

5-2010

Scholarship in Occupational Therapy Faculty: The Interaction of Cultural Forces in Academic Departments

Cathy A. Dow-Royer
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/open_access_dissertations



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dow-Royer, Cathy A., "Scholarship in Occupational Therapy Faculty: The Interaction of Cultural Forces in Academic Departments" (2010). *Open Access Dissertations*. 230.
<https://doi.org/10.7275/1559006> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/open_access_dissertations/230

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

SCHOLARSHIP IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY FACULTY: THE INTERACTION
OF CULTURAL FORCES IN ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

A Dissertation Presented

by

CATHY A. DOW-ROYER

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 2010

Higher Education

© Copyright by Cathy A. Dow-Royer 2010
All Rights Reserved

SCHOLARSHIP IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY FACULTY: THE INTERACTION
OF CULTURAL FORCES IN ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

A Dissertation Presented

by

CATHY A. DOW-ROYER

Approved as to style and content by:

Joseph B. Berger, Chair

Shederick McClendon, Member

Patty Freedson, Member

Christine B. McCormick, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

To the memory of my mother, Dorothy Marie Dow, and my grandparents, Helen (Nallen) Rosenkranz and Henry Rosenkranz whose love, hard work and generosity paved the way for this educational accomplishment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my sister, Mary Ellen, and my son, Brett, for their ever vigilant concern for me throughout this educational passage. It is with their love, support and caring interactions that I was able to press forward and complete this personal and professional goal.

I would like to thank my advisor Joseph B. Berger for his diligence in the face of a decision born of necessity and characterized by a process at odds with preference and protocol. I would also like to express gratitude to Shederick McClendon and Patty Freedson, for their willingness to enter the process late and assist with its completion.

I would especially like to remember the scholars in this study, who are also my colleagues in our academic journey. Their willingness to participate in this research study despite increasing pressure on their professional time is a gift that I will cherish forever. That they were willing to share their voices so that others who will follow can perhaps find a road more traveled and less uncertain, is a gift to the occupational therapy scholars of the future.

Finally, to Michael, who mentored me in all things academic and kept life happening all around me so that I could make this dream a reality, I say with humility and joy, thank you for being in my life.

ABSTRACT

SCHOLARSHIP IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY FACULTY: THE INTERACTION OF CULTURAL FORCES IN ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

MAY 2010

CATHY A. DOW-ROYER, B.S., UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
M.A., UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Dr. Joseph B. Berger

Over the last two decades there has been heightened interest in redefining faculty scholarship in higher education (Boyer, 1990). Trends have included the development of cultural frameworks for understanding how disciplines and institutions influence faculty work and how socialization processes impact academic career development. Despite the fact that the number of occupational therapy practitioners who have pursued doctoral training in pursuit of an academic career has failed to keep up with the need for qualified faculty, academic interest in developing disciplinary scholars to build the knowledge base of professional practice has been slow to develop. Furthermore, leadership interest in guiding the development of future faculty by studying how current occupational therapy faculty members are developing as scholars has been limited (AOTA, 2003).

The purpose of this study was to develop a framework for describing scholarship in occupational therapy faculty members. A theoretically grounded case study design guided the selection of two occupational therapy departments, representing both a research university and a master's college. Narrative data from occupational therapy faculty members in these institutions provided in-depth perceptions of how faculty members in diverse institutional settings develop a professional identity. Rich

understandings of how clinical and academic socialization processes converge as faculty members in academic departments integrate competing influences from the academic culture, the institutional culture, and the professional culture to prioritize faculty work roles.

The study revealed that although occupational therapy departments are succeeding within their institutional contexts, personal faculty priorities as clinician-teachers and institutional missions that create an imbalance in roles that favor teaching, continue to disadvantage certain faculty sub-cultures from evolving as disciplinary scholars. The implications of the failure of occupational therapy faculty members to adapt the researcher role as part of a professional identity include barriers to the development of disciplinary knowledge to support practice, and to the development of successful faculty careers that can be advanced in any institutional environment. The study identified a critical role for program leadership to act as change agents within departmental cultures to balance the need for productive disciplinary scholars, as well as effective clinician-teachers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
CHAPTER	
1. SCHOLARSHIP IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY	1
Statement of the Problem	1
The Occupational Therapy Context	3
Conceptual Framework	6
Purpose and Significance of the Study	9
Research Questions	10
Definitions.....	11
Assumptions.....	15
Summary	16
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	19
Introduction	19
Organizational Culture	20
Academic Culture in Higher Education	23
Disciplinary and Professional Cultures.....	26
Knowledge Domains and Disciplinary Communities.....	29
Academic Socialization	33
Professions as Applied Disciplines.....	36
Faculty Scholarship.....	40
Summary	46
Occupational Therapy: The Evolution of a Health Profession	47
Professional Education: Shaping a Professional Culture.....	52
Graduate Education: Developing Academic Legitimacy	54
Socialization and the Professional Identity.....	65
Professional Accreditation and the Academic Context	72

	The Faculty Role and Professional Development.....	79
	Scholarship in a Practice Discipline	92
	Research on Occupational Therapy as an Academic Profession	97
	Summary	112
3.	METHODOLOGY	118
	Introduction.....	118
	Conceptual Framework	118
	Research Design.....	122
	Units of Analysis and Site Selection.....	125
	Overview of Case Study Methods	128
	Data Recording and Analysis.....	131
	Trustworthiness.....	133
	Summary	135
4.	RESULTS	137
	Introduction.....	137
	Conceptual Framework.....	138
	Description of Sites.....	140
	Data Coding	142
	Data Analysis	145
	Clinical Profession as an Emerging Discipline.....	146
	Professional Culture of Clinician-Teachers	151
	Time as a Barrier.....	155
	Professional Accreditation	157
	Scholarship and Context	163
	Disciplinary Culture of Academic-Researchers.....	164
	Researcher Role	166
	Institutional Culture	168
	Professional Identity as a Disciplinary Scholar	176
	Determination College	177
	Eminence University.....	180
	The Academic Culture and Faculty Careers	185
	Career Mobility.....	189
	Department as Nexus	192

	Socialization as a Manifestation of Departmental Culture	193
	Faculty Priorities	199
	Faculty Scholarship Outcomes	203
	The Role of Leadership.....	208
	Summary	216
	The Matrix Model.....	217
	Manifestation of the Matrix: Determination College.....	220
	Manifestation of the Matrix: Eminence University	225
	Summary	234
5.	DISCUSSION.....	238
	Introduction.....	238
	Synthesis of the Study.....	238
	Key Analytic Findings	240
	Situating Findings in Existing Literature.....	243
	Personal Preferences and Clinical Training.....	243
	Culture: Professional and Institutional.....	245
	Academic Socialization	251
	Implications.....	255
	Policy and Practice.....	257
	Future Research	262
	Limitations of the Study.....	263
	Conclusions.....	265
 APPENDICES		
A.	INFORMED CONSENT	269
B.	FACULTY INFORMANT DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY	271
C.	INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	273
D.	INVENTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP.....	276
E.	DATA CODING: MID-LATE CAREER STAGE SUB-CULTURE	280
F.	DATA CODING: NON-THERAPIST AND EARLY CAREER SUB-CULTURES.....	281
G.	MATRIX ANALYSIS	282
H.	DETERMINATION COLLEGE FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	283
I.	EMINENCE UNIVERSITY FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....	284
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	285

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Data analysis coding scheme for informant responses: why did faculty members leave clinical practice to pursue an academic career?	145
2. Demographic analysis by setting and by sub-cultural groups	148
3. Departmental analysis of scholarship inventory data from Determination College	204
4. Departmental analysis of scholarship inventory data from Eminence University.....	206

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Conceptual Framework.....	119
2. Matrix Model in Research Universities and Master's Colleges	219
3. Manifestation of the Matrix Model: Professional Identity in Occupational Therapy Faculty at Determination College	222
4. Manifestation of the Matrix Model: Professional Identity in Occupational Therapy Faculty at Eminence University	228

CHAPTER 1

SCHOLARSHIP IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

Statement of the Problem

Occupational therapy has a long history and academic tradition of faculty roles and faculty professional development focused on a clinical identity, and on practice issues that favor the use of knowledge over the production of knowledge (Dinham & Stritter, 1986; Wittman, 1990). The strong focus on clinical competency has left some occupational therapists questioning whether the profession has neglected the challenge of balancing clinical and academic role development, especially as it relates to faculty scholarship (Jantzen, 1974; Baum, 1983; Holcomb, Christiansen & Roush, 1989; Yerxa, 1991; Dickerson & Whittman, 1999). Likewise, the influence of the feminine socialization process on the roles that society confers on women further complicates how the traditional clinical role of occupational therapist came to be merged with the academic role to form a scholarly identity (Litterst, 1992; Frank, 1992; Johnson, 1978; Mathewson, 1975; Yerxa, 1975). Because occupational therapy is a predominantly female profession, the role of gender in professional disciplinary development should not be overlooked.

