpson – Scholarship, Administration, and Contributing to the Core

Mission

I am an educator who has been very fortunate to be active both in the core pursuit of education as a member of the faculty as well as an administrator within that aspect of the enterprise, the administrative structure and each part has probably kept me both grounded and pretty

honest in a professional context. I mean focused on core mission, core objectives, which is what I mean by honest. (Dr. Simpson)

The statement above was one that has resonated with me throughout the analysis process. For Dr. Simpson this honesty to the core mission is central to how he feels about scholarship, how he feels about administration, and what he perceives as the primary purposes of higher education, which for him is teaching and learning. (See Appendix I for Inductively developed thematic categories for participant 3).

The teaching-learning exchange, the teacher-scholar exchange, or scholar-to-scholar exchange, is inherently focused on the fundamental. That's why before we got started, let's talk about what does scholarship mean. How do you know it if you see it? You'd like to think, that every classroom exchange is, is contributing to the learning process, the process of inquiry, the exchange of ideas. The process of critical thinking and critical discourse and what comes from that, new ideas. Ideas, reconsidered. I mean, in the most, in kind of the purest sense, this community of scholars, should be implicitly engaged in the act of scholarship.

How Dr. Simpson feels about the core enterprise of higher education and therefore scholarship as teaching and learning is central the meaning of scholarship for him, which is contributing to the core. To understand this, we first need to understand what Dr. Simpson perceives to be core and not core to the

mission of the institution and how scholarship and administration fit together around the core of the enterprise, teaching and learning.

Administration and the core mission. One thing Dr. Simpson made absolute throughout our interview was his belief that administration is not the core of the institution of higher education and is not an end unto itself. This positioning of the field of administration lays the foundation for Dr. Simpson's beliefs in and about higher education.

It's very easy in administrative roles to allow the, I mean administration is largely a problem solving profession. It is very easy for the problems of the day to overtake one's agenda and for that to create, a, kind of inertia that can, can get you out of focus.

Dr. Simpson got more detailed and explicit about what he meant about losing focus of the core in talking about the field of student affairs.

Let me give you a critical and perhaps an unfair critique. I don't feel, I haven't ever really felt attached to a profession called student affairs. Student affairs is an organizational dimension of the enterprise of university administration. I don't think it is a profession unto itself. Now most people would disagree with that. It has to do with professional identity, but I don't think it has anything to do with education. So I've never subscribed to it. I think it is more of a distraction than an enabler, but that's me. See student affairs, there are people in student affairs that actually believe that is what it is that they do, it is so powerful and so important that it's really an end unto itself. "We're developing students".

It's a means to an end. Students don't come to a university to be developed; they come to a university to get a degree.

For Dr. Simpson if the focus is not on earning a degree and meeting the core mission of the institution, as an administrator you are missing the whole point.

Meaning in point of fact, people in student affairs, even use the term and call themselves, student affairs professionals. Well, I don't hear faculty call themselves, faculty professionals, or educational professionals or academic affairs professionals. They are what? They are educators. That kind of frame of reference to me is serving a completely different purpose that has little or nothing to do with education. The people that think this thing (Dr. Simpson made a circular motion within his hand and then pointed down to ground, encompassing the whole of student affairs) is so powerful that it can or should stand all on its own have missed the whole point. They're not educators. They don't even understand how, how their role should impact the other most fundamental core endeavor. They've lost their way.

The idea of being an educator as an administrator was not unique to Dr. Simpson within the study participants, but it was certainly something he spoke about at length; and ultimately, thinking of himself as an educator is how Dr. Simpson bridges the periphery that is administration, with the core objectives of teaching and learning.

Now one could have an interesting debate about that, but it is a core value. It is an administrative core value that I think keeps you focused on the core. Administration generally is infrastructure to the core. I think that is less the case if you don't think of yourself as an educator.

Thinking of himself as an educator is exactly how Dr. Simpson approaches administration and is fundamental to his belief in how administrators should operate in higher education.

The endeavor, the fundamental endeavor of teaching and learning, the discovery of new knowledge implicit in that exchange and critically important, as I said, it's the underpinning of administrative work, or should be. I just feel like I am one of those fortunate people who intentionally became an educator, and happened to come through a delivery model called administration.

Within the delivery model called administration Dr. Simpson seems to have found a way to use scholarship to keep the focus on the core mission of teaching and learning.

Scholarship in administration. For Dr. Simpson performing scholarship and educating through administration is about asking questions focused on the core of the enterprise, teaching and learning.

I mean, you don't need a classroom to teach. You don't need a classroom, physical classroom, to learn. Umm, by in large, we have those environments, virtual or in the physical form. Which ones contribute to enhanced learning? Enhanced scholarship? Are there some that detract

from that? Now you are into an interesting dialogue about facilities management, environmental management, administrative infrastructure to the core.

In asking questions focused on student learning, the core of the institution, Dr. Simpson is able to focus all aspects of student initiatives toward student learning,

By in large, classrooms have been the same for a hundred years or two hundred years. Is that environment, the physical environment, with the advent of the host of technological tools available optimal for student learning? Are we realizing the optimum in learning in this format? If so, okay; if not, why not? What would we do better or differently? It is an interesting set of questions. Umm, they're really also hard to answer is you are not entirely sure what you are measuring. Learning in relation to...what?

Dr. Simpson's last question, "Learning in relation to...what?" summarizes the dilemmas facing education at all levels at the time of this study. While from a content learning perspective, Dr. Simpson did not provide an answer; his thoughts related to the role of administration in higher education reveal that working to ensure everyone is communicating to provide the finest student learning environment are of the utmost importance.

Now you are engaging the facilities people, the budget people, what is that we are trying to accomplish here with respect to a learning environment? Umm... if it is infrastructure to the core, everything should contribute to

the optimum. Do you have situations where you are making decisions or investments that work against that core objective? Sure, sure, now we're back to parking.

Several times during the course of the interview, Dr. Simpson brought up parking as an example of a way we could relate any administrative function to an educational contribution

I mean, I think you can have such a horrific environmental circumstance that it can clearly detract from core objectives; it could clearly detract from one's ability to perform at an optimum level in the learning environment. I think that could be true of facilities management; I think that could be true of any number of services, including parking. You see what I am saying? I am having a little fun with that one; but if mishandled, it could be detrimental. I mean parking ultimately has to add value to the institution, to the core. If it doesn't, it detracts from it.

Parking, while very relevant to my learning environment as a commuter student, is on the periphery of contribution in comparison to the many services provided to students at a typical university.

So here's another closer, kind of to the portfolio, and this is interesting dialogue that has gone on. What do you need a big recreation complex on campus for? How can that in any way contribute to scholarship? Now that's an interesting question. So, on the one hand you can make a compelling case that it is completely tangential, frivolous, un-necessary. Now on the flip side of that, you can talk about stress and healthful living,

and appropriate mind, body, intellectual, emotional, physical balance, that when out of balance can contribute to the negative in terms of performance.

Dr. Simpson said this same discussion and dialogue could be had over almost any number of the services or functions within an institution that are beyond the main purpose of teaching and learning,

Do you need a health center on your campus? Now there, candidly, I would probably say, “No, not if you live in a metropolitan area where the industry can be responsive to your students.” Meaning do you have to run a health center? Okay. Do you have to? Can it be a contracted service? That is probably true of the recreation stuff too, on and on and on and on. Umm, but now that I am at it, I can make that case, about.... a whole host of things.

Dr. Simpson could indeed make the case about the contribution of teaching and learning about almost anything occurring outside of the classroom, even research. In sharing a story about his experiences teaching, Dr. Simpson talked about challenging assumptions and beliefs about what different institutions do and are focused on with his students,

In this last iteration, I had a lot of fun with the class, because they were into this whole thing about research. What’s fundamental about research in an institution of higher learning? What’s fundamental about it? You can’t do this, you can’t do that, you have to have research to have for teaching, the pursuit of new knowledge, I said, “Really you ever heard of

Bell Labs? Let's talk about the German research university. How embedded in that model was research relative to the undergraduate curriculum?" There wasn't any relationship. What, "Let's talk about education at the quintessential four year undergraduate liberal arts institution. They don't have a research agenda." So now they (the students) have cognitive dissonance in that class, because they are indoctrinated to this idea that one and the other must go together, the scholarship of research. You have institutions who have research endeavors that are totally detached from the core of teaching and learning, totally detached. They've lost their way in the same way that people in student affairs have lost their way. You see what I'm saying? The forest for the trees phenomenon, research is an end unto itself. It's not really informing teaching. It's what they tell legislatures you know when they ask and all in here, but you slide the curtain back, there's not really much relevance, there is in places like this. That's where the term, use-inspired research, that's the way to stay connected to the core.

For Dr. Simpson, scholarship and contributing as an educator always goes back to the core. At a research institution, scholarship is central to the core, and contributing to the core in whatever way he can as an educator is what scholarship means for Dr. Simpson.

Scholarship and contributing however you can as an educator.

I'm an educator, I mean, I am here as an educator and for me, and I don't think this is philosophical, it may in part may be, it is both philosophical and pragmatic, I'm an educator.

For Dr. Simpson, participating in scholarship and contributing as an educator is a decision for each individual administrator to make; for him the choice is simple, contribute in whatever way possible.

Look, over the course of one's professional life, I think that has a way of working itself out. And some of that is, you know, part of I'm sure probably, personal choice. I like to be a part of being able to contribute in whatever way possible, I think that is important. You get other stuff to do as a result of that...And I think that is important institutionally and probably helpful to me in some respect.

Contributing how and where he can toward the core of teaching and learning sometimes mean encouraging staff as an administrator.

I want everybody that I'm working with, who believes they've found their niche, I want them all in degree programs. I want junior level staff all in master's degree programs in Higher Ed. I want middle level staff who understand what it is that they are doing here. Meaning that they understand they are educators and we talk about that. I want them all in the doctoral program, for that very reason. They can contribute without a terminal degree. But their contribution will be enhanced, as will their professional sense of fulfillment if there are not only in a degree program,

but if they've completed those requirements, they've done scholarly work on their own and they've modeled for others while doing so. I think that is very important.

Just like everything else for Dr. Simpson, the bottom line is working toward the optimum, to better contribute to the educational environment.

I think you can be effective in your administrative role, but you are much more likely to be closer to your optimum if you are consuming of the contemporary literature and research, staying current. It's very important to make informed decisions and ones that will serve your institution and the students that you are ultimately most focused on.

For Dr. Simpson that focus ultimately provides the meaning found in his practice of scholarship, which is contributing to the core mission of teaching and learning, as he said to me toward the end of our interview,

I'm in an enterprise whose core mission is education; everything that I do is an act of teaching, educating, advancing the mission (air quotes). I'm nothing if not redundant (quiet laughs) but it keeps you focused on core objectives. It (scholarship) keeps you focused on why you are here. It's so easy to lose sight of that as I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Davidson - Scholarship Within the Residential Learning Environment

For Mr. Davidson, scholarship, housing, and education are interwoven into the fabric of each other in his career. The way he contributes to education is as an administrator in the area of housing and residential life by way of scholarship. His understanding of the influence space and environment can have

on education are central to his contributions toward making the best learning environment possible. (See Appendix J for Inductively developed thematic categories for participant 4).

Housing as education. To understand fully the meaning of scholarship held by Mr. Davidson, his perspective on housing and education must be explored to better understanding what education means to Mr. Davidson as an administrator. As a housing professional, education begins in the spaces found on an institutions campus.

I realized that creating environments for students to live in and engage with other students in was really much more than the programming that takes place in the building. How do you create an environment that encourages engagement, encourages development those sorts of things, but how do those spaces interact with the rest of campus?

Mr. Davidson's understanding that the physical environment has an influence on student learning is the foundation for his scholarly work and how he approaches his administrative role as more than putting people in beds, commenting that, "*How we build environments can totally change the campus. It brings the campus to life.*"

The physical environment is not the only factor in considering housing; the people factor and life within the environment has a profound influence on how residential life is maintained. For Mr. Davidson, matching the people with the process of housing and residential life development is about engagement and understanding. He says,

Conflict happens, (laughs a bit) you put people all together. Now how do you manage that conflict? But how do you use the conflict as an educational platform...In terms of achievement, responsibility, and engagement, as three tenets of the student life experience? That just reflects what housing is. Students become part of a community when they live in a student housing facility. They have to take responsibility for their actions, but they have to take responsibility for being part of the community.

Fundamentally, for Mr. Davidson as well as his institution, housing is central to the core mission of teaching and learning.

But there was an institutional decision that the housing experience is key to the core mission of the institution. And we have intentionally built more beds, and intentionally said, and we're not trying to fill the beds to make money. We think it is important to your academic and personal success to have that at least have that first year on campus.

While student programming and curriculum during their time on campus is not really Mr. Davidson's focus within administration, providing the best possible environment for student activities and interactions is a major focus and typifies his ability to contribute as an educator to housing and residential life by asking the right questions about his work.

Does the environment help them to achieve academically as well as personally? How does the environment promote engagement with their peers and also with their faculty? So the whole residential college model

fits in with that. Then when you look at the institutional excellence, impact, and access, the same sort of things happen there. How do we provide a housing program here that is going to aid that student, support that student, in being as excellent as possible, to helping them achieve their potential? How do we operate it in such a way that it doesn't limit access to the experience and what sort of impact can that experience have? So it's really sort of woven into everything. It's, I think, housing is the living laboratory, especially for first year students, to get them to be part of a university's culture and experience.

For Mr. Davidson devising and ultimately providing the best possible environment for learning is central to the meaning he finds in scholarship.

It's focused more on how does the facility allow for or provide barriers to the curriculum, not really talking about what the curriculum should be, because that is very campus specific because the curriculum tends to represent the core values of the institution. When you are talking about a student room, it really crosses all, the differentiation starts taking place when you are moving up the inverted pyramid.

Scholarship and creating a residential environment that encourages engagement and development aligned to an institution's mission. From Mr. Davidson's perspective, scholarship as a housing administrator is about more than reporting on the field of housing; rather, scholarship has provided the avenue for improving the field so that the right people have control in residential environment to make decisions in the best interest of students. For Mr. Davidson

that opportunity has come through leading a major project that is part of the international housing association, of which he is a member. The project has moved from conceptualization, to dialogue, to theory, and eventually to publishing and practice. The following excerpts take us through that scholarship journey with Mr. Davidson, highlighting how that experience defines the meaning of scholarship for him, as creating a residential environment that encourages engagement and development as related to an institutions mission. The genesis for his efforts are best told in his own words.

So, in actuality, even though I didn't realize it at the time, I was at the beginning of this profession, as it's now defined, which is very interesting. So a lot of my colleagues and I have spent a lot of time talking about that and that resulted in the "Project." So I am just going to flip it back, which when I think about Boyer's definitions of scholarship that's probably the thing I've contributed the most, in terms of scholarship. Umm, a developer, an architect, and I all served on the foundation board, the development arm of the organization. And we had meetings like twice a year and we were sitting after a meeting one-day, in a bar, with some Grey Goose. And started talking about from a chief housing officer's perspective, an architect's perspective, and a developer's perspective how frustrating the whole process is of coming up with a program statement for new student housing, that the wrong people sort of steer the boat. Sometimes it's a donor who wants to give money so that donor sort of says, "This is I want." So they end up building it, then the housing officer

has to operate in a building that makes absolutely no sense or doesn't achieve the educational mission of the institution because we cow-towed to a donor or our president wants a building as a legacy, you know whatever it might be. So we decided we were going to say, "Housing professionals should be facilitating the dialogue on what the next generation of student housing should be." So what we did was we decided to put on our own show.

Putting on their own show is exactly what Mr. Davidson and the other foundation board members did, with him guiding the ship. A summit on the future of housing was developed. So much like the way Mr. Davidson approaches administration by asking the right questions of the right people, he worked to identify and gather the right kind of contributors and have a meaningful conversation of what the future of student housing should be.

We raised all the money ourselves, but we brought together the gang of 99 we called it. We had nine college and university presidents, nine chief academic officers, nine business officers, nine student affairs officers, 18 chief housing officers, nine students from across the country who were in residential leadership roles, some information technology people, dining people, a host of others, but there was 99 people altogether, and for three and a half days in Chicago, and we paid everything for them, their hotels, their meals, all that stuff. And we went through a very facilitated discussion on what should the next generation of student housing be, not campus specific. We asked them, "Don't bring your campus politics in

here, but bring your positional point of view. As a university or college president, what do you see the role of student housing being? As a chief business officer, what do you see, chief student affairs officer?"

With the focus of the housing summit not on a specific campus, but rather on what needs from a space and residence perspective exist for optimum teaching and learning, the conversation could take place at a level that kept the focus on space and not what students might do in the space.

And we were able to have a discussion way up here (hand up in the air) because it wasn't the politics that sort of mire down the process on a campus. It was fascinating. We brought in a futurist to sort of set the tone about what we were going to do over these next three and a half days and think outside the box. We had to find this sweet spot in the middle there, where, yeah, it is beyond what we have right now, but it is achievable. So for those three and a half days that's what we tried to do. We went from a macro level of, what is the role of student housing on a college or university campus? How does it benefit the educational experience? How does it promote academic and personal success? All that stuff. And then through a series of focus groups and exercise and facilitated dialogue got it down to the architectural detail. What does it mean in terms of space per student, what does that mean in terms of how rooms relate to other rooms? How do you create this thing?

Creating this thing, the residential life space of the future, was the central focus of the discussion at the summit.

Interesting discussion around what is the appropriate number of people to live on a block. And based on research, because we gave everybody a compendium of the most recent literature about student housing and trending data, that we compiled, to sort of inform them. Then we sort of worked through some of those issues. The perfect size of a block would be 30-32 people, and neighborhoods should be 150-160 people. But the village could be 500 people or it could be 2000 people. It just depends on more than campus demographic, geography, topography. Umm, but real interesting stuff.

From all of the discussion at the summit, theories and ideas began to emerge around what the residential life space will look like in the 21st century.

We came up with a whole hierarchy that came out of this. There is the home or the student living space. Then a grouping of those homes becomes the block or the street. It's a very urban design, and the block or the streets come together to make a neighborhood, and the multiple neighborhoods create a village and how that could look very different on different campuses, depending on what their demographic is.