Yerxa (1975), studied occupational therapists who were new to the field and identified the significant role that gender and social conditioning played on individual therapist's values and assumptions regarding their choice of career and career advancement. New members of the profession identified "helping others in difficulty" as a primary reason for becoming an occupational therapist, whereas "making a theoretical

contribution to science," was rated low on the value scale (p. 598) (Yerxa, 1975). A more recent study by Dickerson & Whittman (1999), indicates that a significant portion of occupational therapists still do not consider graduate education as a viable option for career advancement. These findings help to explain why only 67% of all occupational therapy faculty members have earned doctorates (AOTA, 2009). Thus, female practitioners entering academia with master's degrees and a desire to teach and apply the knowledge developed by others may find themselves in conflict with academic norms that value original research and publication (Stark, 1998; Boyer, 1990; Becher, 1989). Furthermore, research on graduate school preparation for the academic role suggests that it is doctoral training that socializes graduate students to the researcher role, and thus, occupational therapy faculty may be at a disadvantage within the academic culture (Weidman & Stein, 2003; Austin, 2002).

Research in higher education has demonstrated renewed interest in understanding the relationship between the graduate school educational experience and the development of future faculty (Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin, 2000; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001; Wulff & Austin, 2004). Because approximately 33% of occupational therapy faculty members have experienced graduate socialization through the master's level, but not at the doctoral level, one wonders how this has impacted their scholarly development (AOTA, 2009). The influence of doctoral socialization notwithstanding, the scholarly role is also shaped by the institutions that employ occupational therapy faculty members. Colleges and universities introduce faculty members to other "webs of significance" that are meaningful for the institutional culture but may be different from their professional disciplinary culture, gender orientation, or graduate school experiences (Tierney, 1988;

Clark, 1987). Thus, the academic role and work activities for occupational therapy faculty members are subject to influences from multiple sources both within the profession and external to the profession.

It is posited that the clinical acculturation processes that occurred during professional education and clinical employment, the graduate socialization processes that occurred during master's or doctoral training, and the organizational socialization processes that occur in occupational therapy academic departments, converge to influence faculty perceptions regarding their scholarly identity. Understanding how conflicting messages across domains of influence may have affected faculty member's scholarly behavior bears consideration. Despite the attention given to defining scholarship and preparing future faculty scholars within the higher education community, the professional culture of occupational therapy has given little consideration to developing a theoretically supported framework for faculty scholarship (Bondoc, 2005; AOTA, 2003; Yerxa, 1991). Therefore, the proposed research study will use organizational culture as a conceptual lens through which the beliefs, values, and norms that underscore faculty socialization processes in the professional discipline of occupational therapy, can be clarified.

The Occupational Therapy Context

Occupational therapy is a health science profession that developed educational programs in four year colleges and universities in the United States beginning in the early 1900's (Barker Schwartz, 1993; Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). Along with the emergence of the faculty career during the 1930's and 1940's, came the demand for

qualified academic personnel that has historically outpaced the supply (Jantzen, 1973). The shortage of qualified faculty in occupational therapy represents a chronic problem that continues to the present day (Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003).

To date, much of what we know about faculty in occupational therapy comes from survey research conducted from the 1970's through the 1990's. This research created a profile of the academic profession of occupational therapy using demographic data and comparative analyses of research productivity between occupational therapy faculty and faculty in other health professions and disciplines (Schnebly, 1970; Radonsky, 1980; Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Holcomb, Christiansen & Roush, 1989; Rozier, Gilkeson & Hamilton, 1991; Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002). However, except for the studies by Parham (1985a, 1985b), research on occupational therapy faculty has been hampered by the failure to differentiate data on faculty research publications according to institutional type. Research that explores the dynamic interaction of professional culture and institutional type in shaping scholarship within the academic profession of occupational therapy is needed to inform these discussions.

An assumption and inherent limitation in the existing occupational therapy literature on academic scholarship is that all occupational therapy faculty members represent a common culture that espouses shared values and beliefs concerning the expectations for faculty work, regardless of the type of institution that employs them. This assumption has implications for limiting understanding of the role of individual colleges and universities in shaping faculty identity. Given that occupational therapy academic programs are present in all types of institutions from research universities to community colleges, an important source of influence on faculty role and career

development has been overlooked. According to statistics from the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA, 2009) approximately 34% of all professional education programs in occupational therapy are found in research universities, and 43% can be found in master's colleges and universities (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp>). Given that 77% of programs are in institutions that have these designations, gaining insights from faculty members who work in these college or university settings will inform a context-specific understanding of scholarship in occupational therapy.

Research institutions represent the upper end of the institutional hierarchy in the higher education system in the United States (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumport, 1999). Research universities embody institutional missions that advocate for the development of knowledge through disciplinary research and graduate training. Further, research universities are characterized by academic departments whose faculty scholars advance the reputation of the institution. In contrast, master's colleges and universities fill a distinct niche within the academic culture and subsequently pose a unique challenge with respect to organizational identity. Referred to as the "ugly ducklings of higher education," or the "striving colleges," master's institutions are represented by mixed teaching and research missions and thus, lack a definitive model for guiding cultural identity (Clark, 1987; Boyer, 1990). Thus, while the existing occupational therapy literature on faculty scholarship that focused on survey data of research productivity and publications has produced useful demographic data, it falls short of capturing the broader reality of faculty roles and work in diverse institutional environments (Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Holcomb, Christiansen & Roush, 1989; Rozier, Gilkeson & Hamilton, 1991; Paul,

Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002). Also missing from the occupational therapy literature on faculty performance is an in-depth understanding of how faculty members in research institutions and master's colleges make sense of scholarship in their institutional contexts, and how those understandings coalesce around faculty work roles in academic departments and result in a professional identity.

Case study methodology is used for exploring, describing, or explaining little known phenomena and the salient meanings of those phenomena (Yin, 1994). Case studies inquiry permits an understanding of a larger experience through the in-depth exploration of a representative case or multiple cases. Exploring a single "striving college" context from the perspective of the faculty participants permits a rich understanding of an example of the phenomenon of interest, i.e. occupational therapy academic departments. Thus, a case study that describes how faculty members in two occupational therapy department enact faculty roles and functions and emerge as scholars, explicates the *sensemaking* process through which a professional identity in occupational therapy faculty is being shaped (Harris, 1994; Weick, 2001).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for the proposed study is grounded in cultural perspectives of organizations and higher education research on faculty socialization processes (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Stoecker, 1993; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). The literature on faculty scholarship and the influence of institutional type, as well as gender, race and age, on perceptions of faculty roles, rewards, and career development also frames this research (Boyer, 1990, Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Menges, 1999;

Weidman, Twale & Stein, 2001; Wulff & Austin, 2004). In addition, a historical view of the development and characteristics of occupational therapy as a profession and evolving applied disciplinary culture are examined from the perspective of research on traditional academic disciplines and practice professions (Becher, 1989; Stark, 1998). The study selectively focuses on the interplay of professional and organizational influences at work in research institutions and master's colleges and universities as a basis for understanding how occupational therapy academic departments have evolved in these institutional contexts.

Research in higher education has produced frameworks for viewing colleges and universities as social institutions that exhibit unique organizational contexts that are subject to cultural analysis at the institutional level, the level represented by the academic profession, and the student level (Clark, 1987; Birnbaum, 1988; Ott, 1989; Becher, 1989; Tierney, 1988, 1991; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). A sub-layer of the academic profession within which cultural analysis is also possible is represented by a disciplinary or professional department. Although disciplinary training for the academic role begins with doctoral education, Tierney (1988) acknowledged the departmental socialization that continues after faculty members are appointed to academic positions. Thus, cultural perspectives on faculty behavior guided the development of a framework for uncovering the forces at work in how and why occupational therapy faculty members perform faculty roles and function as disciplinary scholars (Van Maanen, 1977; Schein, 1985; Becher, 1989; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Stoeker, 1993; Stark, 1998; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Kezar, 2005).