For Mr. Davison, the hierarchy for student living space was only the beginning as far as his scholarly contributions to this project and to the field were concerned, because communicating their findings and the work that is ongoing since that first summit are critical to furthering the field.

One of the things we were concerned about is, "How do we keep getting the information that is coming out of this process out to the membership."

It's the laboratory, like you said, so how do we keep putting information out there? We are doing some blogging things so each of the schools can blog about where they're at in the process; and when we hit critical points, there will be articles in the newsletter or the electronic newsletter about what is going on, so we keep trying to keep putting it in front of the membership.

Communicating with the membership of the organization was the first goal as far as disseminating results from their housing summit, but reaching a broader audience expands the reach of the work and its potential impact on the field. So like any other theory might be advanced, he published a book and has a website on the project, where *"You can go on to it and see the videos and stuff about it."*

However, to leave a lasting legacy in the profession and achieve the meaning he finds in scholarship, Mr. Davidson had to work to put his theories into action. The first step was actualizing the plans and theories from the housing summit.

Then we took it, we took all the information that came out of the summit and put a call out for RFP's to design professionals, architects and developers to go based on this information, "You come back with a design." We had 57 entries from around the world, who did it for free. There was a \$5,000 prize, but we think they each spent about \$25,000 to come up with the presentation they did. And we winnowed it down to eight finalists, who actually did a presentation. We had the next design

competition, which was the block and the neighborhood. And now, we are to the point right now, where we want to do a prototype of it that came out of it. So schools bid to be the host sight for the prototype and three institutions that were chosen, because we wanted to have a public a private, a small school.

To help offset the costs for schools, that as Mr. Davidson has said, are “laboratories” for study, he worked to find partnerships which could further the educational mission of the work.

We have gotten corporate partners; it was the way we raised all the money. When the prototype is built they will provide their product or their service, at below, or at no cost. And for five years we can use the prototype to actually do some assessment. Did the product do what they said their product was going to do? How did the students interact with their product? What impact did they have with the educational mission? So this is an ongoing.

Ongoing is an appropriate word for the scholarship Mr. Davidson continues to practice, as he has hosted several design showcases and has visited institutions to help further this vision of 21st century student housing.

I think the “Project” is the capstone of my career. It’s the way that I can contribute to the profession and higher education as a whole in a way that’s much more significant than even doing an excellent job at the institution I’m in. It’s my legacy...so it’s a very long-term sort of thing. I think that is my biggest contribution to the scholarship. I consider myself a

practitioner. I'm not a researcher, but this is how I'm contributing to the body of knowledge of student housing, this is how I am making that happen.

Dr. Roberts – Scholarship and Personal-Professional Alignment

For Dr. Roberts, scholarship is connected to everything he does professionally. Scholarship is something he participates in through research and teaching and is something he consumes and uses on a daily basis as a practicing administrator. The practice and use of scholarship are both central to the meaning of personal and professional alignment Dr. Roberts finds in scholarship. To fully grasp this meaning, we really have to understand how Dr. Roberts views scholarship, because his perspective on what scholarship is and should be is foundational to his approach to research. (See Appendix K for Inductively developed thematic categories for participant 5).

Scholarship and the transferability of knowledge. Dr. Roberts' perspective on scholarship really begins with the purposes of scholarship, which for him as an administrator are really about transferring scholarly knowledge; therefore, he keeps up regularly with the field.

I subscribe to a journal called R & D Management. So as the Senior VP of Research here, there's a journal out there called R & D Management, which has all the scholarly literature on how people are thinking about how you better manage research in organizations. So I get that every month; I read it. So I use that to inform what I do. I routinely read the business literature, in this area. With the Harvard Business Review, the

Sloan Management Review, *the Academy of Management Review*. *All the traditional business literature sources for research.*

I probed about the utility of this daily intake of literature and scholarship and Dr. Roberts indicated that it likely helps him professionally and is really a personal choice.

I think it's more of a factor of who I am personally in that, somebody could come into this job and not read any of those things and could probably do okay. But I think it makes you a better; I think in the end I am a better administrator because of that. Because I am looking at broader research out there that has some impact upon this job.

Impact on the job is precisely what Dr. Roberts is looking for in research, because from his perspective as a practitioner, the key to scholarship and its transferability is translating it for administrative practice and practical use. In other words applying what you learn in the reading the literature.

Yeah, so, and you know this from your University of Phoenix job, I think the issue is always that translational piece. So you take a basic research study on group decision making that comes out of the Academy of Management Journal and now you have to connect the dots between that article and what you do in your everyday job. So it's a translation piece. Right? And some people are inherently able to translate that quickly.

"Oh, I see what happened. You know if you have more groups and more groups are working together, you have some collaboration theory."

Right? Then you are going to improve the decision outcomes. Okay, then

you say, “That’s great, because I have all these research groups so if I have the research groups more focused on collaboration with each other then we can improve outcomes. I probably need to set up some wiki’s and some web pages or some way to improve the flow of information between these groups.” So I’ve just translated what was a basic research piece and translated into action. A lot of people don’t know how to do that translation piece. The key is “Can we take research that is coming out and make sure there is some way to translating it into a context so that it is useful for an administrative position and administrative job.” I want to move beyond the anecdotal work.

The end of Dr. Roberts’ statement, *“if they can go beyond anecdote,”* begins to clarify what he means regarding the transferability of knowledge and what represents scholarship. As our conversation continued this led to discussion around practitioner scholarship. And although he is a practitioner scholar himself, Dr. Roberts is a bit skeptical toward practitioner literature, underscoring his beliefs as to the purpose of research as learning through the transfer of knowledge.

So if the administrator has the proper research skill set where they can go beyond anecdote, then I am fine with that. But what you often see in the practitioner driven literature is mainly a set of case studies and usually anecdotal case studies at best, where here is what happened in my situation. And as you know that may or may not be applicable to anybody else. So in some respects, it probably may harm the field where someone

picks up a case study and says, "That's what they did, so that's what I'll do it," without understanding the nuances, of, if this is comparable to my situation, is it the same size organizations, all the factors that you would put in a more broader study that would look at multiple cases or whatever approach, either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The issue with administrative or practitioner scholarship is ultimately about the usefulness from the power of the data to transfer knowledge or the generalizability of the work.

And the real issues is, is it generalizable? Is that practitioner scholarship generalizable? And in most cases you have to say to yourself it's not, yeah and that's what you see now in, even some of the popular management literature. It's interesting to read the case study. The issue is how much are you able to learn from it.

Learning from scholarship is central to Dr. Roberts' perspective about what scholarship and research should be, as well as to the meaning he finds therein, which is using scholarship to alignment of his administrative and academic pursuits.

Scholarship and the alignment of administrative and academic interests. *I would say there is a strong relationship between what I have done historically research-wise and what I do in my job, which is great.*

Dr. Roberts' statement above was not something he just said in passing during our conversation; it was something he provided several examples of to

support the intentionality of career decisions since he came back to the academy in 2004-2005.

It was, the original job I took on here, was to build and be the initial director of a decision research center, which was this large immersive decision making environment here at the university. And as you can tell from my background, that was right in the sweet spot of a lot of work I had been doing. A key part of organizational theory is decision making. This center is all about how do you improve decision making through the use of visualization, collaboration, and simulation. So that was a perfect initial assignment for me, very interesting and from there I moved into some other positions since then.

Those other positions have ultimately led Dr. Roberts to his current position as Senior VP for Research and Development Services, where the connection between his administrative work and scholarship is still very strong, where his research interests are in direct alignment with his position.

'Cause my research is very much aligned with what I do as an administrator. You know, how to use information in large organizations, what are the broader organizational theory implications, what are the research methods. I am senior vice president for research here, so it is very related to what I do. Look, for example, I am running a research study right now that's a survey of other universities about how they manage large-scale research projects, so, it's pretty close.

When his current research came up in the conversation, the joy that he finds in the connections between his work and his research was apparent in the description of what he was doing and what that specific research project means for him as an administrator.

Basically what I did is I pulled a sample of every Research I institution that has ever received a \$50 million grant or larger from the federal government. As it turns out there are 65 projects over the last decade that are \$50 million or larger, conducted at about 40 institutions. So I now have that survey out to those 65 project managers about what were the challenges in doing that work, how did they prepare for it, what systems did they have in place to meet those expectations, because the challenge that universities will have moving forward is that the federal government is expecting us to begin doing larger, and larger, and larger projects; and the research question is: are we prepared to do that?

For Dr. Roberts conducting a study of this magnitude with survey development, sample identification and all of the other steps he described is a major task for an administrator if without assistance. When asked about this, Dr. Roberts replied that, “Yeah I had a graduate student working with me.” He indicated that the funding and support for research within the administrative sphere made having a graduate student to work with him possible. In speaking of collaboration he said, “I had a graduate student and myself. We pulled the survey, designed the instrument, and administered the instrument.” And when

asked about analyzing the incoming data, Dr. Roberts said, “That’s the good part, that’s the fun part.”

This work Dr. Roberts is doing with this graduate student is not the only teaching that he does. Under the professor of practice distinction and like everything else academic and professional for Dr. Roberts, his teaching is aligned with his work and research interests. In speaking of his teaching, Dr. Roberts said,

I’m actually hired here as a professor of practice, which is a designation that actually encourages me to use my practical experience that I have gained over the last, 18 years in the private sector to bring that practical experience into the research and into the classroom. I have it in my contract that I do teach also, and as a professor of practice you are required to do that. My contract specifies a single course a year. I have prepped now four courses and I have been here since 2005; so I am prepping about a new course a year. Last semester I taught a research methods class, can’t be more basic than that. The semester before that I co-taught a doctoral seminar in organization theory, before that, I taught a course in policy informatics, which is related to the use of information in larger organizations. So they are all related. So I am a very different case than a tenured faculty member in administration.

Dr. Roberts is right. His scholarship, whether research or teaching, is different, further illuminating the alignment scholarship brings to him personally and professionally. Ultimately, the intentionality of this alignment is found in the

fact that Dr. Roberts is consciously aware of the power to choose whether or not to practice scholarship. In speaking about the practice of scholarship he said,

As an academic and someone who appreciates scholarship, I think that I look at scholarship as a way to inform what I do on a daily basis. So there is some nuance to what I am saying. So what I am saying is, it is probably not necessary to use scholarship, not necessary to rely upon scholarship for how you do this job; but because I'm interested in scholarship, because I have a background in academics, I think that I'm drawn towards looking for scholarship as a way to help me in this job.

Ultimately, the decision to do scholarship and make it central to his life, aligning his academic interests and administrative career, is his own and it is a decision with which he is content.

I don't need to do the research for this job, but it's very nice that the research I am interested in is very much aligned with what I do institutionally. I just think I've always worked within this band of jobs, where everything has benefited from everything else. In other words my research informed my practice, my practice informed my research, all through my career. So is the case today. I don't know if I purposefully did that in the early years, but that's where I ended up. At this point it works very well.

Chapter 6

SCHOLARSHIP IN ADMINISTRATION: THE MEANING OF THE PHENOMENON

When thinking about the individual meanings I found for each participant regarding scholarship and what the ultimate meaning is for administrators who engage in scholarship, in a phenomenological hermeneutic way, the real question I needed to answer is, “What makes the phenomenon of study unique?” I needed to figure out what was different, determine if that difference was real and unique, and then articulate that difference. To have a difference, I had to have two things to compare; so I asked myself, “What are the two things I am comparing and what is the difference between them?” The difference, within this study, was between administrators who engage in and do not engage in scholarship. The act of scholarship, the lived-experience of participating in scholarship, was the focus of the study and the interviews, which became the text from which a meaning was interpreted. In thinking about what the act of doing scholarship versus not doing scholarship as an administrator meant, the main concept that surfaced consistently across all of the texts was the opportunity to connect more with education.

Specifically, connections and opportunities were available through scholarship to advance education and to contribute to the education environment more as an educator for each administrator. The focus of this chapter is explaining my interpretation of the meaning the phenomenon holds for those who have experienced it. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section is an explanation of my interpretation of meaning, the second section is a metaphor to illustrate my interpretation, the third section provides some potential future

research implications stemming from this study, and the final section is a conclusion to the work.

Being More Connected to Education

More meaningful connections with education occurred in three ways for the administrators in the study: connections with people, such as students, colleagues, and fellow administrators; connections with the field of practice, through the review of the research literature and participation in scholarly activities; and connections with the institution and alignment with and to the mission. In thinking through what all the different connections meant, I realized that for administrators in this study, participating in scholarship provided a greater connection to the educational process. In saying this, it is important to note that while all participants came from the same Research 1 institution, they each perceive education and scholarship from a different lens. In other words, participants have their own perception of what scholarship is and what education is, as described in earlier chapters. Across all of the lived-experiences and the participants' varied scholarly endeavors, they were each more connected to education and contributed more to the educational environment by participating in scholarly activities.

Scholarship and connecting with people. In participating in scholarship, administrators have the opportunity to network and connect with people, regardless of the type of scholarship they are doing. For example, for both Dr. Greene and Dr. Simpson, teaching future higher education administrators provided the opportunity to share their vast experience with the students as well

as learn about what is new and current for students. Dr. Greene mentioned how working with the students helped her, stating that,

Their research was helpful to me, because the reality is, when you are community college president at your own college in your own state, you do pay attention to a certain level of stuff that is out there nationally, but you pay a lot more attention to what's going on in your specific state and system.

The reciprocal teaching and learning process between teacher and students that is possible for administrators when participating in scholarship, like teaching, admittedly enhances their work as administrators. In addition to learning from the students, Dr. Greene found it just as important to learn about her students as an administrator in the classroom,

One of the benefits of an administrator of teaching is that you know your students. You can understand when one of your faculty members says that you know I can hardly control my class because they are 18 and they're dating and you know doing all these things other than paying attention to the course content. So there is a benefit in being a fellow teacher.

For Mr. Davidson, he gets to network with colleagues and other administrators across the country as he participates in his work with a housing association. In speaking about his experience with the international student housing association, Mr. Davidson said, *"That's the one conference I go to every year, where I connect with my colleagues, connect with younger professionals because they bring a different perspective; so it's good to talk with them."* Dr.

Robert's employing a graduate student in his research directly connected him with a student, while simultaneously providing a learning opportunity for the student. The point is that participation in scholarship provides a way for administrators to connect with relevant stakeholders both personally and professionally, enhancing the educational environment for both the administrative scholar and the stakeholders they deal with in the scholarship process.

Scholarship and connecting with the field. Participating in scholarship as an administrator also opens a more meaningful connection with the field of higher education itself. For those administrators who teach, preparation means reading current literature and keeping up with what is happening in their areas of expertise. In speaking about preparing to teach Dr. Greene commented that,

It does force you to update yourself and I also wrote down that it forces you to be more reflective when you teach. There is a good connection with the materials – staying current, knowing what is actually happening in your area of expertise.

Likewise, Dr. Simpson found his efforts to keep up-to-date as a faculty member contributed to his work as an administrator, stating that in preparation for his classes he would “*create reviews of the literature in a periodic way that allow you to stay current,*” which he found, “*very important to make informed decisions and ones that will serve your institution and the students that you are ultimately most focused on.*”

Keeping up with scholarship in the field is not confined to the scholarship of teaching, and can be found across all forms of scholarship for the

administrators in the study. Mr. Davidson commented about staying current with the field and some publications on a weekly basis.

I wouldn't say it's a daily thing; it is probably a weekly thing that, you know, I read a book, or an article, or a chapter, or you know something that someone has referred to me that they think will be beneficial. Umm, so that on a weekly basis, I read the chronicle every week, I get some journals. I am not a big NASPA person, so I tend to go with the housing association's journal.

Opposite the consumption of literature and staying current in the field is contributing knowledge to the field. The intent of scholarship itself is to share knowledge with the field, and the work of the administrators who produce scholarship do that. Dr. Grayson's recent presentation and paper expanded the field of criminology, just as Dr. Robert's research on universities preparing for and receiving \$100 million grants will aid a number of institutions in the future. Likewise, Mr. Davidson's publications, articles, and summits on the future of housing contribute to the field. Just as scholarship for these administrators contributed to their individual fields and disciplines, their work also contributed to the institution.

Scholarship and connecting with the institutional mission. Ultimately, the goal of any higher education institution is educating its students, and each institution has its own mission and vision, which defines the approach to and perspective on education at that institution. With a Research 1 institution as the setting within the study, research and scholarship were a major part of the

educational mission of the institution, along with teaching and learning. To that end, the participation in scholarship contributes toward the mission whether the focus is scholarship in the form of research or teaching and learning. From a research perspective, having both a Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Senior Vice President for Research and Development Services active in the scholarship of discovery is very appropriate. Moreover, it sets an example for faculty and helps an administrator earn their respect. As Dr. Grayson commented during our interview, having an established record of scholarship is important in gaining the respect of faculty.

The issue from the bottom up is respect. Faculty are notoriously hard to deal with, it's like the old analogy herding cats. Faculty are rebellious by nature, they are individualistic by nature, they are not group-oriented. They sit in their office, if they even come to this office as opposed to working from home. It's hard to get them to come to a meeting of the faculty or a committee meeting. You tell them to do something or ask them to do something, and they are likely to say no. They don't feel any obligation like, "Well, the boss just said he needs me to do something." So one of the ways to work with faculty is you got to have that respect.

Being respected as a leader by setting an example for others to follow, like Dr. Grayson's continued scholarship as an administrator, is one way to contribute to the betterment of the institution through scholarship as an administrator. His example is especially important being at a Research 1

institution. Alternatively, from a teaching and learning perspective, with respect to mission, the act of teaching, provides a direct contribution to the environment.

Ultimately, like many things in life, with scholarship you get out of it what you put into it. If you participate more, you will connect more, and you will contribute more. It's not science; it's just reality. In speaking about what is potentially lost by not participating in scholarship, Dr. Greene said,

It is the opportunity lost that is not being more effective. Spending time and energy and resources and talent in areas that are not as effective as you we can make them be if we are using data-based decisions, but data-influenced decisions.

Scholarship in Administration as Social Networking – A Metaphor for Participation

To convey my interpretation of meaning in a more meaningful way for readers, I realized I needed a vehicle with which to illustrate my interpretation. Within the tradition of hermeneutic phenomenology a metaphor has often been used to prove “an abridged version within a single sentence of the complex interplay of signification that characterize the literary work as a whole” (Ricoeur, 1976, p. 46). In other words, a good simple example that illustrates a complex explanation can help readers to achieve a better understanding of the meaning. To illustrate my interpretation of the meaning the phenomenon of participating in scholarship as an administrator holds for those who have experienced it, the following metaphor is offered: Scholarship in administration as social networking.

According to Garton, Haythornthwaite, and Wellman (1997), a social network is people or organizations connected via a computer network. If you replace the computer with participation in scholarship, administrators can use scholarship to connect with both people and organizations. For example, the scholarship of teaching can connect administrators to students and the scholarship of application can connect administrators to organizations within the field. Within social networks, there are sets of people or organizations, connected by various social relationships, such as being co-workers or friends (Garton et al., 1997). For the administrators in this study, the different forms scholarship can take represent the various social relationships possible through social networking. Dr. Grayson's scholarship of discovery within the field of criminology provides various opportunities to engage with other members of the field through presentation and publication. The inherent ability to engage with other individuals within one's own field of study found in scholarship provides another connection between scholarship and social networking.

According to Boyd and Ellison (2007), one of the defining characteristics that makes social networking unique is that it actually enables participants to connect more with people "who share some offline connection" (¶ 6). Likewise, participation in scholarship connects participating administrators to other people and communities where they share the connection of a common interest. Students who took the community college class likely shared an interest in community colleges and higher education with Dr. Greene. Mr. Davidson, when he goes to a university to hold a summit discussing the future of housing, he meets with other

individuals who want to know about housing. In Dr. Roberts' research on institutional preparedness for handling large-dollar grants, his participants all shared a common interest around high dollar grants. The point is, within scholarship, like social networking, relationships and connections already exist; it is about exercising the opportunity that makes the connections meaningful.

Whether connections are faculty-to-student (scholarship of teaching), peer-to-peer (scholarship of discovery), or expert-to-other (scholarship of integration and scholarship of application), like in social networks, those relations are situated by content, direction, and strength (Garton et al., 1997). Content refers to the resource being shared, which may be a tweet or wall post in social networking, whereas in scholarship, the content is the knowledge being shared, whether read, taught, or presented. Relations within social networks can be directed or undirected (Garton et al., 1997). This means interaction can be intentional or un-intentional. For example, if someone posts on his or her Facebook wall, others choose to respond or not, whereas a Facebook message sent from one user to another, like an e-mail, is more directed at specific contact and the sender is looking for an intentional response. Likewise, scholarship can be both direct and indirect. While the people who invited Mr. Davidson to their campuses to hold housing summits were looking for direct interaction, the graduate students who show up will likely receive more indirect interaction as an audience member. The same can be said of the publications of Dr. Grayson and Dr. Roberts, which likely will illicit mostly indirect responses, although some closer colleagues may reach out to them directly about their respective work.

Whether a professor teaching a student, or a colleague reading an article, these connections tie the participants closer to their respective fields and the different people in them. Ties exist in social networking as well and they may be based on a single relation, such as two people being members of the same organization, or more complex with relations across many organizations and interests (Garton et al., 1997). The same is true in scholarship for administrators; the tie might be the reader-author tie found in a single read of an article or the teacher-student relationship that occurs across the span of a semester within a course. In networking, stronger ties are ones where there is more intimacy, disclosure, and frequent communication. The same could be true in scholarship. For example, Dr. Greene now has stronger ties with the two students from her community college course who asked her to be on their respective dissertation committee. This additional connection and reason for interaction increases both the strength of the relationship and the learning possible.

Another characteristic of social networks is networks within networks, where smaller communities have formed among people within groups or organizations within the larger network based on different interests (Garton et al., 1997). The same holds true with scholarship, where within each discipline or field, administrators can contribute by belonging to smaller communities based on their scholarly activities. For example, Dr. Greene is part of the larger community of community college and university relations, and participated in a smaller regional conference on transfer and articulation that provided opportunities to network with people and institutions that could potentially be articulation

partners. On a larger scale, the five administrative scholars who participated in this study are part of a larger, undefined network of administrators who participate in scholarship. Since scholarship comes in multiple forms, the network metaphor makes sense, as networks allow for weaving and contributing in multiple forms, as opposed to webs or mind maps, which always point to a singular center (Know, Savage, & Harvey, 2006).

Ultimately, for social networks to work, participation is key. If people are not posting, there is nothing to respond to. If there are no ties, the interaction of members will be minimal (Garton et al., 1997). Conversely, those people who are involved in multiple communities within a network are part of the hub that ties together the multiple worlds found in multiplex that is a social network (Garton et al., 1997). For scholarly administrators, the multiplex is ultimately the institution in which they work, and participation within multiple worlds within the institution serves to further education by bringing those scholarly administrators closer to education and the educational process.

Future Research Implications

An exploratory study into the meaning of the lived-experience of administrators who participate in scholarship highlights several potential avenues for future research. The first opportunity for future research would be to expand the current study, which could occur in a couple of ways. Future iterations of the research design could be used to explore the meaning for administrative participants at different types of institutions. The participants in this study were all at a Research 1 institution; differences in meaning may be found at

comprehensive institutions, liberal arts institutions, and community colleges, particularly as scholarship pertains to connecting with the institutions educational mission. Similar studies could also be conducted across the three major disciplines of higher education administration or across the four domains of scholarships. In either instance, studies could focus on exploring differences in meaning across each of the various categories of differentiation. Additionally, a recommendation is that further qualitative research occurs with administrative participants at other Research 1 institutions across all of the fields of administration and domains of scholarship to further support or refute the interpretations offered in this study.

Beyond additional qualitative research, several more quantitatively oriented studies could build on the conclusions and interpretations found in this study. Since the total size of the current administrative scholar population is unknown, a survey to generate a better understanding of the scope and size of the field of study is important. Beyond knowing the extent of the participants in the field of scholarship in administration, surveys with questions for administrators, such as about their participation in scholarship, the type(s) of scholarship they practice, how often they participate in scholarship, and how they use scholarship in their daily administrative practice would help to define the field more accurately for future study.

Conclusions

Going back to my research question regarding the meaning of the lived-experience of scholarship for administrators and the first question of this chapter

about what is the difference between administrators who do participate in scholarship and those who do not, it is clear to me now that participation in scholarship allowed these administrators to connect more with education and the educational process within their institution and the respective disciplines or fields of study. This is not to say that those administrators who do not participate in scholarship are not connected to the education process or the institutional mission; rather, those connections could be enhanced through participation in scholarship. As Dr. Simpson commented in our interview,

Absolutely, I think you can be effective in your administrative roll, but you are much more likely to be closer to your optimum if you are consuming of the contemporary literature and research, staying current not only in your specific area of responsibility, but, the broad portfolio of higher education generally.

Universities are complex places that are appropriately titled, as they offer a universe of opportunities for students and educators alike. Within universities, there are three fields of administration [student affairs, academic affairs, and business affairs] that run the day-to-day operations of the each institution not directly related to teaching. Although not required to participate in scholarship, there is an active network and tradition of administrators engaging in scholarship within each of the fields of higher education administration. This study was designed to explore the meaning of the lived-experience of participating in scholarship for five scholarly administrators from a single university. While each of the five members had a different individual meaning for his or her own

scholarship and scholarly activities, collectively as administrators, participation in scholarship meant they all were closer to the education and the educational process from which many administrators feel excluded, as evidenced in the literature review. Therefore, if administrators want to be more connected to education, to feel like more of an educator, and to contribute beyond their role as an administrator, scholarship might provide a way to do all three.

REFERENCES

- Allen, K. E. (2002). The purpose of scholarship, redefining meaning for student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 39(2), 147-157.
- Arnett, T. (1922). *College and university finance*. New York: General Education Board. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=hi-D4fTeNnEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=College+and+University+Finance+Arnett&lr=&cd=1#v=onepage&q=&f=false>
- Becker, H. S. (1992). Cases, causes, conjunctures, stories, and imagery. In C. C. Regain & H. S. Becker (Eds.), *What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry* (pp. 205-216). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blake, M. (1926). *Guidance for college women*. New York: Appleton.
- Blimling, G. S. (2001). Uniting scholarship and communities of practice in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(4), 381-397.
- Bothamley, J. (2002). *Dictionary of theories*. Detroit, MI: Visible Ink Press.
- Boyd, D. & Ellison, N. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), article 11. Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/boyd.ellison.html>
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W., & Helland, P. (2002). Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains. *ASHE-Eric Higher Education Report*, 29(2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Braxton, J. M., & Toombs, W. (1982). Faculty uses of doctoral training: Consideration of a technique for the differentiation of scholarly effort from research activity. *Research in Higher Education*, 16(3), 265-282.
- Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of public schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Chase, E. P. (1930). Research or administration. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1(4), 216-219. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1974339>
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coe, A. D. (2009, November). *An exploratory study on the role of scholarship for senior-level administrators who teach*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Vancouver, BC.
- Cowley, W. H. (1934). Organizing the non-academic personnel for economy. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 5(1), 35-41. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1975014>
- Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (p. 3-26). New York: Longman.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dilthy, W. (1985). *Poetry and experience*. Selected works, Vol. V. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on education administration* (2nd ed., pp. 380-396). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eliot, C. W. (1908). *University administration*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=RdxEAAAIAAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&ots=gM--iyHQJc&sig=vn4eEQnjFysbzQnEWWcYUioKsk#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Foster, W. T. (1911). *Administration of the college curriculum*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=0SkTAAAIAAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=administration+of+the+college+curriculum&ots=ol25lh1-pT&sig=DJ4ujI0U_ti5jTUipZ9EGZ63zBg#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Fried, J. (2002). The scholarship of student affairs: Integration and application. *NASPA Journal*, 39(2), 120-132.

- Gadamer, H-G. (1998). *Truth and method*. (2nd ed.). New York: The Continuum Publishing Co.
- Garton, L., Haythornthwaite, C., & Wellman, B. (1997). Studying online social networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol3/issue1/Garton.haythornthwaite.wellman.html>
- Genzuck, M. (1999). *Synthesis of ethnographic research*. Occasional Papers Series. Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research (Eds.). Los Angeles: Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California.
- Giorgi, A. (2006). Concerning variations in the application of the phenomenological method. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 34(4), 305-319.
- Google Scholar. (2010a). *Search for scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*, Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&q=Scholarship+Reconsidered%3A+Priorities+of+the+professoriate&btnG=Search&as_sdt=800&as_ylo=&as_vis=0
- Google Scholar. (2010b). *Search for Boyer and scholarship of*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?as_q=Boyer&num=100&btnG=Search+Scholar&as_epq=scholarship+of&as_oq=&as_eq=&as_occt=any&as_sauthors=&as_publication=&as_ylo=&as_yhi=&as_sdt=1&as_subj=soc&as_sdt=3&hl=en
- Google Scholar. (2010c). *Search for Boyer and scholarship of teaching*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&num=100&q=Boyer+%22scholarship+of+teaching%22&btnG=Search&as_subj=soc&as_sdt=801&as_ylo=&as_vis=0
- Google Scholar. (2010d). *Search for Boyer and scholarship of discovery*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&num=100&q=Boyer+%22scholarship+of+discovery%22&btnG=Search&as_subj=soc&as_sdt=801&as_ylo=&as_vis=0
- Google Scholar. (2010e). *Search for Boyer and scholarship of application*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&num=100&q=Boyer+%22scholarship+of+Application%22&btnG=Search&as_subj=soc&as_sdt=801&as_ylo=&as_vis=0

- Google Scholar. (2010f). *Search for Boyer and scholarship of integration*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&num=100&q=Boyer+%22scholarship+of+application%22&btnG=Search&as_subj=soc&as_sdt=801&as_ylo=&as_vis=0
- Google Scholar. (2010g). *Search for Boyer and scholarship of engagement*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&num=100&q=Boyer+%22scholarship+of+integration%22&btnG=Search&as_subj=soc&as_sdt=801&as_ylo=&as_vis=0
- Google Scholar. (2010h). *Search for Boyer and scholarship of administration*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&num=100&q=Boyer+%22scholarship+of+engagement%22&btnG=Search&as_subj=soc&as_sdt=801&as_ylo=&as_vis=0
- Google Scholar. (2010i). *Search for scholarship of administration*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&q=%22scholarship+of+administration%22&btnG=Search&as_sdt=0%2C3&as_ylo=&as_vis=0
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29(2), 75-91.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 30(4), 233-252.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hawkes, H. E. (1930). College administration. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1(5), 245-253. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1973979>
- Hawkins, H. (1979). University identity: The teaching research functions. In A. Oleson & J. Voss (Eds.), *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920* (pp. 285-312). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Hossler, D. (2001). Reflections on the scholarship of application in student affairs: A response to “the scholarship of application in student affairs” by Charles C. Schroeder and Gary R. Pike. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(4), 342-356.
- Hudelson, E. (1928). *Problems of college education: studies in administration, student personnel, curriculum, and other instruction*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=bfdBAAAAIAAJ&q=Problem+of+college+education:+studies+in+administration&dq=Problem+of+college+education:+studies+in+administration&lr=&source=gbs_book_other_versions
- Husserl, E. (1962). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology* (W.R. Boyce Gibson, Trans.). New York: Collier Books. (Original English work published 1931, Original work published 1913).
- Jablonski, M. A., Mena, S. B., Manning, K., Carpenter, S., & Siko, K. L. (2006). Scholarship in student affairs revisited: The summit on scholarship, March 2006. *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 182-200.
- Johnston, J. B. (1930). Advising college Students. *The Journal of higher education*, 1(6), 315-320. Retrieved from <http://www.jstory.org/stable/1974315>
- Kelly, R. L. (1925). *Tendencies in college administration*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=Oa4nAAAAMAAJ&q=Tendencies+in+college+administration&dq=Tendencies+in+college+administration&lr=&cd=1>
- Know, H., Savage, M., & Harvey, P. (2006). Social networks and the study of relations: networks as method, metaphor and form. *Economy and Society*, 35(1), 113-142.
- Komives, S. R. (2001). Both/and, not either/or: Viewing the gap as social construction: A response to “a perspective on the values of student affairs and scholarship” by Robert B. Young. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(4), 338-342.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Library of Congress. (2009). *Morrill Act. Web guides: Primary documents in American history*. Retrieved from <http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Morrill.html>
- Lincoln Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lindsay, E. E., & Holland, E. O. (1930). *College and university administration*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Lindseth, A., & Norberg, A. (2004). A phenomenological hermeneutical method for researching lived-experience. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences, 18*, 145-153.
- Lloyd-Jones, E. (1929). *Student personnel work at Northwestern University*. New York: Harper Brothers. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=F_pBAAAIAAJ&q=Student+Personnel+Work+at+Northwestern+University.&dq=Student+Personnel+Work+at+Northwestern+University.&lr=&cd=1
- Lloyd-Jones, E. (1934). Personnel administration. *The Journal of Higher Education, 5*(3), 141-147. Retrieved from JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1975657>
- Malaney, G. D. (2002). Scholarship in student affairs through teaching and research. *NASPA Journal, 39*(2), 132-147.
- McCloud, S. H. (2007). *Writing program administration*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- McGinnis, F. A. (1933). The dean and his duties. *The Journal of Higher Education, 4*(4), 191-196. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1975720>
- Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R. I. (1972). *Evaluating faculty performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mish, F. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (10th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.

- Morrow, S. L., & Smith, M. L. (2000). Qualitative research for counseling psychology. In Brown, S. D. & Lent, R. W. (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology*. (3rd ed., pp. 199-212). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(2), Article 2. Retrieved from <http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm>
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pellino, G. R., Blackburn, R. T., & Boberg, A. L. (1984). The dimensions of academic scholarship: Faculty and administrator views. *Research in Higher Education*, 20, 103-115.
- Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and the surplus of meaning*. Fort Worth, TX: The Texas Christian University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences: Essays on language, action and interpretation* (J. B. Thompson, Ed. & Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riehl, C., Larson, C. L., Short, P. M., & Reitzug, U. C. (2000). Reconceptualizing research and scholarship in educational administration: Learning to know, knowing to do, doing to learn. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 391-327.
- Roper, L. D. (2001). Can we unite the scholarship of student affairs? A response to "Uniting scholarship and communities of practice in student affairs" by G. S. Blimling. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(4), 397-400.
- Ruthen, A. G. (1931). Administration at Michigan. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 2(1), 7-10. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable1974397>
- Schofield, J. W. (1993). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Naturalistic inquiry* (pp. 171-199). London: Sage Publications.
- Schroeder, C. C., & Pike, G. R. (2001). The scholarship of application in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(4), 342-356.
- Schuh, J. H. (2002). Foundational scholarship in student affairs: A sampler. *NASPA Journal*, 39(2), 107-120.

- Seashore, C. E. (1927). *Learning and living in college, psychology of individual differences applied to the organization and pursuit of higher education: A study based upon experience in the promotion of the gifted student project* (National Research Council Issue No. 21). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=jYkDAAAAMAAJ&q=Learning%20and%20living%20in%20college&dq=Learning%20and%20living%20in%20college&lr=&source=gbs_slider_thumb
- Seldin, P. (1980). *Successful faculty evaluation programs: A practical guide to improve faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. Crugers, NY: Coventry Press.
- Slevin, E., & Sines, D. (1999/2000). Enhancing the truthfulness, consistency and transferability of a qualitative study: Utilising a manifold of approaches. *Nurse Researcher*, 7(2), 79-98.
- Smith, J.A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretive phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Stake, R. E. (1992). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of inquiry* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education*. (2011a). Jobs: Academic affairs. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/jobCategory/Academic-affairs/89/>
- The Chronicle of Higher Education*. (2011b). Jobs: Business/administrative affairs. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/jobCategory/Business-administrative/107/>
- The Chronicle of Higher Education*. (2011c). Jobs: Business/administrative affairs. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/jobCategory/Student-affairs/132/>
- Thwing, C. F. (1900). *College administration*. New York: The Century Co. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=1LFDAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=College+Administration+Thwing&lr=&cd=1#v=onepage&q=&f=false>

- Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived-experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Ontario, Canada: The Althouse Press.
- Van Manen, M. (2005). *Writing in the dark: Phenomenological studies in interpretive inquiry*. Ontario, Canada: The Althouse Press.
- Willower, D. J., & Forsyth, P. B. (1999). A brief history of scholarship on education administration. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. (2nd ed., pp. 1-23). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, R. B. (2001). A perspective on the values of student affairs and scholarship. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(4), 319-338.