The use of existing theoretical frameworks distinguished this case study from qualitative research designs that seek to avoid using accessible knowledge to support propositions (Yin, 1994). The case study methodology permitted the investigator to focus on two occupational therapy departments as the primary units of analysis, and faculty members within the departments as natural sub-units from which intimate portraits were obtained. According to Yin, case studies are increasingly being used to understand complex phenomena that characterize daily life events. This study was built upon the premise that occupational therapy faculty are socialized and acculturated to specific ways of knowing and doing as professionals, yet are shaped as clinician-teachers and disciplinary scholars by institutional missions and values (O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Dickerson & Whittman, 1997; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Boyer, 1990; Jantzen, 1973; Johnson, 1978; Jaffe, 1985; Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Campbell, 1985). Thus, a case study that explored how forces originating in the academic culture, the professional culture and institutional cultures converge to influence how occupational therapy faculty "make sense" of their work responsibilities and scholarly identity, is the preferred method of inquiry (Schein, 1985; Harris, 1994; Weick, 2001).

The study is exploratory as it is assumed that occupational therapy faculty decisions regarding their academic role and scholarly identity have no "clear, single set of outcomes" (Yin, 1994, p. 15). As emergent research however, it will enable researchers to expand upon the interpretive framework presented.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of the study is to develop an understanding of faculty scholarship in occupational therapy that is grounded in the profession's history and current theoretical perspectives, and yet permits the aspects of academic life that are unique to this health profession to be appreciated (Tierney & Rhoades, 1994; Boyer, 1990; Stark, 1998). The study is organized around the concepts of socialization to the academic role, the development of a professional identity, and faculty scholarship in the applied discipline of occupational therapy. A conceptual framework that is consistent with research on the differing lives and worlds of academics by discipline/profession, institutional type and academic department guided the inquiry (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Tierney, 1988; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1987; Braxton & Berger, 1999). A theoretically grounded case study inquiry permits a rich understanding of the values, beliefs and norms of occupational therapy departments in two diverse institutional settings, as well as individual faculty perceptions regarding the day to day experiences of faculty work in professional programs (Yin, 1994). This study extends current understandings of faculty socialization in the health professions beyond nursing, to include faculty in the health profession of occupational therapy (Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998).

Researchers in higher education have rarely included faculty in the health professions in studies on the effects of culture on faculty performance. Thus, this study contributes to the higher education literature by using existing theoretical frameworks regarding the role of disciplinary culture and institutional context in faculty development, to examine the previously unexplored, emerging discipline of occupational therapy (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Kezar, 2005).

In addition, this study contributes new understandings about the development of disciplinary scholars by illustrating the nexus of forces that are driving faculty socialization processes and faculty development decisions. Moreover, the findings of the study inform thinking within the profession regarding the preparation, recruitment, socialization, and career support of future occupational therapy faculty in higher education contexts.

An underlying premise of this research study is that there is value in unearthing an “insider’s view” of academic life in an occupational therapy academic department. The study accomplished this by having faculty members describe their daily work lives, thus revealing the assumptions, values and beliefs underlying their professional identities. Assumptions are characterized as the deepest and most unconscious combination of beliefs, perceptions, and values upon which cultures are based (Schein, 1987). Because of the socialization to clinical practice, health professional faculty members add complexity to current understandings of faculty behavior. Yet, there is scant data on whether the influence of the professional culture is more or less influential than the type of college environment in which faculty work.

Research Questions

The primary research questions that guides this study are: 1) how are occupational therapy faculty members in academic departments in research universities and master's institutions prioritizing faculty roles and developing as disciplinary scholars?; and 2) how do these faculty members make sense of the personal, professional, academic and institutional influences that impact the development of a professional identity?

Secondary questions include: how has the personal background of these faculty members influenced the course of their academic careers; how has institutional context accentuated or diluted clinical or academic influences on how these faculty members function in their faculty roles; and how has the departmental culture impacted how these faculty view themselves as scholars?

Definitions

The terms and concepts used in this study are referential to higher education and occupational therapy. The definitions provided provide context for the discussions and analysis that follow:

Occupational therapy is health science profession that uses therapeutic assessment and occupational adaptation as intervention to ameliorate impairment, reduce disability, and increase social and cultural participation leading to health and wellness (www.aota.org). Human *occupation* is how people productively and meaningfully spend their time, utilize their resources, and organize their lives. Specifically, occupation refers to units of activity that are generically labeled and defined by social norms, e.g. work or leisure, and more narrowly interpreted by culture, e.g. worker role as faculty member or carpenter. Adaptation is how people perform life activities, tasks and roles while adjusting to physical, psychological, or emotional disabilities, as well as social or cultural disadvantages or environmental restrictions.

Scholarship, is broadly defined as the "work of the professoriate" (p. xii) (Boyer, 1990). Being "scholarly" has historically meant earning a doctorate in one's area of study, achieving academic rank in colleges and universities, conducting research, being

published in peer-reviewed media, teaching undergraduate students, mentoring graduate students, and being engaged in post-doctoral work. It follows, that the determination of a faculty member's value to the college or university is based on the assessment of his/her scholarship. Teaching, research and service are the traditional domain areas of scholarship upon which faculty assessment is based. The current debates regarding the changing realities of American higher education and the changing priorities of the professoriate afford an opportunity to reassess the meaning of faculty scholarship, and to revise the standards for scholarly work and performance to include interdisciplinary integration, socially responsible application, and teaching as a scholarly enterprise (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997).

According to organization theorist John van Maanen (as cited in Hatch, 1997), "*culture* refers to the knowledge members of a given group are thought to more or less share; knowledge of the sort that is said to inform, embed, shape, and account for the routine and not-so-routine activities of the members of the culture.....A culture is expressed (or constituted) only through the actions and words of its members and must be interpreted by, not given to, a fieldworker....Culture is not itself visible, but is made visible only through its representation" (p. 205).

Institutional culture in higher education varies by such parameters as type of college or university, size, geographical location, student profile, etc. The characteristics of institutional culture include the ways in which meaning is communicated, why that meaning exists, and how that meaning is interpreted by others. Aspects of institutional culture include mission, faculty socialization, and leadership (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

According to Broski (1987), a *profession* is defined as containing a specialized body of knowledge that sets its members apart from other professionals, a public service mission, a commitment to the development and transmission of new knowledge upon which practice is based, autonomy with respect to entry to itself, authority over its educational and practice standards, and control of its discipline. It is the sharing of common values and beliefs and the occupational designation that characterize *professional cultures*, e.g. clinical psychologists, academics, or occupational therapists (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

An *academic discipline* according to King and Browness (as cited in Becher, 1989), includes "a community, a network of communications, a tradition, a particular set of values and beliefs, a domain, a mode of inquiry, and a conceptual structure" (p. 20). *Disciplinary cultures* are characterized as varying by area of study and having established paradigms. A paradigm is described by Kuhn (as cited in Becher, 1989), as "the particular constellation of ideas and techniques, beliefs, and values which serves to define a disciplinary culture". Those disciplines with clear and unambiguous paradigms imply a tightly knit membership group with high levels of consensus on what to study, and how best to study it. Other disciplines, having unformed, partially formed, or competing paradigms are represented as knowledge communities in which there is little consensus about pertinent research questions, and subsequently little agreement about research methodology and what evidence should be used to guide thinking.

Anticipatory socialization is a process that takes place during doctoral training in which the beliefs, values and attitudes of the academic culture and the discipline are

learned by graduate students as they pursue membership in the academic profession (Austin, 2002).

Organizational socialization is a cultural process that involves the "exchange of patterns of thought and action.....[it] is ongoing, although it occurs most clearly when new recruits enter the organization" (p. 21) (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

Sensemaking is the "process by which people in an organization arrive at acceptable agreements about what is real and important" (p.xvii) (Birnbaum, 1988). Sensemaking is a social process involving interpretation that is conducted retrospectively, in an effort to understand decisions made, and legitimize actions taken (Weick, 2001).

Master's Colleges and Universities according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp>) offer baccalaureate programs and at least 50 master's degrees, but fewer than 20 doctorates. The most recent revision of the classification system split master's institutions into three categories based on the volume of master's degree production, with larger programs awarding at least 200 degrees, medium programs awarding 100-199 degrees, and small programs awarding 50-99 degrees. Coined as "striving colleges" for drifting from their missions and aspiring to the norms of research universities, master's institutions struggle with their identity in the teaching-research debate (Boyer, 1990; Clark, 1987). *Doctorate-Granting Universities* include institutions that award at least 20 doctoral degrees per year. Doctoral-granting institutions are assigned to one of three categories based on a measure of research activity, i.e. very high, high and standard.