APPENDIX A
CONSTRUCTS AND THEMES FROM PILOT STUDY ON SCHOLARSHIP
AND ADMINISTRATION

Constructs and Themes	AVP SA	SVP USI	AVP SAS	AVP AA	Chancellor	Dean	Response Percent
The Individual Self in Administrators							
Balance	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Family Values in Personal Decisions		X		X		X	50%
School-based education	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Plans laid, but paths taken	X	X		X	X	X	83%
Drivers	X	X		X	X	X	83%
Related to the Academy							
Institutional Expectations	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Understanding the Task at Hand	X	X		X		X	66%
Current Professional Roles	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
On Administration within the Academy	X	X	X		X	X	83%
Practice Informing Practice: Scholarship in Administration							
Participant Record of Scholarship	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Scholarship as an add-on	X	X	X			X	66%
Administrators who teach	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Professional development as a way of life	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
It all informs	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%

APPENDIX B

PEDAGOGY OF SCHOLARSHIP – RECRUITMENT E-MAIL TEMPLATE

Hello Dr. XXXX,

My name is Aaron Coe and I am currently working on my dissertation study toward an EDD in Higher and Postsecondary Education at Arizona State University under the direction of Dr. Alfredo de los Santos in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College. In the study I am looking to describe the lived-experience of producing scholarship for 5 – 8 full-time, administrators at public institutions of higher education in the Southwestern United States. Within the study scholarship is defined through Boyer's four domains of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of application, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching (1990). Please see the attached table for greater clarification of Boyer's Four Domains.

Your name was passed on to me by XXXXXX as someone who may fit the parameters for the study as an administrator in higher education who has recently produced scholarship as defined by one of the four domains of scholarship established by Boyer (1990). I wanted to see if I could set up an interview with you sometime in the next few weeks for an hour or so to discuss your experience producing the scholarship. In addition to the table clarifying Boyer's four domains and your potential fit for the study, I have attached a copy of my information letter and the steps I will take to preserve your confidentiality in the study.

If you are interested in participating in my study, I have three requests prior to the interview. First that you share with me a brief explanation of the scholarship you completed, including identification of which domain of scholarship you believe your work aligns. For example, you might say that you are teaching in your area of expertise, which would be scholarship of teaching, or that you have recently completed a recent study within your department, that solved a larger problem, which would reflect the scholarship of application. My second request is that you share a copy of your Curriculum Vitae with me prior to the interview; your CV along with the brief explanation of your scholarship can help me refine some of my questions for our interview and confirm your fit within the boundaries of my study. Finally, I ask that you share the name of any other higher education administrators you know who might also fit the parameters for my study, which is being full-time administrator at a public institution in the southwestern U.S. who has produced scholarship in the last three years and might be interested in participating in my study.

Thanks for your time and interest in my study and helping me finish my degree here at ASU please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Aaron Coe, MaEd
Arizona State University EdD Candidate

APPENDIX C

INCLUSIONS WITH RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Inclusion C1

INFORMATION LETTER-INTERVIEWS: Pedagogy of Scholarship in Higher Education Administration

Date June 29, 2010

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Research Professor: Alfredo de los Santos, in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to explore the meaning of the lived-experience of producing scholarship as an administrator in higher education. As such, I would like to interview you, regarding your experience producing scholarship as an administrator.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve at least one, approximately 1-hour semi-structured personal interview regarding your experience producing scholarship as an administrator in higher education. There may be follow-up questions from the investigator to ensure understanding and clarify any misunderstanding or misinterpretations. Additionally you may review the transcripts from the interview(s) upon request.

Prior to the interview I ask that you share with me a brief explanation of the scholarship you completed, including identification of which one of Boyer's domain of scholarship you believe your work aligns along with a copy of your curriculum vitae so I can have better working knowledge on you as an individual prior to the interview. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop the interview at any time. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty.

The knowledge gained from this study seeks to further familiarity, understanding, and appreciation of the experience of administrators producing scholarship in higher education. Thus, may provide insight into your own production of scholarship, although no other direct benefits have been identified. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

Your responses will be kept confidential and a pseudonym will be used for your name and the name of your institution. The data collected in this study will be used as the primary data for my doctoral dissertation and will be interpreted using a phenomenological hermeneutic approach. Additionally, the data and results may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be known or used.

I would like to audiotape this interview. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be taped; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know. The primary investigator under lock will keep the tapes and key for a period of three years after which time they will be destroyed.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team at: alfredo.delossantos@asu.edu or aaron.coe@asu.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

Inclusion C2

Pedagogy of Scholarship – Confidentiality Statement

Within the framework of the study and based on the political nature of the positions held by the candidates several safeguards will be employed to ensure confidentiality of the participants within the study. Special consideration will be given, particularly in the following areas:

1. Pseudonyms will be used for the names, titles, institutions and experiences associated with the participant.
2. All research materials will be kept under the direct control of the researcher and stored under lock and key for the duration of the study and after completion of the study.
3. The researcher will do all transcribing.
4. The researcher will do all analysis and interpretation.
5. Participants will be collaborative partners to some extent within the study, having the opportunity to review transcripts to ensure accuracy of the transcription upon request.
6. Participation is voluntary and all participants have the option to withdrawal from the study at any time.

7. Any issue related to confidentiality or appropriateness brought up by any participant will be open for discussion within the process.
8. The researcher is committed to the highest standards of confidentiality, professionalism, and ethical behavior regarding the position of the participants.

Inclusion C3

Boyer's Four Domains of Scholarship in Higher Education		
Domain of Scholarship	Narrative Description of Domain	Example activities or tasks
Scholarship of Discovery	The domain most would associate with traditional scholarship, i.e. research and publication to contribute to both campus climate and human knowledge (Boyer, 1990). This domain represents the very essence of academic life and the idea of having an academic place where people do academic things purely for the sake of academics; it is knowing something just for the sake of knowing something.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing a book chapter on a new theory, • Reporting new theory, or describing knowledge gained from a new research design • Refereed research journal article • Agency report on research findings
Scholarship of Application	The engagement in applying the theories and principles found in scholarship to solve problems or improve situations (Boyer, 1990). Modern look at service, considering service to both the lay public, in a role such as consulting or expert testimony, and service to the institution itself, with work on committees, such as self-studies, departmental sub-committees or search committees (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmental committee service • Institutional wide committees • Departmental based study addressing problem or policy • Off-campus consulting • Expert testimony • Studies conducted for local government or organizations
Scholarship of Integration	The scholarship of integration domain works on scholarship from	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk as disciplinary expert for a public

	<p>an interdisciplinary perspective seeking to make connections across disciplines to reveal new insights than might otherwise be found (Boyer, 1990). This rather interpretive type of scholarship searches for meaning and a more comprehensive understanding.</p>	<p>audience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary or interdisciplinary literature review • Multiple book reviews on same topic • A cross disciplinary book • Disciplinary article in press
Scholarship of Teaching	<p>The scholarship of teaching is about recognizing the work done in educating students as scholarship. According to Boyer (1990), the scholarship of teaching starts with knowledge and is carried out in good teaching and ongoing active learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directed student research projects • Course content/material preparation • Presentation or experimentation on new instructional techniques • Publication on classroom experience

APPENDIX D
IRB APPROVAL



Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

To: Alfredo De Los Santos
ADMIN A 20

From: Mark Roosa, Chair *SM*
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 05/26/2010

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 05/26/2010

IRB Protocol #: 1005005189

Study Title: Pedagogy of Scholarship in Higher Education

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2) .

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.

APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW GUIDE

Pedagogy of Scholarship interview guide

The questions here are a basic outline for our conversation. As a semi-structured interview the specific questions or order of questions may change, but not the overall focus on your experience with scholarship as an administrator in higher education.

Part I – Career/Professional Background (5-10 minutes)

Could you describe your career path in higher education?

Miscellaneous follow-up questions related to path to/in/within administration

EX: It sounds like you have been in administration for a number of years have you always wanted to be in administration? OR It seems you went into higher education straight out of your undergraduate degree, did something happen during your undergraduate experience that drew you to higher education?

Part II – Current position and scholarship (10 minutes)

Describe your current position and duties within the institution?

Do you feel that scholarship plays an important roll in your daily work? How so?

What has been your experience with scholarship in administration?

Are you required to complete or produce scholarship as part of your role? Why or why not?

Does the current economic climate alter anything from your perspective as it relates to scholarship for yourself or within administration in general?

Part III – Your scholarship (40 minutes)

You mentioned scholarship as related to the scholarship of teaching in our communications. Could you describe your typical course to me?

Within that course, could you describe a typical class for me?

What specific acts within that class you described represent scholarship?

Describe the work you put into preparing for that typical class you just described?

What specific acts within that preparation represent scholarship?

Beyond what we have spoken about already, what else within the work of teaching do you do that you consider scholarship?

Why do you do teach?

How often do you teach?

When you are not teaching, why are you typically not teaching?

How does teaching make you feel?

Personally?

Professionally?

Does teaching enhance your career? How so?

Is teaching connected to your work as an administrator? How so?

Do you receive any rewards intrinsic or extrinsic for teaching?

Is teaching scholarship? Why or why not?

What other administrative activities might you do that you would consider scholarship?

Explore those as appropriate.

APPENDIX F
VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION STRATEGIES EMPLOYED IN THE
STUDY

7 Stages for validation	Verification strategy employed	Description of verification strategy	Effect on rigor
Thematizing	Methodological coherence	Substantial literature review of topic and method to identify relevant theories – Boyer’s (1990) domain’s of scholarship – nothing else	Had the right question, as the field of study was open, making a question about meaning within the phenomena very appropriate.
Designing	Methodological coherence AND Appropriate Sampling	Alignment of method, design, and question – phenomenological hermeneutics to answer a question of meaning. Sample taken from nearly 50 administrators contacted about doing scholarship as administrators.	With alignment across study, possible to answer question posed. Had known sample of administrators who participated in the phenomena
Interviewing	Appropriate Sampling AND Concurrent Collection and Analysis	Interviewed administrators from single institution that all said they participated in phenomena. Overlap between the timing of the various interviewing and beginning of transcription and analysis process.	Known sample, with identified area of scholarship. Able to validate ideas and question others across interviews.
Transcribing	Thinking Theoretically	All transcription done by researcher, allowed time to think about data closely.	Doing own transcription allowed for more intimate knowledge and understanding of interview and time to develop concepts.
Analyzing	Concurrent	Overlap in collection	Multiple steps in

	collection and analysis AND Thinking theoretically	and analysis allowed for immediate analyses of date.	analysis process, occurring over lifespan of the study, contributed to greater understanding and validated interpretation.
Validating	Thinking theoretically AND Theory development	Thinking theoretically allowed for multiple explanations, which could be individually validated and explored via structural analysis. The writing of the structural analyses provided one more step in theoretical validation. Although theory development not a goal, ultimate interpretation of meaning required consideration of theory.	Not all structural analyses were supported by the writing, had to re-do two interpretations, validating the other three explanations, and pushing two explanations back through the process again. Explanation and interpretation required a return to the literature further validating the work.
Reporting	Theory Development	Several reviewers in process including participants and other administrators.	Having the multiple reviewers read and comment on the work, added to the validity and communicability in the field.

Note: Adapted from "Validation at Seven Stages," by S. Kvale and S. Brinkmann, 2009, *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*, p. 248-249. Copyright 2009 by Sage Publications, Inc.

APPENDIX G
INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR
PARTICIPANT 1

Thematic Category	Sub-themes	Participant quote(s)
Her values	Personal values PV1 Value of Fit	<p>PV1.1 It is one of these flukes, these moments in time. I was in an MBA program, ran out of money. Looked for a job. Found one at a school, had never considered working at a school. Didn't have an undergraduate degree in education or anything like that. Began working at the school. By the time I left I had been there seven years. Had served as a faculty member and then as the principal.</p> <p>PV1.2 Because the reality is I already know I can work in all sorts of environments that aren't universities or community colleges. That's the hard decision do you want to stay in education or not. But if you like a constant teaching and learning and kind of an invigorating environment.</p>
Her values	Personal values PV2 Value of Writing	<p>PV2.1 So I am big into writing, because it helps you capture where you are at and where you are going. It forces a level of self-reflection.</p>
Her values	Personal values PV3 Value of family	<p>PV3.1 When I adopted a child and went back into the faculty for about a decade. And then went back into administrative roles. So it is kind of a flip flop, as you will often see women doing when they get to certain stages in their lives, but by then I had, had a lot of administrative experience.</p> <p>PV3.2 My brother was a little older than I. He was in his MBA as well and he just kept saying, get done come out; we are going to have such great fun. You know we are doing all these different things. I always thought I would end up in business with him.</p> <p>PV3.3 So all my siblings have done well in their respective fields.</p>
Her values	Personal	<p>PV4.1 There is also kind of a process that</p>

	<p>values PV4 Value of scholarship process</p>	<p>happens when you are forced to write about something or reflect on the progress that you have made or not made and examine the data. What's working and what's not and present it to another group?</p> <p>PV4.2 By going to conferences you learn a lot about what other schools are doing, but it does force you, when you have to prepare for an audience with a lot of other college faculty and administrators to think through what is working and what is not. You know, why don't you know that piece of data when they ask you that, "well gee that is a really good question and I am going to find out the answer to that."</p> <p>PV4.3 Scholarship is a different sort of thing and it does force you to sit down and anytime you are force to write down what you are thinking about those things you have to sort and categorize and synthesize, you know that's a level of processing that is different.</p> <p>PV4.4 I liked to do that because it forces to you think about what you are doing and why you are doing it, how consistent it is with the research, how inconsistent it is, whether or not it holds up to other people's questioning.</p>
<p>Her values</p>	<p>Personal values PV5 Value of scholarship</p>	<p>PV5.1 I spend quite a bit of time researching and reading materials that will influence the structure of our programs. So every morning I start with the literature, University Business, Inside Higher Ed, the Chronicle, the Board of Regents news, just quickly scanning to see, are there new reports, are there new research findings are there new things that have come out that I ought to be aware of.</p> <p>PV5.2 I think it is important to have read those things and to be aware of what is going on and then decide if they should change the way your program is structured. So I do that</p>

		<p>a lot.</p> <p>PV5.3 There is a lot of loss from the scholarship viewpoint in not doing enough documentation of what has worked and what hasn't worked and not sharing that enough and not following up on the real research related to things that you kind of know didn't work, you didn't know why it didn't work or to what degree it didn't work, but you kind of know that it didn't work and you are not going to do that again. It is the opportunity lost that is not being more effective. Spending time and energy and resources and talent in areas that are not as effective as we can make them be if we are using data influenced decisions.</p>
Her values	<p>Personal values PV6 Perception of self</p>	<p>PV6.1 A teacher. When people ask me on airplanes "so what do you do?" "Oh, I'm a teacher and I am also an administrator."</p> <p>PV6.2 I think people who are drawn to this sort of a life must like themselves learning or producing knowledge or both.</p>
Her values	<p>External values EV1 Value of others</p>	<p>EV1.1 the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs here, basically constructed a program, which now they have hired me to help implement the program. But I have to give him credit, he is really the mastermind who did the research behind how well transfer students do.</p> <p>EV1.2 And a lot of them are professionals already in education, and so they know a lot, they bring a lot to the table to start with. People like you and your colleagues I am sure in the program. I am sure you have learned as much from them as you have from your instructor.</p>
Her values	<p>External values EV2 Value of</p>	<p>EV2.1 Its too new here and we've got way too much on our plates to just let it go. Anytime you are trying to create big culture shifts or change you have to really commit to</p>

	commitments	<p>three to five years to get that going. And after examining this first year, it will take us the full five years... And so, it will take us a while. So, I think it is just a commitment I needed to make. I don't think it would be very healthy for us or the community colleges to start something big and new and then have key people pull out.... And I promised I wouldn't do that, so I have no intention of it.</p> <p>EV2.2 they proposed the possibility of my moving over here last January. But I would have not felt good just picking up and leaving my college in the middle of the academic year. So I promised to see the year through, help them get a search underway, then bow out to come over here, while they proceeded on.</p> <p>EV3.2 I would not want to do anything to derail them.</p>
Her values	External values EV3 Value of relationships	<p>EV3.1 At conferences you come into contact in that case with a lot of people who work in community colleges. So from a professional standpoint, from an administrative standpoint, those are good relationships to build.</p> <p>EV3.2 Relational connections, I think are important and are actually really helpful. I've met a whole lot of people who work here at the university being a newbie here, by way of who has been in my class.</p>
Balancing and connecting values through scholarship	Scholarship connecting values SCV1 It all kind of intertwines	<p>SCV1.1 It all kind of comes together there is no way to split it all apart; you know it is just not that neat. It all kind of intertwines like that (she brings her hands together and connects them).</p> <p>SCV1.2 I mean you can draw on so many different things and answer questions so easily, it has become your second nature that</p>

		<p>I think it makes it a better experience for the students and easier for me in some regards as well.</p> <p>SCV1.3 There are a lot of things you learn by way of these connections that happen byway of your administrative role and your teaching role, that you are thinking about when you are doing these things that just kind of its different. You know sort of a constant interwoven relationship.</p>
Balancing and connecting values through scholarship	<p>Balancing values BV1 It takes time</p>	<p>BV1.1 You would have to build in the time and you know as we mentioned earlier the economics, although it doesn't change it a lot, staff reductions do. Where resources and time is going to go, you cut out the things that seem least important, like I don't have time to have you read those three research studies anymore, just get the curriculum stuff done.</p> <p>BV1.2 But perhaps we should be constructing it based upon what somebody else's research showed them what worked and what didn't work. It's hard I mean where do you find the balance between most of those things?</p>
Balancing and connecting values through scholarship	<p>Understanding Role UR1 Knowing what to do and what others should do</p>	<p>UR1.1 So it wasn't, you know, like it might be for most teachers coming into their first administrative role, I was actually moving back into an administrator role after having had a number of years in the faculty. And it just escalated from there.</p> <p>UR1.2 In fact part of my contract here is to teach. And so I teach one or more courses per year. My primary role is administrative in nature.</p> <p>UR1.3 When you are an inch deep and a mile wide, like you are as a president, you read things very quickly. You get a report, you skim the executive summary, and I need to send that to so-and-so. You don't bother to read the 300-page report they sent. You send</p>

		<p>it to somebody else at your campus to do that.</p> <p>UR1.4 There is a difference in what happens teaching as an administrator in the earlier part of my career and what is happening now, because I'm teaching exclusively courses of students who are already professionals. They want to be in these classes, nobody is forcing them to be in these classes. Their parents didn't force them to enroll for it. So it is just a different level of interaction.</p>
Balancing and connecting values through scholarship	<p>Value educational contribution</p> <p>VEC1</p> <p>Relevancy for learning</p>	<p>VEC1.1 I think it went pretty well. Most of the students said they really enjoyed getting into something at that level. It gave them such good preparation. And those who signed up were considering already either for topics for their dissertation or topics related to their professional aspirations. That had value for them. It was not an exoteric exercise in how to do this. It had applicability for them.</p> <p>VEC1.2 I think most students really like that. They do want to use these years. I always tell them, you are not going to have this chance again, you might as well use this time when you are a student to get as much as you can out of the experience. Because it will help you professionally assuming you are studying something associated with your intended profession.</p>
Balancing and connecting values through scholarship	<p>Value educational contribution</p> <p>VEC2</p> <p>Personally rewarding work</p>	<p>VEC2.1 I enjoy it. I think it is enriching for me. It forces me to keep up to date on the research in the literature, which I like. You are forced to read. I learn new things from my students. They'll very often bring up new things that I wasn't up-to-date on. "Well gee, I got invited by so-and-so to this conference, and did you Illinois does this now?" And I will be like, "No I didn't know that," because we all have different connections and things.</p>

		<p>VEC2.2 If it was just a generic leadership course, yes I could probably do it. But I am not as prepared as I want to be to do it, to make it a really good experience. If they are only going to take one leadership course, you really want it to be a wow experience for them and exposure. So no, I am not that interested in like learning about a class two weeks ahead of it and hope that it comes out okay. They can do that.</p> <p>VEC2.3 Originally I was going to teach a course this summer, but it didn't have enough students in it. And they called me and said, "how badly do you want to find something else to teach, because we could probably see what we can figure out." I said no, that's okay, because I don't have to feel whole.</p>
Scholarship and producing educational value	Value of Teaching and Learning VTL1 Learning with/from students	<p>VTL1.1 I was teaching a higher ed course for doctoral students and we were studying specifically the transfer process. And so we did, we did some really interesting things that actually very helpful to me. Their research was helpful to me, because the reality is, when you are community college president at your own college in your own state, you do pay attention to a certain level of stuff that is out that nationally, but you pay a lot more attention to what's going on in your specific state and system.</p> <p>VTL1.2 everybody identify another state that they were interested in perhaps they wanted to work there over time, or maybe they had family there. So we set up a research construct what they needed to find out about how the university system and the community college systems interacted in that state. It was really fascinating for me, because it's all over the map.</p> <p>VTL1.3 And of course I wanted to know it better as well, so I was really interested in</p>

		<p>what they were researching. It was just now granted, you don't often get to do a doctoral level seminar where you have 12 people there, that is a small class.</p> <p>VTL1.4 Some of what we do isn't based upon data, but you know from a students reaction okay, we just hit that nail on the head. We just know it, we probably can't prove it, you know, but you know it.</p>
Scholarship and producing educational value	<p>Value of Teaching and Learning</p> <p>VTL2 Teaching and learning</p>	<p>VTL2.1 I have learned from them and I think they felt like they learned from me. And so it was a mutually beneficial process.</p> <p>VTL2.2 I have some structures that I have used over the years for how to do that. How many to have in a group, how you set up your exercises, getting people knee-to-knee and eye-to-eye on things. Only spending so much of a class period describing and then getting them into an activity where they talk about it. Because they don't learn as much by listening as they do by having a chance to really grapple with the material.</p> <p>VTL2.3 I do love teaching and learning and I do think it does influence whether or not you like working in education.</p>
Scholarship and producing educational value	<p>Value of Teaching and Learning</p> <p>VTL3 Learning from preparation</p>	<p>VTL3.1 It does force you to update yourself and I also wrote down that it forces you to be more reflective when you teach. You know you do have to think before you come in.</p> <p>VTL3.2 one of the benefits of an administrator of teaching at that level is that you know your students. You can understand when one of your faculty members says that you know I can hardly control my class because they are 18 and they're dating and you know doing all these things other than paying attention to the course content.</p>
Scholarship	Value of	VTL4.1 I often find with students that part of

<p>and producing educational value</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning VTL4 Value add of teaching</p>	<p>the role of a teacher is to try to get them to go look at the research or the facts related to area that they're speaking about. Well "we decided that we are going to do our performing arts program like this and now we do it like that". Well why? "Well, I don't know because we just decided to." So is there any data that shows students learn more by doing it this way or anything like that. And you realize they've not given it any thought. They just really literally came from some other field. They don't have an education background. That is often the case in colleges and universities. People don't have any formal training on how people learn or acquire knowledge. And unless somebody asks them. It is just "well I was in charge of that program, so I decided to structure it that way." And it never occurs to them to look to assessment issues or how other colleges did it or anything else. Yeah so I think a teacher can be helpful in getting them to look at the research. Helping them to synthesize it, helping them to make the right connections.</p>
<p>Scholarship and producing educational value</p>	<p>Scholarship adding value to administration SAVA1 Value the institution</p>	<p>SAVA1.1 I had an ulterior motive for the conference, I wanted to learn more about the Texas system. It was being hosted in Texas. The university was thinking about examining relationships with Texas community colleges, We are only entering into out of state agreements when it is strategic for the university to do so. So we will do those when it benefits them and it benefits us.</p> <p>SAVA1.2 All these new programs are predicated on the research. That said here are the things we need to design as we construct these new programs. Because we know students following things are more likely to be successful in the end. So all of the programs are going to be structured that way.</p> <p>SAVA1.3 it is really quite well known I've</p>

		<p>heard about it for years, but I have never been to it, conference on transfer and I thought I will go to that, I'll present, at the same time I will attend things with some people, I made my short list, not necessarily based upon what they were talking about, but who was giving the presentation and that would give me the opportunity to say "hi and do you want to talk for a few minutes and so forth and then I followed up and flew to Texas to meet with a number of them and now we articulation agreements with some of those colleges.</p> <p>SAVA1.4 I want to maximize the use of my budget and wherever possible and look for places where I can double dip and get my work, work done and also do some things like that. I will just have to wait and see how many of those appear to align with one another. Because you know budgets are tight, it's not an easy time to gallivant off to a conference and present.</p> <p>SAVA1.5 So there is a benefit in being a fellow teacher with them. They view you different as an administrator because they know that you know their circumstances and you understand better their circumstances as a result of what you are doing. And you better understand who you are serving.</p>
Scholarship and producing educational value	Application and expertise as scholarship AES1 Value add community	<p>AES1.1 when I retired from the community college system, they offered me this great new job they had created and I thought what a neat opportunity to do something new and different. Because they wanted to form this office of transfer partnerships and change the relationship between the university and the community college system.</p> <p>AES1.2 The idea is to fundamentally change the relationship of the university and the community college system in the state. We have a lot of community college students in</p>

		<p>this state. A very tiny percentage of them ever move on to university work. This is not a good thing for the state or the students.</p>
Scholarship and producing educational value	<p>Application and expertise as scholarship AES2 Value add expertise</p>	<p>AES2.1 Because they don't have a lot of retired presidents teaching for them. They do have a few folks, who are retired out of the community college system, but not at the CEO level. So that is something, as they began thinking about they, they were like "oh yeah, let's do it".</p> <p>AES2.2 Dr's Chan and Carmichael rely on me to keep them up to date with what is happening in the community college world, so that when they are having interactions with other colleges and they know the President of Western has left to do this-in-such. I do those things. I need to be the eyes and ears about what is happening in the community college world on behalf of them, because they've got a ton on their plate dealing with all of their day-to-day stuff.</p> <p>AES2.3 I do have some interesting new opportunities to maybe work on some publications with the American Association of Community Colleges, where their looking for people to help with certain things who have a perspective of many years. And so I like the idea of doing that I think that will be a fun project to work on</p> <p>AES2.4 So EDU/250 is a course taught within the community college that I regularly guest lecture in.</p>
Scholarship and producing educational value	<p>Application and expertise as scholarship AES3 Value add Service</p>	<p>AES3.1 I'm working with some doctoral students this fall when they are working on their own research.</p>
Scholarship and producing educational	<p>Application and expertise as scholarship AES4</p>	<p>AES4.1 I realized they really needed someone who could get them organized, the finances, the employment issues, the planning issues and so forth. And so I took</p>

value	Value add business skills	an administrative role as the principal. AES4.2 I wasn't planning on my first position in education, I would have ended up in business. AES4.3 Schools need people with good skill sets and planning. You know all those things as well as finance and budget.
-------	------------------------------	--

APPENDIX H
INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR
PARTICIPANT 2

Thematic Category	Sub-themes	Participant quote(s)
His self-perception as a scholar	Self as a scholar SS1 Self-esteem	SS1.1 I try to do research. I find it important to me and my own self-conscious to do it, but it is not easy to do. I have been known to maintain some profile there, but not as much as I would like.
		SS1.2 I still kind of have my self-esteem, I go to conferences, people I know, I want them to think well of me. Oh yeah, that Grayson, he used to be.
		SS1.3 I still do that and I still enjoy the teaching part of it. For my own kind of intrinsic rewards, for my own self-esteem
His self-perception as a scholar	Self as a scholar SS2 Priorities	SS2.1 I have an office in my old department downtown. I teach a class of about 120 students each semester, well one semester in the fall.
		SS2.2 when I go down to the downtown to my office and I am surrounded by 18 to 20 colleagues and 40 graduate students I don't want them to think I am a total stranger or like what are you doing here, kind of thing. I want them to be like oh yeah, he is one of us. He is doing what we are doing.
His self-perception as a scholar	Self as a scholar SS3 Faculty roles	SS3.1 So anyway I stopped in 1990 and then returned to full-time faculty, and I was happily in that role until 2005. So for 15 years, I was a full-time faculty.
		SS3.2 I weighed the issue very seriously. I enjoy faculty, roles. First of all the best job in the universe is being, well maybe a supreme court judge, but after that, anyway it is a really good job in terms of all the intrinsic rewards that come with it.

SS3.3 The kind of work you do, working with the students, whether undergrad or doctoral the whole notion of discovery and dissemination of research results, findings and kind of helping advance that thing, that you have invested your entire life in anyway. As a faculty member, whether you are a biochemist or sociologist, you have kind of bought into the paradigm of this is something worth knowing otherwise why would I be spending my life teaching it to other people.

SS3.4 I have always enjoyed it. I have worked with both undergrad and graduate students. And again from my point of view being a faculty member is the second best job in the world. So, its not like it is a step down.

His self-perception as a scholar

Self as a scholar
SS4
Not just an administrator

SS4.1 It (his scholarship) may not be my lowest priority, as a person, because I still see myself as a faculty member.

SS4.2 I still consider myself a scholar, not just quote, un-quote, not just solely an administrator.

SS4.3 I'm tenured. So I can do that at anytime. So especially because I want to keep my identity as being a scholar and academic and not solely as an administrator.

The Traditional academic affairs administrator

His perception of academic affairs
PAA1
The traditional route

PAA1.1 I think coming through a faculty side is the traditional route. I think if you look at, umm, everything from the President on down to the department chairs, on the academic side. If you are talking about people in academic affairs, umm, most of us were at some point or another full-time faculty.

PAA1.2 All your deans. The only dean that might not have a background as a faculty member is possibly the current dean of business. Because of the nature of the business colleges I know we brought him in.

PAA1.3 I wonder if there are differences based on the kind of college or higher ed that people are targeting. I don't know if there is a difference if you get to smaller little colleges, or community colleges

PAA1.4 Most people, who come to any large so-called state or research university, come in as faculty. Even if we go out and hire someone in as an administrator, we usually get people in who have been faculty.

PAA1.5 Where they get a master's degree and start teaching, then decide they want to go into administration so they get a higher ed degree or begin to do some more higher ed preparation, because they tend to think of themselves as being on a track, that they have targeted. And I don't know how many faculty, how many people come there have that goal as it pertains to higher ed, as a potential PhD even. I don't think we have anyone with a higher ed PhD in an administrative position.

The Traditional academic affairs administrator

His perception of academic affairs
PAA2
History of scholarly achievement as an academic affairs administrator

PAA2.1 I think it is critical to have an administrator who has at least a strong history of scholarship achievement.

PAA2.2 He or she has a better understanding of what that issue is. Whether it is curriculum development, like here is a new master's program, here is a new doctorate that person should have been in the trenches and should know what looks good and what doesn't, substantively; especially if it is in your area.

PAA2.3 You want someone who knows the field, knows the discipline, knows where it is going, who has a national reputation, who brings that national eye and respect from colleagues around the country to your unit. Who as well as the students and faculty he can help recruit as a result of that.

The

His perception

PAA3.1 What you get when you get a contract

Traditional academic affairs administrator	of academic affairs PAA3 No research, no administration	faculty member is that you don't expect them to do research, whether it is in higher ed or biochemistry. They teach four classes or six classes or whatever the contract says and their job is working with the students whether it is freshman or doctoral and so some people might go that route, but they are never going to be an administrator.
--	---	--

PAA3.2 If you are the department chair, you want a department chair that really knows the material. Otherwise, you can just bring in someone who has an MBA and have them be the administrator of your department.

The Traditional academic affairs administrator	His perception of academic affairs PAA4 Backing into the profession	PAA4.1 I think most administrators kind of back into it. I think that especially, because you start out, usually your first administrative position is a department chair and often times it is a reluctant person moving into that position. Its kind of like someone has to do it and we don't want X to do it, so you have got to do it and throw yourself on the sword.
--	---	---

PAA4.2 What's not on my CV is I took a leave...and went to university B and held a faculty position as a visiting position at B while I weighed whether I wanted to stay there or go back. I couldn't hold tenure at two universities. So basically I took a leave from one university while I took a job, without tenure at another. And after a while I decided I wanted to go back to my university, A, so I called the Dean and said, "You know, I really don't like university B that much; I'm coming back." He said, "Well, I don't want you back, unless you come back as the chair" and that was that, and I had no choice. So I came back as a chair and that is how I ended up being chair of the department.

PAA4.3 I received a phone call, ahhh from the provost calling me in asking to see me and I went in, not knowing what was about to happen and they, the provost, said they "have

been searching, for two years now they have had a failed search for a dean, we don't have a, we haven't found anyone we like. Would you take it on an interim basis for a year? While we do another search." And I said yeah

PAA4.4 Again, its reluctance, you come to it reluctantly; especially times at the lowest level you see it as an interim. In the sense, that my title isn't interim, I'm chair or director, but this is only going to be for three, or four or five years.

PAA4.5 I think people, I don't think they grow up wanting to be a Dean. They may want to be a biochemist or they might want to be an engineer, but I don't think they ever think about being the Dean of the College of Engineering or the Chair of the electrical engineering department or whatever. And I think those are things that happen.

PAA4.6 I would be interested to know, how many people end up being administrators at those lowest levels that the first time actually campaigned for the job. As opposed to one way or another being conscripted to the job. Umm and or taken on the assumption that it is a rotating chair and I will do my three or four years and then I'll roll out and somebody else will do it. It's kind of like a service obligation being director of undergraduate studies curriculum or some such thing.

The
Traditional
academic
affairs
administrator

His perception
of academic
affairs
PAA5
Importance of
the traditional
route

PAA5.1 I think that it is important for people in administrative positions in the university to have had substantial experience doing what faculty do, and both as the teaching piece, which in of itself is critical, but then also if you are a university that emphasizes research, the research piece.

PAA5.2 if you have to deal with faculty issues, faculty governance issues, you got to deal with academic curriculum and course development;

whatever level you are dealing with it, whether it is the department chair, dean, or the provost, you know, you have got to have a full kind of comprehensive understanding of these issues.

PAA5.3 More importantly in terms of administrative duties, your duties are to, nurture, and grow and improve the quality of that program. And so you have to have a sense of where is the discipline, what critical, where is the discipline going. Instead of being behind, let's get in front of it, in terms of new program development, hiring new faculty, where do we go for our next three hires in order to, do we just replace ourselves or do we try to expand and move off of dead center on these kinds of things.

PAA5.4 I mean I deal with tenure and promotion reviews and I tell people and they don't want to hear it if you haven't been there

The
Traditional
academic
affairs
administrator

His perception
of academic
affairs
PAA6
Respect and
faculty

PAA6.1 The other issue from the bottom up is respect. Faculty are notoriously hard to deal with, it's like the old analogy herding cats. Faculty are rebellious by nature.

PAA6.2 They sit in their office, if they even come to this office, as opposed to working from home. It's hard to get them to come to a meeting of the faculty or a committee meeting, you tell them to do something or ask them to do something, they are likely to say no. They don't feel any obligation, like well the boss just said he needs me to do something. So one of the ways to work with faculty is you got to have that respect.

PAA6.3 So if you are the dean where you are telling faculty that you need to be publishing more in top notch, refereed journals, with high impact scores. They need to know that you've done that. Its hard to say do it, when you, yourself have never done it. So when you've got a dean or a department chair, telling the

faculty these are the standards for promotion and tenure, but of course I didn't meet those standards...I came in the back door or they want to see, if you are going to impose it, you need to show that you can do it and you have done it. That is one reason, another reason; we end up with administrators who are already full professors.