Assumptions

The primary assumptions of this study are that: 1) professional identity in occupational therapy faculty members is influenced by personal characteristics, values and experiences, acculturation to the profession during training and clinical practice, and anticipatory socialization to the academic role during graduate education as well as organizational socialization in academic environments (Menges, 1999; Dickerson & Whittman, 1997; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Yerxa, 1991; Jaffe, 1985; Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Campbell, 1985); 2) occupational therapy faculty have a highly developed clinical identity that evolved as a function of extensive clinical experience and thus, their ways of performing as practitioners, ways of knowing and applying existing knowledge, and the strong value they ascribe to the clinician-teacher role may conflict with the norms of the traditional academic culture (Stark, 1998; Stoecker, 1993); 3) as a low consensus, rural, applied profession whose faculty members have historically entered academia in mid-career without doctoral socialization to the academic role, occupational therapy faculty members have not fully integrated the researcher role and thus, lack a commitment to developing as disciplinary scholars (Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001; Vasantachart & Rice, 1997; Becher, 1989; Parham, 1985a, 1985b); 4) the institutional culture of colleges and universities impacts faculty work priorities based upon the influence of the academic culture, the mission of the institution, and leadership at the college and departmental level (O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Braxton & Berger, 1999; Clark, 1997; Alpert, 1991); and 5) because professional accreditation standards have historically support institutional prerogative in faculty development, occupational therapy faculty rely on the values and norms of the departmental culture to shape faculty

scholarship through socialization processes (AOTA, 1991,1998; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Boyer, 1990). These assumptions served as context for understanding the complex relationship between the academic culture, the institutional culture, and faculty socialization in the practice discipline of occupational therapy.

Summary

Chapter one introduced the need for research on faculty scholarship in occupational therapy to explore the confluence of cultural forces and socialization processes from which scholarly identity and behavior emerge. The background for this research is the changing face of the academic workplace in the United States that has prompted the development of cultural frameworks for understanding how disciplines influence faculty work, how socialization impacts career development, and how dynamic models of faculty scholarship and assessment define the academic profession (Becher, 1989; Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Menges, 1999; Wulff & Austin, 2004).

Despite the heightened interest in faculty development in the higher education literature, with few exceptions, health professions have been largely ignored in studies on the impact of culture on faculty work and professional development (Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1986; Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998). Yet, health fields such as occupational therapy bring distinctive professional perspectives to discussions of the development of professional identity in academia. The dual roles and functions of clinicians and educators, specialized accreditation requirements for academic programs, the pressure for high pass rates on post graduate certification testing, and the need to balancing the

application of practical knowledge with the development of knowledge for knowledge sake, are just some of the complexities to consider (Clark, 1997; Young, Chambers & Kells, 1983).

In summary, the prevalent literature on the academic profession of occupational therapy is premised upon the existence of a common culture of faculty members who hold similar beliefs about scholarship regardless of whether they are employed at research universities or master's institutions. If one believes that there is a common professional identity in occupational therapy, then it follows that useful comparative analyses are possible by using the number of research publications per faculty member as a measure of faculty productivity (Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Holcomb, Christiansen & Roush, 1989; Vasantachart & Rice, 1997). This assumption however, runs counter to research on disciplinary culture that recognizes core cultural values amongst the professoriate, but also acknowledges the disciplinary, institutional, and faculty demographic distinctions that influence individual faculty performance (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Becher, 1989; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Menges, 1999).

The assumption of a common culture of faculty members who believe that faculty work is exclusively characterized by a focus on independent research and publication, is also not desirable if occupational therapy is to mature as a practice discipline. Although the growth of the discipline requires that all faculty members develop themselves as disciplinary scholars, this will require that occupational therapy embraces an expanded model of scholarship that include interdisciplinary integration, socially responsible application, and teaching as a scholarly enterprise (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002; AOTA, 2003).

The remaining chapters in this dissertation are organized as follows: Chapter two reviews higher education and social science research on organizational culture and faculty scholarship, and occupational therapy literature on professional development and the academic role. The literature review in chapter two provides the basis for a conceptual framework that provides a foundation for understanding cultural influences that are specific to practice disciplines, as well as external forces and institutional features that converge to shape faculty roles and a professional identity in occupational therapy. Chapter three further synthesizes the literature that establishes the basis for the conceptual framework, and outlines the case study methodology that derives from the research questions. The discussion defines the units of analysis for the design, identifies the primary informants that were used in the inquiry, and describes how the data collected are linked to the assumptions of the study. Chapter four provides an in-depth analysis of the findings from the informant interviews, the follow-up focus groups, and the survey data. A description of the two institutional settings, as well as an explanation of the method used to code and analyze the data is presented. The findings of the study were organized around the research questions and emerged as themes from which explanations were derived. The criteria used to infer the explanations are presented as the basis for an interpretive framework for conceptualizing the development of professional identity in occupational therapy faculty members. Chapter five discusses the theoretical and practical implications of the findings for the development of future faculty. Recommendations for future research that is designed to provide additional knowledge based upon the suggested framework are provided. Further, the limitations of the study are discussed.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review is structured to explore two bodies of research. The first research area is framed by literature on the importance of professional, academic and institutional perspectives in determining how faculty scholarship is defined and enacted by specific faculty groups. Literature on the historical development of occupational therapy as a maturing practice discipline, including the quest for clinical authenticity and the development of the academic role frames the second research area.

The discussion begins by exploring the literature on the academic culture that provides a general understanding of faculty scholarship, as well as more specific understandings of how work roles and functions vary across academic disciplines and institutions. Research findings on the disciplinary and institutional socialization processes that shape faculty scholarship in graduate training and academic departments are also considered. As a basis for situating occupational therapy within the academic culture, the discussion highlights the impact of the feminine socialization process on the development of a professional identity. Moreover, an exploration of the occupational therapy faculty role over the last thirty years focuses on the limited understanding of how professional departments have influenced the development of a professional identity. This section closes with an examination of the impact of professional accreditation standards on faculty preparation and scholarly productivity relative to the norms of the academic culture.

Organizational Culture

Organization theory offers a variety of lenses from which to view how organizations, professional associations, and disciplinary groups understand knowledge-making and decision-making behavior (Hatch, 1997). The varied vantages that contribute to organization theory provide a powerful way of thinking about how groups function within organizations, but also how individual members interact “with and within it” (p.7). The most common viewpoints in organization theory are classical, modern, symbolic-interpretive and post-modernist (Hatch, 1997). Underlying each viewpoint is a distinct epistemology, or way of knowing about what constitutes reality and from which an understanding of the world is based. For example, the classical and modernist perspectives are grounded in objectivist epistemology that assumes that truth exists outside of one’s awareness of it, and that independent observation by someone is necessary to mediate the knowledge. Researchers in this tradition seek discovery through empirical research to test hypotheses using quantitative measurement. On the opposite end of the philosophical and epistemological scale, are those who believe that subjective ways of knowing are also valid for understanding the human condition.

Scholars of the symbolic-interpretive and post-modernist viewpoints challenge the modernist premise that knowledge represents a singular reality just waiting to be discovered and then applied universally (Hatch, 1997). In contrast, they suggest that because reality is a social phenomenon that is constructed by the viewer it requires understanding that is derived from individual viewpoints, and therefore may or may not generalize to others. Subjectivist epistemology assumes that “knowledge is relative to the knower and can only be created and understood from the point of view of the individuals

who are directly involved” (Hatch, 1997, p. 48). Because knowledge is considered relative in terms of time, place, and social influences, qualitative research methods are commonly linked to the symbolic-interpretive and post-modernist perspectives. Organizational culture is one concept within organizational theory that has been influenced by the symbolic-interpretive vantage (Hatch, 1997).

Studies that support organization theory frequently address rational decision-making as a primary theme (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Research on decision-making commonly focuses on the choices made and the actions taken to solve organizational problems. Higher education has turned to the literature on organizations to develop frameworks for investigating problems in academic institutions. Consequently, rational models have been developed to assist colleges and universities internally correct performance problems and make decisions about practices. However, the limitation of rational models for understanding an issue such as faculty performance is evidenced by the fact that behavior is shaped by values and norms as well as rational decision-making.