PAA6.4 there has to be from a faculty's point of view, especially at a research university, a sense that the person they are talking to understands the difficulties of the research that is more than half of their job. In terms of what they are expected to do on an annual basis, that's half your job. So they want somebody who has been there and done that. Who can better appreciate what they are going through when they have their problems. And how hard it is to get a grant. And how, and which agencies are funding and which agencies aren't funding. And, why, we don't even have a graduate program in this department, why are you expecting me to do these things. I don't have grad assistants and that kind of thing.

The Traditional academic affairs administrator

His perception of academic affairs
PAA7
Other administrators

PAA7.1 Now if you are talking about the non-academic side, that's an entirely different game. When you get into assistant deans and associate deans who might be professionals, who are brought in to work specifically on enrollment management problems or budget problems or then you are bringing in, like here at the university level, we have the vice president and chief legal council, he is an attorney, he has never been a professor, he is a lawyer, we've got our CFO who is in charge of our budgets, as far as I know he hasn't been in a faculty position. So you start getting into those kinds of things.

The scholarly (faculty) administrator

Scholarship and academic affairs administration
SAAA1

SAAA1.1 Keep in mind that a vice provost like an associate dean is staff, its not a line position, we don't make decisions. There are line positions and there are staff positions. Line are the provost, the dean, the department

	Clarifying administration	chair. Assistant deans, deputy chairs, vice provosts, vice presidents, you know have very, very little authority to make decisions. We make recommendations we respond, we are staff.
The scholarly (faculty) administrator	Scholarship and academic affairs administration SAAA2 Upholding scholarly rigor	<p>SAAA2.1 We are concerned with the value of a product. We don't want to be putting out masters, doctorates, or bachelor's degrees, which don't pass the smell test.</p> <p>SAAA2.2 For example, let's say one of those I get a lot, the policy says you can only take a course twice. And yet it is a core course and you haven't passed it twice and have taken it and sometimes students will appeal. And we always tell them maybe you just aren't meant to be a whatever.</p> <p>SAAA2.3 We're not going to be giving, we don't give credit for life experiences, we don't give credit for jobs you've had. You could have been a general in the army and think you are going to get three hours of credit for management or that kind of thing. And if you took a course somewhere else, and it is an accredited university, then we will accept it. We may not accept it as equivalent, but we'll at least give you general credit hours toward your degree.</p>
The scholarly (faculty) administrator	Scholarship and academic affairs administration SAAA3 Student academic integrity	<p>SAAA3.1 Once they apply, we want to make sure we process them quickly enough and admit those we are going to admit and then the next issue is how are they going to show up on our doorstep in August. That is true almost everywhere</p> <p>SAAA3.2 So we want to make sure if they are at the top of the list for academic achievement, we want to find a way to recruit them, even if we are not going to give them money, we let them know that we value them and they know we look forward to having them here</p>

SAAA3.3 Just because it says you need a 3.0 to get in, doesn't mean you are going to get in with a 3.0. Because we only have room for 12 students and you have a 3.2 and there are 50 students who have a 3.6 and above. So you are not likely to be one of those 12.

SAAA3.4 In fairness to the student, we don't want to admit a student with a 2.0 in basic things and throw them in and make them think they are going to study X, engineering or whatever and then throw them into the fire, they are totally unprepared. They don't have the grades; they don't have the math background. There is no way they are going to succeed.

The scholarly
(faculty)
administrator

Scholarship
and academic
administration
SAAA4
Uphold rigor

SAAA4.1 So we have a really popular program here, where if a 2.0 gets you in we could have a thousand students and you're curtailing it to having a 2.8 so we are going to lose some students and my job is to enroll students. And I say enroll them but put them somewhere else. Right and the Deans say that too. These things come from the dean, not from us. Its not top down, its bottom up.

SAAA4.2 If you are trying to build Harvard at a state institution, in terms of your admissions standards and your retention standards, i.e. you have to have a 2.75 or whatever it is, then at the same time Brian is going to say, "How can I have 65,000 students? How can we admit 10,000 more students if you keep raising the standards?" And so there has got to be some...A saddle point as they say in mathematical models. Where do we get to the point that we can compromise enough that there is still the academic integrity or rigor that we want

The scholarly
(faculty)
administrator

Scholarship
and academic
administration
SAAA5

SAAA5.1 So I served as chair for four years, five years, whatever it was. I came out and did that for another five years, so the entire 1980s basically, I was an administrator, and then my term was up, I

	Five years	mean I had done it.
		SAAA5.2 My point is, after about five years, you have pretty well used up your political capital, you've pretty well done what you can do to make changes, to develop, to build, you've hired in your new faculty to move.
		SAAA5.3 I see this as a year-to-year job and as long as it is fun and I feel like I am making contributions, umm, at least for another year or two. I've already been here, what two years now so. Like I said, at the very beginning after about four or five years, you've kind of exhausted, you've hit the wall about as many times as you can and you've tried to make some changes, and dealt with faculty, and dealt with this and used up your political capital. And made a lot of enemies.
The scholarly (faculty) administrator	Scholarship and academic affairs administration SAAA6 Administration is temporary	SAAA6.1 All administrators serve at 90 days notice. SAAA6.2 at any given time, I could be back full-time in the faculty. This is temporary. SAAA6.3 I know I am not a faculty member, I understand the fact that I am from an administrators point of view...but I know I am going to go back there at some point. And that is always I think is the back of my mind.
The scholarly (faculty) administrator	Scholarship and academic affairs administration SAAA7 Full professor	SAAA7.1 most of us are full professors. And were before we got into an administrative position for a variety of reasons. SAAA7.2 if you are a research faculty member and you are doing it well, first of all you want to become full professor. Because once you get into administration its very hard to keep your research agenda going. SAAA7.3 If you take that job before you are a full professor, it is very, very hard to keep your research agenda going to get, to become full

professor. In which case then you suffer this problem of you are not doing your own research, how can you be telling your faculty. And you have yet to make the leap to full professor or establish a national reputation yourself, and yet, “You want us to do it. And you don’t have a clue as to what’s needed to do it. You don’t understand because you have been there. You don’t understand how hard it is to establish a national reputation and don’t understand how limited I am in doing that with the resources that I have.” “And why when I come to you and say I need more of X, Y, and Z, whether its grad assistants, or computers or labs, or whatever, you don’t understand, because you have never been there. You think I can just do this and make it happen over the weekend.”

Discipline
specific
scholarship in
administration

Scholar in
administrator’s
clothing
SAC1
Discipline
specific
scholarship

SAC1.1 I don’t study higher education. What you are getting at is a little bit different. For me, when you talk about scholarship, I think about scholarship in one’s discipline.

SAC1.2 I don’t know, I would be glad to do a guest lecture or better yet, be a panelist or be interviewed as part of a course. Whatever my experiences whether that can be used to generate discussion among students or among prospective higher ed people. But I don’t want to study higher ed.

SAC1.3 The paper that I just presented is called inmate misconduct and the capacity of institutional control and dealt with institutional management efforts on behavior in prisons. Unless you want to make some weird analogy about our university and its inmates.

Discipline
specific
scholarship in
administration

Scholar in
administrator’s
clothing
SAC2
Scholarship in

SAC2.1 The doing is very hard when you are a full time administrator. You probably noticed from my CV my level of productivity has dropped.

administration is hard SAC2.2 It took me two years to write that paper. To get the data, to collect the data, analyze the data, write the article, and write the paper.

SAC2.3 The other half is the data collection. If I've got the data, I can find a way to run it. But where do I get the data? How much time does it take me to go out and get the data? If I have to go out to beg, borrow, and steal from these formal agencies, or get grants. That's the stuff that is hard to do. When you're, in this job, it is pretty routine. People expect me to be here, at least during the 8-5 routine. Because Deans or associate deans or provosts or others have things, obviously I'm tethered (referring to his phone) and so I can be reached.

SAC2.4 Right, well you are penalized for taking a vacation it just builds up.

SAC2.5 But once you are a dean, you are pretty much full-time. So if you want to be research-active, you've got to find a way to make it happen, while you do all the duties that are required of this. It is like having a 100 percent job and a second one for 10 or 15 percent.

Discipline specific scholarship in administration
Scholar in administrator's clothing
SAC3
Scholarship doesn't count

SAC3.1 No. Its not part of the job description, in fact I don't think the provost or the president would even know if I do or don't do, because it is not part of my performance review.

SAC3.2 I don't think it is relevant that I keep the agenda but the fact that I had a history of scholarship and scholarly research, which led to promotions and national visibility and so-on, I think is key to getting into the position in the first place and then maintaining that credibility.

SAC3.2 The problem is, one of those stacks over there is a manuscript that I am working on, but it is only one of several stacks. And it is the lowest priority in the job.

SAC3.3 Often times, when a crunch comes, that is the very first thing that has to go.

SAC3.4 When they say, what did you do this year; I don't say I also wrote an article or a paper. They will know it, only because I have to notify them to take vacation days to go to the conference, because it is not a part of my job. Its not like they are going to pay to send me there. Its like, okay fine, it's your time, your vacation you are free to go. And I know that coming in.

SAC3.5 Now that is my priority, but keep in mind that is nowhere in my contract as vice provost or for that matter for deans.

Discipline
specific
scholarship in
administration

Scholar in
administrator's
clothing
SAC4
Knowing vs.
doing
scholarship

SAC4.1 I think there are two ways you can talk about scholarship, there is the doing and there is the knowing.

SAC4.2 I can always find time to read, because that doesn't require as much effort to keep up with the journals and read in my area even take a few notes. It's the creative part, where okay I've read these last 46 journal articles; I've got some general ideas. Now how do I find the time to write?

Discipline
specific
scholarship in
administration

Scholar in
administrator's
clothing
SAC5
Time for the
process

SAC5.1 If I still have some energy left at five o'clock or maybe I can get an hour in on the article, or read.

SAC5.2 I have to catch some time where I can. And sometimes I can do it during the so-called normal course of the day. I might find myself, during the day I might be able to read an article of two when I am waiting for a meeting to start or at the end of the day, I am burned out on what I have been doing, I don't have to rush home, its only 4:30, but I don't want to start my next project, reviewing the by-laws for class, which is one of the things we do, we do by-laws. So I'll say, I'll just read this

journal article.

SAC5.3 That's where I carve it out. If I am feeling in pretty good shape and not too tired, and then I'll say, "look if it is okay with you, I am going to stay an extra 2 two and half hours tonight and get some work done on the manuscript." Kind of like amateurs trying to write the novel. It took them 12 years to write their first novel and that's kind of the way it is.

SAC5.4 But if I want to, like on that particular article, it required that I set aside blocks of time. Evenings and occasionally on weekends.

SAC5.5 I find, then when I have gotten to the point that I am feeling really comfortable, like anybody else who writes in my style, then I will block out four or five hours. Because all of those little two hours bits are to kind of run ideas into an outline, or write a little piece about section a, here is section c. Now I will need four hours to put together a first draft. So, then I will take a Sunday afternoon or whatever it is and just stay home and do it

Discipline specific scholarship in administration	Scholar in administrator's clothing SAC6 Scholarship and quality	SAC6.1 I'd like to think the quality is still there, but clearly the quantity is not there. I just actually in the last week, I was in England presenting a paper.
Discipline specific scholarship in administration	Scholar in administrator's clothing SAC7 Personal times and sacrifice	SAC7.1 In addition to being married, you may not have guessed this about me given my age, I have a pair of kids at home. SAC7.2 My wife's on the faculty. So she understands and I understand when she does the same thing. As long as you don't pick the same night, it works pretty well.
		SAC7.3 I don't want to make it sound like, its not like, I'm working full-time and pursuing a doctoral degree, its not at that level of sacrifice, where you really have to forego your

family time, because three nights a week you are taking classes in addition to working full-time during the day and then when you are not in the classroom you are doing the work for the classroom. I don't want to make that kind of analogy.

APPENDIX I
INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR
PARTICIPANT 3

Thematic Category	Sub-themes	Participant quote
Scholarship and the core mission	Scholarship is what is core SC1 What is scholarship	<p>SC1.1 I'd answer that question by deferring to Boyer's paradigm, talking about the scholarship of discovery or the scholarship of teaching and you know how does that dynamic in any of the four spheres, how does that dynamic manifest in a tangible way around the act of what we are regarding as scholarship</p>
		<p>SC1.2 The teaching-learning exchange, the teacher-scholar exchange, or scholar-to-scholar exchange, is inherently focused on the fundamental. That's why before we got started; let's talk about what does scholarship mean. How do you know it if you see it? You'd like to think, that every classroom exchange is, is contributing to the learning process, the process of inquiry, the exchange of ideas. The process of critical thinking and critical discourse and what comes from that, new ideas. Ideas, reconsidered. I mean, in the most, in kind of the purest sense, this community of scholars, should be implicitly engaged in the act of scholarship.</p>
Scholarship and the core mission	Scholarship is what is core SC2 Teaching, learning and the core	<p>SC2.1 Yeah, and if you think about, scholarship. And this is the act of teaching and learning; it's the thread that is woven through the entire enterprise, no question.</p>
		<p>SC2.2 Most faculty would make a broader and different argument, but there is no question you could make that case. Absolutely. I can make that case about any dimension of the university outside of happens in the classroom, teaching and learning. You can make that case with research.</p>
Scholarship and the core mission	Scholarship is what is core SC3 Research and	<p>SC3.1 In this last iteration, I had a lot of fun with the class, because they were into this whole thing about research. What's fundamental about research in an institution of</p>

universities

higher learning? What's fundamental about it? You can't do this, you can't do that, you have to have research to have for teaching, the pursuit of new knowledge, I said, "Really you ever heard of Bell Labs? Let's talk about the German research university. How embedded in that model was research relative to the undergraduate curriculum?" There wasn't any relationship. What, "Let's talk about education at the quintessential four year undergraduate liberal arts institution. They don't have a research agenda." So now they (the students) have cognitive dissonance in that class, because they are indoctrinated to this idea that one and the other must go together, the scholarship of research. You have institutions who have research endeavors that are totally detached from the core of teaching and learning, totally detached.

SC3.2 So now they (the students) have cognitive dissonance in that class, because they are indoctrinated to this idea that one and the other must go together. The scholarship of research. You have institutions who have research endeavors that are totally detached from the core of teaching and learning, totally detached, they've lost their way in the same way that people in student affairs have lost their way. You see what I'm saying. The forest for the trees phenomenon. Research is an end unto itself.

SC3.3 There is a lot of work that can be done far away from college campuses. That is part of the criticisms on research parks, faculty go there and they never come back.

Scholarship and the core mission

Scholarship is what is core
SC4
Economics and teaching and learning

SC4.1 No, and I say that not because the downturn in the economy and all it has meant to budget cutting hasn't been impactful. It certainly has been, but where making institutional decisions relative to what we cut to protect the core. And scholarship is at the core. I don't feel like there has been

substantive impact there.

SC4.2 That's not to say there hasn't been impact, but it is more at the margins, that's intentional. You know we are going to cut administratively as deeply as possible and as necessary to ensure that we are not impacting the core mission.

SC4.3 We'll reduce services and programs and ancillary support, long before we want any impact on our research or on teaching.

Scholarship
and the core
mission

Scholarship is
what is core
SC5
Everything
should
contribute

SC5.1 Everything that happens, should be in my view, following the Boyer Model, should be contributing to scholarship in the way that he, I think defined it.

SC5.2 I mean parking ultimately has to add value to the institution, to the core. It does, if it detracts from it.

SC5.3 I would like to think, as we discussed earlier, I would like to think, virtually every endeavor that we are involved in, its contributing to the act of scholarship, however defined, using Boyer's paradigm. I'd like to think that, we've talked about that.

SC5.4 We've got research going on in the health center, we've got research going on in the rec center. Given the nature of the disciplines and all that, absolutely. And with some of the other stuff, it's maybe less how they contribute and more to the extent to which they can detract on the services part.

Administration
and the core

His perception
of
administration
HPA1
Administration
is not core

HPA1.1 I mean administration is largely a problem solving profession. It is very easy for the problems of the day to overtake one's agenda and for that to create, a, kind of inertia that can, can get you out of focus.

HPA1.2 Now one could have an interesting debate about that, but it is a core value. It is an

administrative core value that I think keeps you focused on the core. Administration generally is infrastructure to the core. I think that is less the case if you don't think of yourself as an educator.

HPA1.3 I'm in an enterprise, whose core mission is education, everything that I do is an act of teaching, educating, advancing the mission (air quotes). I'm nothing if not redundant but it keeps you focused on core objectives, it (scholarship) keeps you focused on why you are here. Umm, it's so easy to lose sight of that as I mentioned earlier.

Administration and the core
His perception of administration
HPA2
Student affairs and missing the core mission

HPA2.1 let me give you a critical and perhaps an unfair critique. I don't feel I haven't never really felt attached to a profession called student affairs. Student affairs is an organizational dimension of the enterprise of university administration. I don't think it is a profession unto itself. Now most people would disagree with that.

HPA2.2 It has to do with professional identity, but I don't think it has anything to do with education. So I've never subscribed to it, I think it is more of a distraction than an enabler, but that's me

HPA2.3 See student affairs, there are people in student affairs, that actually believe that what it is that they do, it is so powerful and so important that its really an end unto itself. "We're developing students". It's a means to an end. Students don't come to a university to be developed; they come to a university to get a degree.

HPA2.4 Meaning in point of fact, people in student affairs, even use the term and call themselves, student affairs professionals. Well I don't here faculty call themselves, faculty professionals, or educational professionals or academic affairs professionals, they are what?

They are educators. That kind of frame of reference to me is serving a completely different purpose that has little or nothing to do with education.

HPA2.5 The people that think this thing (student affairs) is so powerful that it can or should stand all on its own have missed the whole point. They're not educators, they don't even understand how, how their role should impact the other most fundamental core endeavor. They've lost their way. For any number of reasons.