Missing from discussions that focus on rational decision-making are the cultural factors that intervene to influence interpretations of choices and actions. Culture emerged as a topic of interest within the business community during the 1980's, and evolved into an important concept for studying organizational performance (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Hatch, 1997; Schein, 1985; Tierney, 1988; Van Maanen & Barley, 1984). Culture is conceptualized as the shared values and beliefs that bind organizations together by providing a sense of identity, stability and commitment (Schein, 1987). According to Tierney (1988), culture can be used to make manageable the non-rational character of organizations by clarifying what forces shape the activities and behaviors that occur in

organizations. As one of the most recent and contentious of the organizational theory perspectives, organizational culture has generated frameworks for studying organizations as groups of people, specifically focusing on what is valued in organizational lives, and the meanings attached to roles, functions, and behaviors (Hatch, 1997).

A matrix model was developed by Alpert (1991) to visually depict key features of colleges and universities as organizations that are embedded in the system of higher education. One advantage of viewing colleges and universities as matrix organizations is that problems associated with performance can be visually portrayed at each of the levels and sub-levels of the university system. A matrix model makes it possible to arrange the major universities in order of institutional excellence, based upon the published ratings of its academic departments. Further, the framework depicts academic institutions as consisting of inter-related disciplinary and professional departments that are organized by their faculty activities to create an institutional structure. Academic departments in colleges and universities are organized according to disciplinary or professional communities. Across institutions academic departments are comparatively rated by members of the disciplinary or professional communities. By and large the comparative ratings are a reflection of departmental reputations for research excellence. High departmental ratings yield status and increased resources at the institutional level. Moreover, the composite picture of the departmental ratings represent an informal institutional rating, that is used as a measure of comparison to other institutions in the higher education system. Thus, individual faculty scholars contribute to the standing of their departments and their institutions. The matrix model points to the fact that no

institution is independent of others, and this inter-connectedness helps to explain the similarity of aspirations across institutional types.

According to Weick (2001), one way to transition from a focus on decision-making to one of meaning is to explore the cultural perspective of *sensemaking* in organizations. Sensemaking is conceptualized as a cognitive process that occurs as a function of human effort to create order and make retrospective sense of events that constitute daily reality (Weick, 2001). Increasingly, administrative decision-making is seen as being less important than common shareholder interpretations about the kinds of behaviors and interactions that are sensible in a given organizational context. Because organizations seek stability for effective performance, it is important to consider how shared agreements between organizational members interface with the processes used to develop them to form stable institutional cultures. In the midst of the challenges and uncertainties that colleges and universities have faced over the last decades of the twentieth century, it is not surprising that higher education researchers have turned to culture perspectives to better understand academia and the faculty experience (Birnbaum, 1988; Orr, 1989; Becher, 1989; Stoecker, 1993; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Kezar, 2005). It will be useful to discuss the history of the higher education system in the United States to provide insights into the development of the academic culture.

Academic Culture in Higher Education

By 1908, universities in the United States had established their own identities, the hallmarks of which included high school graduation as an entrance requirement, doctoral training in the disciplines offered by professors with Ph.D.'s, and the presence of

professional schools. The expansion of disciplinary and professional offerings in colleges and universities influenced the creation of the academic profession by “defining academic knowledge” in the context of describing the faculty role (p.55) (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumport, 1999). Altbach, Berdahl & Gumport’s (1999) historical analysis of American higher education indicates that the academic system is comprised of a series of hierarchies framed by institutional type, discipline, and academic rank and specialty. Within the system of higher education, power and status are allotted relative to defined values and boundaries (Birnbaum, 1988). For example, the research-oriented universities form the top tier of the hierarchy, master’s institutions and liberal arts colleges assume the mid-levels, and community colleges trail below (www.carnegiefoundation.org). Likewise, the hard science disciplines such as physics form the highest rung on the status ladder, with the soft or applied sciences disciplines such as sociology, trailing on the lower levels. The hierarchies tend to be self-reinforcing traditions, and thus difficult to overcome for those institutions or disciplines not in the top tiers. For instance, physicists consider themselves above average in their intellectual domain and thus, feel entitled to their notoriety (Becher, 1989). In similar fashion, high-tiered research institutions retain selectivity in student and faculty recruitment based upon historical reputations and social traditions (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumport, 1999). As a recent graduate of Harvard wrote, “what I learned at Harvard was how to behave as though I had gone to Harvard” (Finnerty, 2007, p.8).

Colleges and universities are institutional contexts that exemplify the interaction of many constituent groups including students, administrators, trustees, disciplinary departments and faculty members, who coalesce into an academic culture (Tierney &

Rhoades, 1994; Menges, 1999). Moreover, the academic culture in higher education represents a series of concentric layers that include the culture of the academic profession, the culture of the disciplines and professions, and the culture of the institutions. Understanding how these cultural layers intersect is critical to an understanding of faculty scholarship.

As an example, despite the fact that colleges and universities are positioned variably in the higher education hierarchy, many aspire to the prestige identified with norms such as research orientation, ability to obtain federal and other external funding via grants, and high published rankings (Clark, 1987). Thus, the striving of the academic culture toward the norms of the research institutions irrespective of whether the research mission appropriately fits the university context, has led to a trend whereby professors are measured by their ability to conduct original research and less so by their ability to teach (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997). Further complicating the issue of faculty work are the 21st century demands for competence in complex institutional activities beyond the domains of research or teaching, including student recruitment and advising, financial aid, fundraising, and governance, and whether doctoral education is providing adequate preparation (Gold & Dore, 2001; Birnbaum, 1988).

Researchers studying the academic profession as one segment of the academic culture, have uncovered the dilemma of attempting to portray faculty members in the United States as a unified whole (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Clark (1987) described the culture of the academic profession as having a similarity in prevailing ideology that includes core values and beliefs about knowledge development, intellectual integrity, and academic freedom. However, because faculty members come from distinctive disciplines and

diverse college and university contexts, they exhibit differences in faculty work patterns and priorities that preclude a common cultural identity. In an effort to reduce the complexity of the academic identity, researchers have identified important differences in function and degree structure between professions and disciplines (Mayhew & Ford, 1974; Becher, 1989; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1986).

For example, professions are characterized as seeking professional legitimacy by requiring an educational degree to practice and autonomy over educational standards. Professions are also said to vary by occupation, e.g. teacher or therapist. By contrast, disciplines vary by area of study, and have distinctive ways of developing knowledge and methods of acquiring legitimacy in academic contexts. Thus, whether the academic profession can be viewed as a common culture or is more accurately visualized as a series of sub-cultures, remains a topic of debate in the literature (Becher, 1989, 1994; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Clark, 1997). Discussing what differentiates the faculty groups that populate the academic landscape will provide a basis for further understanding the academic profession.

Disciplinary and Professional Cultures

The study of the academic profession in the United States is complex due to the inherent diversity of the features that comprise the academic identity (Clark, 1987). The subject area disciplines which are at the core of the academic identity in higher education best exemplify this diversity. Academic disciplines have been described by Becher (1989) as fields of study that are afforded credibility by the existence of certain characteristics including professional associations, recognized international communities,

specialty journals, knowledge domains, modes of inquiry, and the structural designation of departments within colleges and universities. Disciplines are depicted as structurally and epistemologically unique, and vary by maturity of paradigm development and content area, e.g. mathematics, biology, and psychology. The distinctive *disciplinary cultures* that have evolved in higher education contexts are characterized by traditions, symbols, and communication patterns, as well as assumptions, values and beliefs that foster ways of thinking and gaining knowledge (Becher, 1989).

Disciplinary cultures in higher education contexts are shaped by the socialization to the discipline that occurs during doctoral training. Through the mechanism of the research doctorate, graduate students are provided with the skills and mentorship necessary for the development of a faculty career (Wulff & Austin, 2004; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman, Twale & Stein, 2001). The professions share the landscape of higher education with the academic disciplines, but are more difficult to categorize due to their emerging scholarly traditions, overlapping knowledge boundaries, socialization that is focused on practice, and the need to conform to external pressures, e.g. accrediting bodies and the demands of society.