Administration and the core	His perception of administration HPA4 Scholarship underpins administration	HPA4.1 I think it is the underpinning of, and should be, for daily administrative work. HPA4.2 The endeavor, the fundamental endeavor of teaching and learning, the discovery of new knowledge implicit in that exchange and critically important, as I said, it's the underpinning of administrative work, or should be.
Administration and the core	His perception of administration HPA5 Asking questions	HPA5.1 I mean you don't need a classroom to teach. You don't need a classroom physical classroom, to learn. Umm, by in large, we have those environments. Virtual or in the physical form. Which ones contribute to enhanced learning? Enhanced scholarship? Are there some that detract from that? Now you are into an interesting dialogue about facilities management, environmental management, and administrative infrastructure to the core. HPA5.2 By in large, classrooms have been the same for a hundred years or two hundred years, is that environment, the physical environment, with the advent of the host of technological tools available. Are we realizing the optimum in learning in this format? If so okay, if not, why not, what would we do better or differently? It is an interesting set of questions. Umm, they're really also hard to answer is you are not entirely sure what you are measuring.

Learning in relation to...what? Now we come back to this other fundamental thing, umm, now there are some more obvious, issues in the built environment. If the classrooms are not properly ventilated, it is pretty easy and you could test this, pretty simply. Students are not going to perform at their optimum if the physical environment, if the lighting, if the conditions, work against basic human interaction umm, and you kind of take it out from there.

HPA5.3 Now you are engaging the facilities people, the budget people, what is that we are trying to accomplish here with respect to a learning environment? Umm... if it is infrastructure to the core, everything should contribute to the optimum. Do you have situations where you are making decisions or investments that work against that core objective? Sure, sure, now were back to parking.

HPA5.4 Now you see what I'm saying. Or...so here's another closer, kind of to the portfolio, and this is interesting dialogue that has gone on. What do you need a big recreation complex on campus for? How can that in any way contribute to scholarship? Now that's an interesting question. So, on the one hand you can make a compelling case that it is completely tangential, frivolous, un-necessary. Now on the flip side of that. You can talk about stress and healthful living, and appropriate mind, body, intellectual, emotional, physical balance, that when out of balance can contribute to the negative in terms of performance.

HPA5.5 Do you need a health center on your campus? Now there, candidly, I would probably say, no, not if you live in a metropolitan area where the industry can be responsive to your students. Meaning do you have to run a health center, okay, do you have

Scholarship means contributing however you can	His choice to contribute HCC1 Choice	too? Can it be a contracted service? That is probably true of the recreation stuff too, on and on and on and on. Umm, but now that I am at it, I can make that case, about.... a whole host of things. HCC1.1 Look over the course of ones professional life, I think that has a way of working itself out. And some of that is you know part of, I'm sure probably, personal choice.
Scholarship means contributing however you can	His choice to contribute HCC2 Contribute however you can	HCC1.2 I may have a colleague at university of Florida, who just completed a terrific chapter on student affairs administration or some analysis of a recruitment or outreach activities, blah, blah, blah. Well you know That's terrific, might there be a time where I am able to contribute more. Yeah, I think I would look forward to the opportunity to do that. HCC2.1 I like to be a part of being able to contribute in whatever way possible, I think that is important. You get other stuff to do as a result of that and okay, so as an example, when asked to be the interim dean of the school of education, yes, I will do that. And I think that is important institutionally and probably helpful to me in some respect.
Contributing how and where he can	Supporting lifelong learning SLL1 Scholarship and learning enhancing	HCC2.2 Now that's a very good point, and actually that was my interest in joining as a founding member this advisory group... That's the space that they are filling and I wanted to help shape that agenda and the way that I've described. So it is my way of trying to contribute to that, without really having to stop and do it on my own. SLL1.1 They can contribute, without a terminal degree. But their contribution will be enhanced, as will their professional sense of fulfillment if there are not only in a degree program, but if they've completed those requirements, they've done scholarly work on their own and they've modeled for others while

contributions doing so, I think that is very important.

SLL1.2 I want everybody that I'm working with, who believes they've found their niche, I want them all in degree programs. I want junior level staff all in master's degree programs in higher ed. I want middle level staff who understand what it is that they are doing here. Meaning that they understand they are educators and we talk about that. I want them all in the doctoral program, for that very reason.

SLL1.3 I think you can be an effective in your administrative roll, but you are much more likely to be, closer to your optimum if you are consuming of the contemporary literature and research, staying current.

SLL1.4 Very important to make informed decisions and ones that will serve your institution and the students that you are ultimately most focused on.

Contributing
how and
where he can

Scholarship of
teaching
ST1
Teaching as
his scholarship

ST1.1 Currently, that (Governance) has been the focus. Historically, that has included, on multiple occasions, introduction to higher education, student development, critical issues in higher education, umm, the American college student. I think that is probably the extent of it.

ST1.2 I have taught historically, in the main once a year, on an occasion, per semester.

ST1.3 So this fall, because there is a modification setting the EDD cohort program aside, for one year. So we are not admitting a class this year. But this is the first fall, that I will not have taught since 199...3. I'll still be involved in helping the cohort advance in all of their research and dissertation work.

ST1.4 I think I may use the time actually to re-work the course. Umm. I'll look at the written materials that we've relied on. I think I'm

really going to think through and then revise the structure of the class in total. Including assignments and the like.

ST1.5 You know what happens in the course of the day, you got 75 emails waiting for you, I get how it works, but it's important to take the time too. It goes back to the educator part of it, if I'm not here to talk to you, like what am I here for?

Contributing how and where he can

Scholarship of teaching
ST2
Students and scholarship

ST2.1 Now I would also say that we do rely on our doctoral programs as another vehicle for that, but the incubation time is much longer.

ST2.2 You talk to a doctoral student who says "Hey Dr. Simpson I am interested in looking at freshman retention, etc. Can you work with me on it?" And you say, yeah, yeah, because that does clearly inform our practice, but you are looking at in some cases you are looking at 18-24 months before you have a report, a dissertation, in hand that helps you understand the work that you are doing.

ST2.3 So it is harder to get to in real time. Its still valuable and it creates other kinds of synergies relative again to core, scholarship.

Contributing how and where he can

Scholarship, discovery, and publication
SDP1
His publications

SDP1.1 We did, a colleague of mine did a monograph for New Directions in Student Services, a Jossey Bass series, right after 9/11 on campus safety. And I write the introductory chapter and I think another chapter on, I'm forgetting now, it may have either had to do with study abroad programs or residential programs. And I asked other colleagues to collaborate.

SDP1.2 Though more comprehensive I have done some writing, some professional writing in both of those spheres, both published in the core text for student services administration. Again, a Jossey-Bass publication. So in terms of scholarly work informing practice, yeah,

there is a need to do that, on an as needed or as time allows basis.

SDP1.3 The writing of the monograph, several book chapters for a couple of those textbooks that are used in the field.

Contributing how and where he can

Scholarship, discovery, and publication
SDP2
Publishing opportunities are at a premium

SDP2.1 The opportunity to do that is more at a premium because it is time consuming and again it is not unlike a dissertation where if you want real time, information gathering, analysis, scholarship to inform practice, its not going to meet your needs.

SDP2.2 Now if asked, “Kevin would you write a chapter.” Yeah, I could figure out a way to get that done. It just harder to do in the normal course.

Contributing how and where he can

Scholarship, discovery, and publication
SDP3
Scholarship in administration is hard

SDP3.1 We’d all like to say I take two hours a day to follow the latest but these are 12 hour a day jobs anyway. So carving out, that’s without the stuff on the periphery. Carving out the time to stay current, as a scholar is difficult.

SDP3.2 So administratively though, we are pretty lean. That means, that might mean that there is not the kind of opportunity for a kind of administrative reflection or review, or opportunities to set aside some time to, to analyze, to research, to even contemplate a set of activities and think about it, discuss it, and write about it. That’s harder to do right now. You know, that’s some work that I did here, prior

SDP3.3 Because that’s, they see that dilemma, people working hard just to solve problems and not really having the time or the resources to stop umm, to do the research to do the review of the literature, synthesize it and then inform the field.

Contributing how and where he can

Scholarship, discovery, and publication

SDP4.1 Certainly I’d never make the case that the field is diminished by my lack of ability to contribute to the body of knowledge, I mean.

	SDP4 The field is not diminished	SDP4.2 No I don't think we are missing out. I think if you looked at for my part of the world. If your question is, is there an active is there a robust research agenda, what's the body of scholarly work being done by administrators in this space? I think it's more than adequate.
Contributing how and where he can	Scholarship, discovery, and publication SDP5 Holes in the research	SDP5.1 I say that there is an asterisk there and its tied to my comments earlier, it's a bias that I have, I think there are too many people in the student services area that are focused only on, on they're too narrowly focused on the value of what student services people do relative to the what core mission. SDP5.2 SO I don't want to contradict, so I'm trying to be fair to my colleagues, and so I think it is adequate, I think it is more than adequate. Where I do think we are probably lacking, is we haven't taken the time or we have chosen not to think about and research and write about how these activities really do advance core objectives. I think there more work should be done...much more work should be done.
Contributing how and where he can	Scholarship in Administration SA1 Scholarship in administration evaluating teaching and learning	SA1.1 Absolutely, absolutely. In some ways that's what some of the accreditation visits really do for an academic unit or an administrative unit. It's a longer, you know process, but it, it enables the same kind of self-reflection, analysis, review, opportunity for improvement. SA1.2 Scholarship, there's the term. We can define it, in the way that you have, in the way that Boyer has and the way we've described it today. How would I know it if I saw it. What's the outcome? Now that's your question. You know is there more that we could be doing, that we should be doing, that contributes to an outcome, connected to scholarship. SA1.3 That's the big dilemma, that's the

learning outcomes discussion in education. Right. That's the accountability agenda historically. Between the state legislatures and public institutions. That's what has given rise to P20 councils in every state in the nation.

SA1.4 So I got started there, we're measuring learning, largely in writing and critical thinking. Pre-test, post-test, freshman class, benchmarking throughout a student's tenure. And then benchmarking their starting point with what they learned prior to leaving the institution as seniors.

APPENDIX J
INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR
PARTICIPANT 4

Thematic Category	Sub-themes	Participant quote
Housing as education and housing in education	Origins of educational perspective OEP1 Perception of housing as education	OEP1.1 Had always thought I was going to go into education, but always thought of education in terms of teaching and I realized that education is much more than just the classroom.
		OEP1.2 I just had a good series of administrators who were strong mentors and helped me realize that I could achieve my goal of being an educator by working in the housing profession.
		OEP1.3 In actuality, even though I didn't realize it at the time, I was at the beginning of this profession, as it's now defined. Which is very interesting.
Housing as education and housing in education	Origins of educational perspective OEP2 Situating the housing profession historically	OEP2.1 Do you want a little history about housing? Because it's really sort of interesting and it has framed a lot and it ties back to the scholarship stuff that you want to talk about.
		OEP2.2 Student housing during the golden years of higher education as it is sometimes referred to, post World War II with the G.I. Bill. There was a huge demand for housing, because the local communities where most colleges and universities were located, relied on the townspeople to provide housing and boarding housing and stuff like that, but there was such a huge influx that institutions started building more housing in the late 40's early 50's.
		OEP2.3 What they did is they turned to quartermasters that were now no longer in the services to make it happen. That's why a lot of the housing facilities from that time are very block like, very barrack like. The dining halls were very stainless steel, so they could be sprayed down. You know big old

bathroom, shower room stuff like that.

OEP2.4 The next big wave came in the sixties when the baby boomers, like myself started arriving at higher education and there was another big move to build housing.

OEP2.5 The federal government was actually providing no-interest loans for public institutions to build housing. And that's the period when housing was built with all the furniture built in, because it could be covered under the loan, because it became part of the structure and not part of the FF&E, furnishing and finishing (expense).

OEP2.6 It was about this time when all the social activism was going on, it was a societal shift that housing as a profession, an educational profession started to emerge.

Contributing to education through a career in residential life

Choosing and preparing for housing
CPH1
Him and preparing for a career in residential life

CPH1.1 Started in under-graduate. I had a really excellent experience my first year living in residence halls and was encouraged by, my hall director at the time, to get involved in fall welcome and then become president of my hall council ultimately became president of the residence hall association.

CPH1.2 So actually as an undergraduate, realized I wanted to go into housing as my career.

CPH1.3 I got an interdepartmental, interdisciplinary major in liberal arts, psych, soc, and home economics, those things seemed to be what I would need in the housing.

CPH1.4 So a lot of food science courses and some other things, knowing that I was going to go to grad school that if I wanted to pursue a career I needed to at least get a master's degree.

CPH1.5 Worked in housing the first year in graduate school. But then the graduate program wanted to have us experience things outside what we thought we were going to do our career in, so I was also in student activities and orientation. Realized that I like housing better, went down that road.

CPH1.6 I did all my course work for an EdD in educational leadership, but left before I completed the degree.

Contributing to education through a career in residential life

Choosing and preparing for housing
CPH2
Career progression and accomplishments

CPH2.1 went back to my alma mater as a hall director, was there for a couple years, then went to another university as an area coordinator, and then was promoted to assistant director for residential life, focusing more on the programming, staff training and development, leadership development, those sorts of things.

CPH2.2 Became a Director of Housing, that's when I got more exposure on the business side, of housing. In terms of coming up with budgets, room rates to take to the board, those sorts of things

CPH2.3 It was the mid 80s, public-private partnerships were not the norm, but it was the only way I could increase our housing there. We wanted to go from a commuter institution to a residential institution, but we could not issue any bonds or use any of our fiscal resources, so I had to find a third party who would work with us. Ended up building nine residence halls and seven apartment complexes using that model and went from housing less than 400 to close to 3,000

CPH2.4 I left there to go to another university because they had some very old housing stock that they wanted to renovate and they had just merged housing and dining together. So I thought, okay, here is an opportunity for me

to get experience in renovation but also, let me dabble in how does the dining experience mingle with the residential experience and have it be more enriching.

CPH2.5 So went there, did that. Renovated four high-rise buildings. Completely changed the dining program from a very standardized, every cafeteria was serving the same thing on a six week rotation cycle. To what's referred to now in the industry as destination dining.

CPH2.6 was at the very front end of setting up what's, in housing, they've been calling them living-learning communities before, but moving more toward what we've started referring to as a residential college model.

CPH2.7 Became the assistant vice president there and I had student activities, housing, and a bunch of other stuff. And realized that I liked housing too much. I was too far removed from what I enjoyed.

CPH2.8 I've been here, it's going to be 4 years in September and we've built over, since I've got here, over \$600 million in new housing facilities, and have doubled our capacity. We are just right now a little bit over 13,000 bed spaces and we've got stuff in the works.

Scholarship
in housing

Currency and
involvement
CII
Learning in the
discipline

CII.1 scholarship at that point, did a lot of reading about what creates a critical mass on campus that tips it from a commuter to a residential and when it tips the scale, how does that impact the whole element of student life and how does it impact other student services, those sorts of things. Very interesting.

CII.2 I wouldn't say it's a daily thing, it is probably a weekly thing that, you know, I read a book, or an article, or a chapter, or you know something that someone has referred to

me that they think will be beneficial. Umm, so that on a weekly basis.

CI1.3 I read the chronicle every week, I get some journals, I am not a big NASPA person, so I tend to go with the ACUHOI, student housing journal.

CI1.4 I don't know if it helps me make decisions, but it helps me think beyond just the information I already had. It may expose me to new concepts, new ideas that I might not have considered before, it may umm, inform me on how I can work with the staff that report to me and the staff that work with them, you know, how do we come together around a shared vision or value. It gives me new opportunities new techniques to try, that sort of stuff.

CI1.5 I'm on several listservs, CHOBiz, Chief Housing Officer Business, umm, that it's just a bunch of us who have come together, once a year for a variety of years, and we share resources that way or we ask each other questions. I'm on the NASPA listserv.

CI1.6 So there are some of those things that then prompt me to either find out more about something or get a book that I didn't have.

Scholarship
in housing

Currency and
involvement
CI2
Scholarship
through
association

CI2.1 ACUHOI is an organization that has been around since the late forties and it's grown over time and I've gotten involved with that.

CI2.2 That's the one conference I go to every year. Where I connect with my colleagues, connect with younger professionals because they bring a different perspective, so it's good to talk with them.

Scholarship

Understanding

CI2.3 When I think about Boyer's definitions of scholarship that's probably the thing I've contributed the most, in terms of scholarship. UHE1.1 that I realized that, creating

in housing

housing as
education
UHE1
Perceptions of
housing as
education

environments for students to live in and engage with other students in was really much more than the programming that takes place in the building. How do you create an environment that encourages engagement, encourages development those sorts of things, but how do those spaces interact with the rest of campus?

UHE1.2 That's when sort of the architectural part of my personality came out in terms of wow; how we build environments can totally change the campus. It brings the campus to life and did.

UHE1.3 Before it was just putting people in beds, now it became, oooh, learning takes places here. So that how the whole profession started.

UHE1.4 In terms of achievement, responsibility, and engagement, as three tenets of the student life experience. That just reflects what housing is. Students become part of a community when they live in a student housing facility, they have to take responsibility for their actions, but they have to take responsibility for being part of the community

UHE1.5 Does the environment help them to achieve academically as well as personally? How does the environment promote engagement with their peers and also with their faculty, so the whole residential college model fits in with that?

UHE1.6 How do we operate it in such a way that it doesn't limit access to the experience and what sort of impact can that experience have? So it's really sort of woven into everything. It's I think, housing is the living laboratory, especially for first year students. To get them to be part of a university's culture and experience.

UHE1.7 It's focused more on how does the facility allow for or provide barriers to the curriculum, not really talking about what the curriculum should be, because that is very campus specific because the curriculum tends to represent the core values of the institution.

Scholarship
in housing

Scholarship in
the field
SIF1
Reflection to
scholarship

SIF1.1 A lot of my colleagues and I have spent a lot of time talking about that and that resulted in the Project.

SIF1.2 A developer, an architect, and I all served on the foundation board, the development arm of the organization. And we had meetings like twice a year and we were sitting after a meeting one-day, in a bar, with some Grey Goose. (I laugh a little). And started talking about from a chief housing officers perspective, an architects perspective, and a developers perspective how frustrating the whole process is of coming up with a program statement for new student housing. That the wrong people sort of steer the boat.