Professional cultures are characterized by a body of theory and specialized knowledge, as well as core philosophical assumptions, values and beliefs associated with the ideals of service to society. A focus on the activities of practice and the development of practitioners is also a feature of the professions (Vollmer & Mills, 1971). The criteria for professionalization in professional education environments, such as medical or law school has traditionally been through the mechanism of the professional degree structure. Professional education is designed to confer clinical or professional degrees at multiple

degree levels, including the graduate level. Similar to the arts and science disciplines however, professions also consist of hierarchies that determine status and prestige.

The long established profession of medicine for example is considered a "learned profession" due to the authority it accrued when it established the doctorate as the degree required to enter practice in the 1920's (Rogers, 1980; Pierce & Peyton, 1999; Hoberman & Mailick, 1994). Moreover, the medical field has acquired academic legitimacy as research methods have evolved from practice-based studies to theory-driven medical trials. Unlike the disciplines however, many professions are characterized as pre-paradigmatic due to the reliance on theoretical perspectives that are borrowed from parent disciplines, and more importantly, due to the lack of clear research support for practical applications (Becher, 1989). While less is known about differences between the professions, the intellectual and cultural distinctions between the traditional arts and science disciplines have been widely explored by gaining the perceptions of faculty themselves about their academic lives (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1987).

According to Becher (1989), because disciplines have "recognizable identities with particular cultural attributes" (p.22), they can be conceptualized as *academic tribes*. Conceptualizing disciplines as "tribes" is premised on the belief that the nature of disciplinary knowledge is related on multiple levels of analysis to those who explore it. Thus, it is not surprising that as disciplinary variability dictated academic role performance at the departmental level, the need for research to categorize knowledge fields on pertinent features related to faculty work, gained saliency. Understanding how

researchers have organized thinking about disciplinary distinctions by developing typologies will provide further insight into the academic profession.

Knowledge Domains and Disciplinary Communities

Given the complexity inherent in the existence of numerous academic disciplines, researchers in higher education have developed classification systems to better understand the features that constitute the landscape of academic knowledge and the characteristics of the disciplinary tribes that inhabit that landscape (Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Becher, 1994). The purpose of the classifications systems has been to help order thinking about the faculty role by describing faculty on dimensions such as disciplinary versus institutional characteristics, presence or absence of consensus on theory and ways of acquiring knowledge, and interest in pure knowledge or applied knowledge to address practical problems. As the basis for one of the classification schemes, in the 1970's, Biglan surveyed 222 faculty members from a large, mid-western research university and a small western college to determine how academics themselves perceived the similarities or differences in the characteristics of disciplines (Stoecker, 1993). The system developed by Biglan relies heavily on distinctions related to intellectual domains and paradigm consensus, i.e. what is researched, how the research is conducted, and the types of publications produced. The data from the Biglan study produced a scheme that classified disciplines along three primary dimensions related to knowledge forms. The dimensional terms used to differentiate the disciplines were expressed as dichotomies, i.e. hard or soft sciences, pure versus applied research orientation, and life or non-life in focus. Whether the content of the discipline is clearly

defined by a unified theory that grounds a consistent paradigm and established lines of research, typifies the hard-soft dimension. The pure-applied dimension is best characterized by the purpose of knowledge development, i.e. disciplinary development or social utility. Finally, biological or social concerns as opposed to the study of inanimate objects, differentiates faculty groups on the life/non-life dimension (Stoecker, 1993).

Other investigators used the Biglan classification system to explore the academic department as the unit of analysis and to expand the scheme to previously unclassified professional disciplines (Stoecker, 1993). Stoecker (1993) included the health profession of nursing in a study that examined faculty time allocation, type of scholarly output, sources of research funding, and faculty attitudes towards scholarship. Research by Smart and Elton (as cited in Stoecker, 1993) classified disciplines based on the goals established by academic departments including differential attention to graduate education and research, student and faculty development, administrative efficiency, and interest in the provision of direct services. In addition, Creswell and Bean (as cited in Stoecker, 1993) studied differences in the disciplines related to scholarly output and funding sources. Research by Becher (1989) broadened the scope of the Biglan scheme by exploring the social dimensions of academic groups in addition to the intellectual dimensions, and including professional faculty.

Becher (1989) furthered the concept that academic disciplines have “ways of knowing” that reflect subject matter characteristics, but also explored the cultural attributes that are important for distinguishing one academic discipline from another. How faculty groups “organize their professional lives is intimately related the intellectual tasks on which they are engaged” (p. 1), but is also influenced by the tribal language,

traditions, customs, practices and meanings that they share, according to Becher. Because “the intellectual territory remains largely uncharted” in the social or science-based professions (p.15), Becher investigated professional groups, e.g. engineering and pharmacy, in addition to arts and science disciplines. By including professional faculty in his research, Becher acknowledge the void in the literature regarding these groups, and filled a knowledge gap. The classification scheme that emerged identified the social features of knowledge communities as issues of cognitive border zones, intellectual boundaries, and communication patterns. The features were classified along the social dimensions of convergent or divergent thinking and action, as well as rural or urban roles and communication patterns.

According to Becher (1989), the convergent/divergent dimension positions disciplines on a continuum based upon membership consensus. Consensus refers to the level of shared agreement on issues related to theory, problems to solve, research methodology, curriculum structure and course content. Moreover, disciplinary unification is also related to the underlying beliefs and norms for behavior that functions to position faculty groups within the hierarchy of the disciplinary culture in terms of intellectual standing and credibility within society. The link between disciplinary knowledge forms and the knowledge communities that they inhabit is evident in the prevailing understanding that high consensus fields tend to be groups that would be considered as hard/pure disciplines in Biglan’s scheme. For example, hard/high consensus fields include biology and physics, whereas sociology and education are characterized as soft/low consensus disciplines. While the convergent/divergent

dimension relates to intellectual distinctions, the rural/urban dimension is more about how knowledge is communicated to the public.

Convergent disciplines or hard/pure knowledge fields tend to be positioned on the urban portion of the research continuum, due to a narrow research focus and a limited number of problems that are shared by all researchers (Becher, 1989). Urban researchers carry high prestige because they are thought to be individuals with high ability who pursue the type of pure knowledge that is thought to be intellectually demanding, e.g. physicists. As a tightly knit membership group, urban researchers in hard science disciplines are encouraged to establish their knowledge base in ways that are not constrained by practical considerations (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). This may account for why most hard science faculty members are more committed to conducting research and publishing in scholarly journals, than to teaching or service activities.

The divergent and loosely coupled knowledge communities that are associated with the soft/applied disciplines, however, tend to be rural researchers because they lack the theoretical unity of their urban counterparts (Becher, 1989). Rural disciplines are knowledge communities that are considered semi-paradigmatic due to the presence of competing theories, and multiple issues of concern that require mixed methods to research. Moreover, rural researchers are characterized as being susceptible to having their research interests directed externally by society, rather than internally to advance the status of the discipline. Because faculty members in the soft sciences frequently focus on practical problems, they tend to publish information that has applied social value and are more likely to have a concomitant interest teaching and service. Thus, through no fault of their own, rural knowledge communities are unable to exploit their uniqueness or to

advance their collective interests, and thus perpetuate the image in the academic community that they are politically weak and lacking academic rigor. Research on classification schemes for the traditional disciplines may prove useful in characterizing occupational therapy faculty as a professional group.

For example, given that occupational therapy's parent disciplines are biology and physics as well as psychology and sociology, suggests a mixed hard/soft orientation. The clinical practice orientation and low level of consensus based on the immature status of the emerging discipline, clearly distinguishes the field as applied. Moreover, research in rural knowledge communities is less centered on what makes the discipline distinctive and more focused on solving practical problems. Given the profession's need to answer clinical questions, classification as a rural faculty culture might be expected. Thus, whether scholarship in occupational therapy faculty is focused externally in the domain of application or directed more internally in the domain of teaching, may provide useful insights into how faculty members are developing as disciplinary scholars.

While valuable information has been gained from research that differentiates the disciplines as diverse knowledge communities, it is also useful to understand how the disciplines as a whole have established continuity within the larger academic culture, and what role institutions have played in disciplinary development.

Academic Socialization

Academic disciplines in higher education contexts are shaped by a socialization process that begins in graduate school as subject area knowledge is cultivated, and continues at the institutional level as faculty are hired and develop as academic

professionals (Boyer, 1990; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Baldwin, 1996). The graduate school socialization experience represents one aspect of disciplinary culture that is associated with the selection and development of a faculty career (Weidman & Stein, 2003; Wulff & Austin et al., 2004). Doctoral education is expected to provide the anticipatory socialization to the academic role and the requisite competencies that are the hallmarks of the academic profession, i.e. effective teaching, participation in the faculty/graduate student mentoring relationship, the production of original research, and service to the institution and the greater community (Boyer, 1990; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). A primary outcome of the doctoral socialization experience is that aspiring faculty members accept, internalize, and act upon the values, beliefs and norms of the disciplinary group within which they are seeking membership. Because disciplines have traditionally met the criteria for academic legitimacy through the mechanism of the research doctorate there is a reciprocal relationship between graduate socialization and later faculty behavior.

Disciplinary development relies on having graduate students to socialize into doctoral traditions, and faculty scholarship relies on having been socialized and then assuming the habits of mind relevant to the discipline (Austin, 2002). Weidman & Stein (2003) discussed the importance of involving doctoral students in the research and scholarly pursuits of faculty as a foundation for the development of scholarly behaviors in their future academic careers. Thus, faculty members who are viewed as scholars contribute to the perceived quality of academic departments and institutions. It rationally follows that if the academic culture narrowly defines scholarship as original research to benefit the discipline, one might expect faculty loyalty to be at the level of the discipline

(Birnbaum, 1988; Altbach, 1999). However, because the socialization process for faculty continues after graduate school sources of influence on faculty behavior from inside institutions, also deserve consideration.

The implications of intersecting disciplinary and institutional cultures in shaping the system of higher education and the academic profession, is well established in the literature (Clark, 1987; Boyer, 1990; Tierney & Rhoades, 1994). Institutional culture is characterized by the institution-specific assumptions, values, beliefs, and norms that influence academic life in tangible and intangible ways. Just as colleges and universities vary on relevant measures such as size and setting descriptions, the institutional cultures that make up those institutions also differ on variables such as educational mission, leadership style, and socialization to faculty work roles (Birnbaum, 1988; Clark, 1997). Researchers have developed cultural frameworks for delineating the important role of institutional context and departmental environment in understanding how faculty members learn how to behave, and how those values are conveyed (Clark, 1987; Tierney, 1988). Referred to as organizational socialization, it is a process that occurs as new academics are employed and continues as faculty progress to later career stages. Thus, distinctions in institutional missions as revealed in departmental cultures provide an additional layer of influence through which academic scholarship is shaped. Moreover, whether advantages accrue in certain institutional contexts for faculty in one type of knowledge field over another type is also useful for understanding how faculty settle in to new academic jobs and develop careers.

Research by Braxton & Berger (1999) provides support for the perspective that institutional setting influences new faculty adjustment and performance, regardless of

disciplinary affiliation. For example, research findings indicate that faculty from both high consensus and low consensus disciplines had a greater tendency toward adjustment to the researcher role if they worked in research institutions. Furthermore, regardless of discipline, faculty in comprehensive colleges and universities adjusted more readily to the teaching role. Overall, findings from Braxton & Berger indicate lesser influence of disciplinary affiliation than might have been expected, and more influence due to institutional context. However, across institutional types high consensus fields demonstrated higher adjustment scores, indicating that these disciplines are more adaptive regardless of environment. Given that high consensus fields are most likely to have faculty with doctorates who have been socialized to the teacher and researcher roles, the positive influence of the double skill set as an explanation for increased faculty adaptation, appears cogent. Unfortunately, the low-consensus, rural, professional health fields have been largely ignored in higher education studies on the effects of disciplinary and institutional culture on faculty behavior. Consequently, the implications of the academic socialization process for these applied disciplines are unknown (Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1986; Stark, 1998).

Professions as Applied Disciplines

Within the academic culture, distinctions between faculty groups are used to establish a disciplinary hierarchy that assigns status, prestige, and authority to the disciplinary group, and thus to the faculty members within that group (Clark, 1987). The science fields have traditionally assumed the top rung of the disciplinary ladder. There is a similar hierarchy of faculty groups within the professional culture. Whereas,

medicine and law are the most prominent of the professions, the professional fields such as teaching, nursing, and occupational therapy have traditionally occupied lower levels on the professional continuum (Stark, 1998; Heater, 1987).

One explanation why the academic legitimacy of a relatively new profession such as occupational therapy is suspect may be due to the fact that faculty in the baccalaureate or master's entry health professions came to the academic arena with little or no academic training. Further, occupational therapy only recently established the doctorate as the terminal academic degree for the profession (AOTA, 2003). Moreover, the small number of programs that offer a research doctorate in occupational therapy remains a disadvantage for the field (AOTA, 2009). Although occupational therapy faculty members have increasingly earned doctorates in other professional and disciplinary areas, faculty preparation and doctoral socialization to the researcher role in general, has lagged behind the more mature disciplines (Tanguay, 1985). A comparison of the academic profiles of occupational therapy faculty members to faculty in other similar professional fields on the issue of faculty credentials, research experience and pedagogy would provide on measure of success in the academic culture. However, given that few studies have explored the scholarly development of faculty in professional career fields, comparative information is limited (Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1986; Stark, 1998).

Limited knowledge about the characteristics of professional preparation environments was the factor that encouraged Stark, Lowther & Hagerty (1987) to pursue a framework for distinguishing professional fields such as the social services and health professions. A nationwide survey of undergraduate faculty in architecture, business administration, education, engineering, journalism, nursing, and pharmacy, as well as

graduate faculty in law, library science and social work, was conducted to obtain faculty perspectives from these knowledge fields. The sample for the survey research was drawn from a wide range of college and universities representing a variety of institutional types. The questionnaire was designed to elicit faculty perceptions of the effects of internal, external, and intra-organizational influences on program outcomes. Data analysis revealed that the presumed domains of influence do differentiate professional groups, however the influence was found to be relatively independent of the type of institution in which the program operated. Moreover, the external societal influence was identified as the factor that was most useful in distinguishing between fields, especially between predominantly male and female professions.

According to the findings by Stark, Lowther & Hagerty (1987), the gender distribution of the professional fields resulted in there being an association of gender with perceived societal influences. Findings indicated that faculty in professional programs producing primarily male graduates, such as business, engineering, law and pharmacy, generally perceived themselves as high in societal support and recognition. Whereas, faculty in those fields with a high percentage of female graduates, i.e. nursing and social work, perceived less support and recognition from the societal sector, and more influence from their professional communities in the form of accreditation. Moreover, the survey data revealed that nursing faculty tend to spend a significant amount of time assuming a teaching role and minimal time in the researcher role.

Consistent with these findings from Stark, Lowther & Hagerty (1986), Stoecker (1993) classified undergraduate nursing faculty as soft/applied professionals according to the Biglan typology. Relative to the teaching/research debates, the Stoecker's findings

are consistent with teaching as a preferred role for practice professionals. The similarity in professions between nursing and occupational therapy in terms of gender, clinical experience, and the external linkage to the professional culture via accreditation standards, suggests that occupational therapy faculty may be characterized as members of an applied discipline who favor curriculum development and the teaching of clinically relevant competencies over research.

Although the functions of professional faculty are distinct from faculty in the arts and science disciplines, it is speculated that the process through which disciplinary structures evolve and paradigms develop is likely the same for a profession as an applied discipline as it is for the traditional disciplines (Stark, 1998). During the final decades of the twentieth century, occupational therapy faculty scholars explored the status of occupational therapy's knowledge development guided by Kuhn's (1962) perspective that less mature fields have immature paradigms (Kielhofner & Burke, 1977). As a professional discipline in its infancy in the decades of the 1970's and 1980's, it is not surprising that the professional literature indicated that occupational therapy's paradigm lacked clear definition and articulation (Christensen, 1981, 1986, 1987). As an indicator that perspectives are changing, occupational therapy is increasingly describing itself as both a profession and an applied discipline (Yerxa, 1991; Kielhofner, 2006).

Current scholarship has addressed the maturation of the occupational therapy paradigm guided by occupational science as the theoretical perspective, and supported by research on the impact of occupation on human performance (Christiansen & Baum, 1997; Wilcox, 1998; Larson, Wood & Clark, 2003; Braveman, 2006). This paradigmatic progress is consistent with the premise that even immature disciplines will eventually

evolve towards more mature paradigm stature (Becher, 1989). However, because it is the scholars within an academic field that determine the evolution and direction of theoretically-driven research, it is imperative to understand how occupational therapy faculty are interpreting college and departmental values and norms in the pursuit of disciplinary scholarship.