Scholarship
in housing

Scholarship in
the field
SIF2
Leading in the
profession

SIF2.1 So we decided we were going to say, housing professionals should be facilitating the dialogue on what the next generation of student housing should be. So what we did was we decided to put on our own show, we raised all the money ourselves, but we brought together the gang of 99 we called it the gang of 99.

SIF2.2 We had nine college and university presidents, nine chief academic officers, nine business officers, nine student affairs officers, 18 chief housing officers, nine students from across the country who were in residential leadership roles, some information technology people, dining people, a host of others, but there was 99 people altogether, and for three and a half days in Chicago, and we paid everything for them, their hotels,

their meals, all that stuff.

SIF2.3 We went through a very facilitated discussion on what should the next generation of student housing be, not campus specific. We asked them to, don't bring your campus politics in here, but bring your positional point of view. As a university or college president, what do you see the roll of student housing being? As a chief business officer, what do you see, chief student affairs officer? And we were able to have a discussion way up here (hand up in the air) because it wasn't the politics that sort of mire down the process on a campus.

SIF2.4 We went from a macro level of, what is the roll of student housing on a college or university campus? How does it benefit the educational experience? How does it promote academic and personal success? All that stuff. And then through a series of focus groups and exercise and facilitated dialogue got it down to the architectural detail. What does it mean in terms of space per student, what does that mean in terms of how rooms relate to other rooms? How do you create this thing?

SIF2.5 I think the Project is the capstone of my career. It's the way that I can contribute to the profession and higher education as a whole in a way that's much more significant that even doing an excellent job at the institution I'm in. It's my legacy.

Scholarship
in housing

Scholarship in
the field
SIF3
Applying
scholarship

SIF3.1 Then we took it, we took all the information that came out of the summit and put a call out for RFP's to design professionals, architects and developers to go based on this information, you come back with a design.

SIF3.2 And we had 57 entries from around the world, who did it for free. There was a \$5,000 prize, but we think they each spent

about \$25,000 to come up with the presentation they did. And we winnowed it down to eight finalists, who actually did a presentation.

SIF3.3 We had the next design competition, which was the block and the neighborhood. And now, we are to the point right now, where we want to do a prototype of it that came out of it. So schools bid to be the host site for the prototype.

SIF3.4 We have gotten corporate partners, it was the way we raised all the money. When the prototype is built they will provide their product or their service, at below, or at no cost. And for five years we can use the prototype to actually do some assessment, did the product do what they said their product was going to do, how did the students interact with their product, what impact did they have with the educational mission, so this is ongoing.

SIF3.5 Yes, like the university architects office now refers to the Project, the facilities management refers to it. It's become part of the lingo here, because, I think it is because we are actually doing it. You know you can talk and talk and talk, but we are actually applying it to these projects that are popping up, it is getting woven into the fabric. But its very reflective of what we are trying to become as a university. So to be doing what should the next generation of student housing be like, fits into that fabric.

Scholarship
in housing

Scholarship in
the field
SIF4
Tangible
scholarly
outcomes

SIF4.1 We came up with a whole hierarchy that came out of this. There is the home or the student living space. Then a grouping of those homes become the block or the street, it's a very urban design, and the block or the streets come together to make a neighborhood, and the multiple neighborhoods create a village and how that could look very different on different campuses, depending on what their

demographic is.

SIF4.2 Then housing people from across the country, could attend the design showcase, and hear the ideas and came up and there was some really cool stuff that came out of it.

SIF4.3 Then we published a book out of it, and we have a website about it. You can go on to it and see the videos and stuff about it.

Scholarship
in housing

Scholarship in
the field
SIF5
Teaching in the
field

SIF5.1 So I was actually on the phone with her today, going I don't think you want to have the summit until that is done, because if you have a campus master plan that says housing is going to go here, that is a chunk of information we have to have before we do the summit.

SIF5.2 Your market study will show you have an unmet demand for 1,500 spaces that will help to inform the discussion. So if we had a discussion and out of the 21st century goes oh we don't have anything more than 500 beds, but you are dealing with a 1,500 bed shortfall, we don't want to have that conflict, we want to have those pieces first.

SIF5.3 One of the things we were concerned about is how do we keep getting the information that is coming out of this process out to the membership.

SIF5.4 It's the laboratory like you said, so how do we keep putting information out there. We are doing some blogging things so each of the schools can blog about were their at in the process, and when we hit critical points there will be articles in the newsletter or the electronic newsletter about what is going on, so we keep trying to keep putting it in front of the membership.

Scholarship
in housing

Scholarship in
the field

SIF6.1 I'm not a good maintainer, I'm much more of a, I don't want to sound like I am

SIF6
Perception of
self

tooting my own horn, but I'm much of a visionary, I like to have a let's figure out what we want to get to and I love working on how do we get there.

SIF6.2 So the Project is a very long-term sort of thing. I think that is my biggest contribution to the scholarship. I consider myself a practitioner, I'm not a researcher, but this is how I'm contributing to the body of knowledge of student housing, this is how I am making that happen.

SIF6.3 Again, not tooting my own horn, but I'm, I'm considered one of the handful of housing gurus. Primarily because of this. I've been involved in leadership positions in the organization for a long time, but this thing sort of put me over the top in terms of people, seek me out.

SIF6.4 I'm the conductor at this point.

APPENDIX K
INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR
PARTICIPANT 5

Thematic Category	Sub-themes	Participant quote
Scholarship and his career, his career and scholarship	Research as a way of life	RSWL1.1 Sort of career path wise got my PhD in 86, I had actually joined the faculty at the university in 85 as a lecturer and then as soon as I got my PhD I went on as a tenured faculty member at the university in 86. My degree is in Public Administration, a PhD in Public Administration, with a specialization in Science and Technology Policy and Organizational Theory.
	RSWL1	RSWL1.2 Went on the faculty was on the faculty there for three years and then made a decision to move into the private sector. To, for a number reasons, but ended up in Washington DC.
	Academic and professional background	RSWL1.3 I was in the private sector from 1989, 88-89 until 2004 then emerged back in the academic sector coming back here in January 2005. So I started out in the academy, went out in research consulting, and I will explain what that means in a minute because it ties very directly with what you are studying...and then came back into the academy in 2004, 2005.
Scholarship and his career, his career and scholarship	Research as a way of life	RSWL2.1 Most of the work was not, was not published. It was publishable but it was not published.
	RSWL2 Research and publication	RSWL2.2 Just to give you my publication history. Up until I left, even for a couple years after I left the academy in 88-89, you know, I was publishing, 3 or 4 peer reviewed articles a year. And then, and then as soon as I got into the private sector, that went down to probably one a year or one every other year. So it really tapered off as soon as I got into the private sector.

RSWL2.3 I've been publishing my whole life, so I still do publish, but it is not a requirement of my position to publish. I'm not on a tenure track position; I am on a professor of practice distinction.

RSWL2.4 You know, when I was more junior, I think the progression for me at least, as I think it is for most academics, is, I would probably would have presented it at a conference first. Get it accepted at a conference first. Then from the conference I would then convert it into a couple of publications, usually. I don't have as much time to go to conferences these days, so I'll probably go to straight to get some published papers out of it.

RSWL2.5 There's a, Journal of Project Management that I think would be suitable, peer review journal called The Journal of Project Management. There's a couple of journals in the area, you know R&D Management that I talked about, I might go to R&D Management. There are a couple journals on the university side, peer reviewed journals I think about getting into those two.

Scholarship and his career, his career and scholarship

Research as a way of life
RSWL3
Private sector research

RSWL3.1 White papers, research notes, for these organizations. There were no restrictions on public; well I should take that back, sometimes there were restrictions on publications. So even if I would have gone to the open literature it would have had to go through some requirements.

RSWL3.2 I would probably do at least two conference presentations a year, so I was being active at some of the conferences.

RSWL3.3 it was discovery, everything that was published is open source and everything that wasn't published, again, there wasn't restrictions, well there was some restrictions on going through the approval process for

publication, but it was all open source in that it wasn't classified, it was not for example classified information.

Scholarship and his career, his career and scholarship

Research as a way of life
RSWL4
Research for a living

RSWL4.1 I am actually running a research firm so I was actually doing original research on a number of different topics. You know I was building data sets I was doing analysis off of the data sets. Again, not at the same intensity I was doing when, you know, I left the academy, but still doing it.

RSWL4.2 I think what happens is I had grown the firm to umm, several hundred people. So I was less engaged actually in the day-in and day-out research, because I was actually the CEO running the company. I actually had an interest in getting back somewhere closer where I could do the work. So that was one of the motivations to do that.

The administrative sphere of research

Framing a perfect alignment
FPA1
The institution and research

FPA1.1 We renamed it recently. But we've always had a vice president, ever since we started doing large-scale research, which was probably starting in the 80's. We've always had a research administration organization to help facilitate research here.

FPA1.2 We're a young university when it comes to research, so but it's been in place since we started engaging in research in the 80s.

FPA1.3 Yes, I'm able to spend time and funding within this position.

FPA1.4 I've hired them out of this administrative sphere. I get no research support as a professor of practice. Because again the assumption is I am bringing practice to the table, not necessarily research.

The administrative

Framing a perfect

FPA2.1 So I'm Senior Vice President for Research and Development Services. Which

sphere of research	alignment FPA2 Research responsibilities and administration	<p>includes research, entrepreneurship, innovation, our multi-disciplinary institutes here, I also oversee the tech transfer function here.</p> <p>FPA2.2 So on the research side, what it means is I help lead all the systems that facilitate research for the university. I don't do the research; the research is done by the faculty members. But I help them get their grants submitted and help them collect their invoices on their grants. I help them put the infrastructure in place for that. If they need I run all the systems that check them for their compliance with experimentation, with human experimentation and animal experimentation. Provide animals for animal experimentation; provide oversight in terms of research compliance and integrity with all the rules and regulations for research that apply to our researchers. I have research facilities that I oversee on campus. We have eight buildings that we oversee across our four campuses and I also deal with research strategy.</p> <p>FPA2.3 I have research facilities that I oversee on campus. We have eight buildings that we oversee across our four campuses. Umm, and I also deal with research strategy, and that is what direction is and should the university be investing in as they move forward with research.</p> <p>FPA2.4 It's just like any other organization, where you want to be led by people you can look up to. And so if I am leading a research organization, it is important that I am a successful researcher.</p>
--------------------	---	--

Transferability of scholarly knowledge	Practitioners and scholarship PS1 Translating scholarship	<p>PS1.1 Yeah, so, and you know this from your University of Phoenix job; I think the issue is always that translational piece. So you take a basic research study on group decision making that comes out of <i>The Academy of Management Journal</i> and now</p>
--	---	--

you have to connect the dots between that article and what you do in your everyday job. So it's a translation piece. Right? And some people are inherently able to translate that quickly. "Oh, I see what happened. You know if you have more groups and more groups are working together, you have some collaboration theory." Right? Then you are going to improve the decision outcomes. Okay, then you say, "That's great, because I have all these research groups so if I have the research groups more focused on collaboration with each other then we can improve outcomes. I probably need to set up some wiki's and some web pages or some way to improve the flow of information between these groups." So I've just translated what was a basic research piece and translated into action.

PS1.2 A lot of people don't know how to do that translation piece. The key is "Can we take research that is coming out and make sure there is some way to translating it into a context so that it is useful for an administrative position and administrative job." I want to move beyond the anecdotal work.

Transferability of scholarly knowledge
Practitioners and scholarship
PS2
Keeping up with the literature

PS2.1 I subscribe to a journal called R & D Management so I'm basically, the Senior VP of Research here at ASU, there's a journal out there called R & D Management, which has all the scholarly literature on how people are thinking about how you better manage research in organizations so I get that every month, I read it. So I use that to inform what I do.

PS2.2 I routinely read the business literature, in this area. With the Harvard Business Review, the Sloan Management Review, the Academy of Management Review. All the traditional business literature sources for research.

Transferability Practitioners

PS3.1 So if the administrator has the proper

of scholarly knowledge

and scholarship
PS3
Using scholarship and generalizability

research skill set where they can go beyond anecdote, then I am fine with that. But what you often see in the practitioner driven literature is mainly a set of case studies and usually anecdotal case studies at best, where he is what happened in my situation. And as you know that may or may not be applicable to anybody else. So in some respects, it probably, may harm the field where someone picks up a case study and says, that's what they did, so that's what I'll do without understanding the nuances, of, if this is comparable to my situation, is it the same size organizations, all the, all the factors that you would put in a more broader study that would look at multiple cases or whatever approach, either qualitatively or quantitatively.

PS3.2 The real issue is is it generalizable. Is that practitioner scholarship generalizable? And in most cases you have to say to yourself it's not.

PS3.3 Yeah and that's what you see now in, even some of the popular literature. Popular management literature. It's interesting to read the case study, because, you know. The issue is how much are you able to learn from it?

Aligning it all

Intentionality in administrative and scholarly pursuits
IASP1
Intentional Alignment

IASP1.1 I don't need to do the research for this job, but its very nice that the research I am interested in, is very much aligned with what I do institutionally.

IASP1.2 I've always worked within this band of jobs, where everything has benefited from everything else. In other words my research informed my practice, my practice informed my research, all through my career. So is the case today. I don't know if I purposefully did that in the early years, but that's where I ended up. At this point it works very well.

Aligning it all

Intentionality

IASP2.1 I would say there is a strong

in
administrative
and scholarly
pursuits
IASP2
Alignment of
personal and
academic
interests

relationship between what I have done
historically research wise and what I do in
my job, which is great.

IASP2.2 Look for example, I am running a
research study right now, on, that's a survey
of other universities about how they manage
large-scale research projects. So, it's pretty
close.

IASP2.3 More importantly, *for* me, I'm
looking at universities and saying if you have
a big grant, a \$50 million grant are you
prepared to deal with it? Most universities
aren't so, you know, I'm using my research
background as a way, so it's very closely
related.

IASP2.4 I had a graduate student and myself.
We pulled the survey, designed the
instrument, and administered the instrument.
That's the good part, that's the fun part.

Aligning it all
Intentionality
in
administrative
and scholarly
pursuits
IASP3
Research
interests

IASP3.1 Organization, science technology
policy, I did a lot more work specifically in
environmental policy and energy policy.
Umm, and then a lot of work in organization
design and organization theory. Yeah, so I
when I went out into the private sector I
actually started research consulting firms and
much of what we were doing was
researching different areas.

IASP3.2 The most, the current project that I
have moving toward publication. Is this work
I'm doing in large scale project management
for universities. And that is a survey-based
project, so the sample has been identified,
the survey instrument has been completed,
the survey instrument has been distributed.
We're actually in the middle of waiting for
the results back from the survey. And then
we'll do some analysis and get that work out
the door. So that's the immediate.

Aligning it all	Intentionality in administrative and scholarly pursuits IASP4 Previous examples of alignment	<p>IASP3.3 I have a longstanding for the last two years before that, I've been building up an area of research called policy informatics, where I have been co-authoring some pieces with two other faculty members in my department in the area of how do you use information for policy decision making. That's been both some theory pieces, mainly theory pieces at this point that I've been contributing too. They have some empirical work that they've been working on in that area.</p> <p>IASP4.1 The original job I took on here was to build and be the initial director of the decision theater, which was this large immersive decision making environment here. And as you can tell from my background, that was sort of right in the sweet spot of, of, a lot of work I had been doing.</p>
Aligning it all	Other types of scholarship OTS1 Teaching as scholarship	<p>IASP4.2 A key part of organizational theory is decision making. This is all about how do you improve decision making through the use of visualization, collaboration, and simulation. So that was, perfect, initial assignment for me, very interesting and from there I moved into some other positions since then.</p> <p>OTS1.1 I'm actually hired here as a professor of practice, which is a designation that actually encourages me to use my practical experience that I have gained over the last, you know, 18 years in the private sector to bring that practical experience into the research and into the classroom.</p> <p>OTS1.2 I have it in my contract that I do teach also, and as a professor of practice you are required to do that. A single course a year actually.</p> <p>OTS1.3 Last semester I taught a research methods class, can't be more basic than that. The semester before that I taught a, co-taught</p>

		<p>a doctoral seminar in organization theory. Ahhh, before that, I taught a course in policy informatics, which is related to the use of information in larger organizations. So they are all related to, so I am a very different case than tenured faculty member in administration.</p>
Aligning it all	<p>Other types of scholarship OTS2 Alignment of teaching and administration</p>	<p>OTS2.1 Cause my research is very much aligned with what I do as an administrator.</p> <p>OTS2.2 How to use information in a large organization, what are the broader organizational theory implications, research methods. I am senior vice president for basic research here, so very related to what I do.</p>
Aligning it all	<p>His choice HC1 Application of scholarship in practice</p>	<p>HC1.1 As an academic and someone who appreciates scholarship, I think that I look at; I routinely look for scholarship as a way to inform what I do on a daily basis. So there is some nuance to what I am saying.</p> <p>HC1.2 It is probably not necessary to use scholarship, not necessary to rely upon scholarship for how you do this job, but because I'm interested in scholarship, because I have a background in academics, I think that I'm drawn towards looking for scholarship as a way to help me in this job.</p> <p>HC1.3 I think it's more of a factor of who I am personally in that, somebody could come into this job and not read any of those things and could probably do okay. But I think it makes you a better, I think in the end I am a better administrator because of that. Because I am looking at broader research out there, that has some impact upon this job.</p> <p>HC1.4 I think in university administration its more the norm. I think in the private sector it is less of a norm. I've been in both sectors.</p>
Aligning it all	<p>His choice HC2 Intentional</p>	<p>HC2.1 I don't need to do the research for this job, but its very nice that the research I am interested in, is very much aligned with what</p>

alignment

I do institutionally.

HC2.2 I just think I've always worked within this band of jobs that, where everything has benefited from everything else. In other words my research informed my practice, my practice informed my research, you know all through my career. So it's now, I don't know if I purposefully did that in the early years, but that's where I ended up and at this point it works very well.