Faculty Scholarship

Higher education researchers have documented the important role that scholarship has played in the development of the academy and the academic profession (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumpert, 1999). Because disciplinary cultures have distinctive characteristics that influence the expectations for faculty scholarship, there is a need to better understand the domains of faculty work and approaches to knowledge development and dissemination. Although the meaning and scope of faculty activities is currently being debated, *scholarship* is generally defined as the "work of the professoriate" (p. xii), and has traditionally been identified as research, teaching and service (Boyer, 1990). Scholarship and higher education exist in a mutually dependent relationship in which each helps to define and shape the other. For example, it has been suggested that a university's success in accomplishing its mission depends upon the selection and scholarly advancement of its faculty (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997).

The academic culture within higher education is conceptualized as providing a general scholarly identity to faculty. However, individual faculty members must also perform faculty roles that contribute to the perceived quality of their disciplines, academic departments and institutions (Boyer, 1990). Thus, just as measures of

scholarship are used to determine a faculty member's value to the academy, they are similarly used to maintain higher education's system of hierarchies in terms of institutional type, knowledge development, disciplinary standing, and student profiles (Clark, 1987; Birnbaum, 1988; Tierney, 1998).

Faculty scholarship is at the core of a discipline's development and hierarchical status (Boyer, 1990). Individual faculty members distinguish themselves as disciplinary scholars, and in turn, advance the notoriety of their academic departments and the status of their institutions. Higher education researchers concerned with the problems facing the professoriate in the twenty-first century have taken an evolutionary look at faculty work and productivity in an effort to reconceptualize scholarship more broadly to include teaching, discovery, integration and a consideration of how knowledge will be put to practical use (Boyer, 1990; Altbach, 1999; Middaugh, 2001; Kezar, 2005). The perspective that has emerged challenges traditional thinking about what is important about faculty work, how those values and skills are conveyed to graduate students, and the best way to assess career lasting activities (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Rice, Sorcinelli & Autsin, 2000; Wulff, Austin, et al., 2004).

Whether faculty performance within the domains of teaching, research and service must be narrowly defined to meet society's need for universal standards, or broadly defined as demanded by diverse higher education contexts, the increasing presence of professional schools and programs, and the changing priorities of the professoriate, represents the opposing poles of the scholarship debate (Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997). Discussing how the concept of faculty scholarship evolved, and how the domains of scholarship have become

institutionalized in academic work, is useful for understanding the faculty role in the twenty-first century (O'Meara & Rice, 2005).

The determination of a faculty member's value to the college or university has traditionally been based on the evaluation of scholarship in the areas of research, teaching and service. This evaluative criteria assumes baseline graduate training at the doctoral level, recognizing that the graduate socialization process imbues beliefs and knowledge consistent with the discipline's paradigm, and ultimately with an individual's paradigm for academic scholarship (Betcher, 1989; Boyer, 1990; Wulff, et al., 2004). Since World War II, as graduate education assumed increased importance in higher education doctoral granting universities achieved prominence and the mission of higher education became skewed toward defining the academic profession by the research model (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumport, 1999). The publication of original research became central to the faculty role in research universities and some elite colleges, and the definition of faculty scholarship and its assessment became narrowly focused as the culture of the academy shifted to undervaluing teaching and overvaluing research (Boyer, 1990; Altbach, 1999). The pressure to acquire the status and prestige afforded to upper-tier research institutions proved sufficient to convince colleges and universities further down the institutional hierarchy to conform and embrace the research model despite existing undergraduate teaching missions (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumport, 1999). Master's colleges and universities represent one institutional type that have traditionally catered to an undergraduate clientele, and offered degrees in the liberal arts as well as the professions. Because of their mid-range position in the academic hierarchy, researchers have studied

these "striving colleges" to identify the influence of institutional context on faculty scholarship (Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Clark, 1987; Boyer, 1990)

Boyer (1990) and other researchers that have followed after him have challenged the assumption that defining scholarship narrowly in terms of the research model is the most desirable for understanding and assessing the professoriate (O'Meara & Rice, 2005). Boyer, used data from a 1989 national survey of faculty to revisit the definition and standards for faculty scholarship and for proposing a new model that expanded faculty scholarship beyond discovery or original research, to include the scholarship of integration, application and teaching. A proposition guiding the Boyer model is that colleges and universities are guided by distinct missions that reflect their institutional diversity. Thus, just as purposes and goals differ from setting to setting, it follows that expectations for faculty performance should also be allowed to vary based upon institutional priorities. To assist institutions with defining scholarship that fits their contexts, Boyer developed prescriptions for where faculty in different institutional contexts should place emphasis relative to the four domains of scholarship. While Boyer's work discussed how scholarship should be performed, how faculty actually carried out the academic role remained unanswered. Thus, empirical research that standardized the evaluation of faculty performance and identified the extent to which faculty engage in the Boyer domains, became necessary (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002).

Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff (1997), extended Boyer's (1990) model by focusing on faculty evaluation and articulating a series of qualitative standards to be used universally in the assessment of scholarly work that included clarity of goals, appropriate

preparation and methods, significant results, effective presentation and reflective critique. Furthermore, using data from a national study of faculty, Braxton, Luckey & Helland (2002) developed an inventory that categorized professional behaviors according to Boyer's domain areas and sorted them as scholarly activities, unpublished scholarly outcomes, and publications. Within this recording system, unpublished scholarly outcomes meet the definition of scholarship" if they appear in a publicly observable form," i.e. designated as subject to critical review and in a form that permits other members of the scholarly community to use them (p. 141, Braxton et al.).

According to the Braxton et al. (2002) categorization of faculty behavior, discovery scholarship may include presenting a paper that describes a new theory developed by the author (unpublished), or a book or refereed journal article describing a new theory developed by the author (published). Scholarship consistent with the principles of integration speaks to the closely controlled extension and synthesis of original research into new areas, preferably at the boundaries where disciplines converge, to reinterpret and bring new insight to bear on what is already known. The scholarship of integration might include a talk or lecture on a disciplinary topic at a high school or radio station (unpublished), a review of literature on an interdisciplinary topic, or a book chapter on the use of a research method borrowed from a discipline outside one's own (published). The focus on moving knowledge to the social environments where it can be useful for solving practical problems typifies another area of scholarly inquiry, i.e. the scholarship of application.

An applied view of scholarly service demands that the application process itself is one that raises the level of intellectual understanding, and thus, is considered a serious,

demanding and rigorous research activity (Braxton et al., 2002). Application scholarly activities include service on a departmental program review committee or a college-wide curriculum committee, whereas outcomes of the scholarship of application consist of a study conducted to help to solve a community problem (unpublished), and an article that applies new disciplinary knowledge to a social problem (published). The final domain of scholarship is teaching. Teaching involves the careful planning and continuous examination of pedagogical activities to assure that educators are "...not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well" (p. 24) (Boyer, 1990). Directing student research projects and developing a new course are considered scholarly teaching activities. To be considered as an outcome within the scholarship of teaching however, one would need for example to construct a novel examination, testing practice or method for assisting critical thinking in students (unpublished), and to publish the use of a new instructional method or strategy for dealing with classroom behavior (published).

Braxton et al. (2002) determined that while the scholarship of discovery persists as the preeminent focus of faculty engagement regardless of type of institution, neither age, gender, race, prestige of doctoral program, tenure or institutional type accounts for why faculty engage in the scholarship of teaching. Moreover, whereas 99.4% of the faculty reported having created unpublished scholarly outcomes reflective of the scholarship of teaching, for the three years previous to the study, only 25.3% of registered publications were associated with the scholarship of teaching. Thus, while faculty members are engaging in scholarly activities related to teaching, and may be

communicating them publicly, they are not publishing them in scholarly forums as Boyer intended.

Summary

Whether a balanced weighting of Boyer's (1990) domains of faculty scholarship will ultimately prevail as a common standard in higher education is uncertain. What is certain within the Boyer model however, is that the presumption of faculty preparation at the doctoral level remains the norm and that faculty members in all institutional types should establish credentials as researchers. While not limiting scholarly pursuits to original research, the faculty role necessarily includes the demonstrated ability to conduct research, implying an in-depth exploration of a serious intellectual issue that is reviewed by peers, made available to the scholarly community, and subsequently published. Moreover, to achieve a more "inclusive" perspective of what it means to be a scholar, colleges and universities need to define "the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates" (Boyer, 1990, p. 16).

The literature on the academic profession that was reviewed for the proposed study, suggests that the framework for scholarship that is institutionalized in the academic culture of higher education defines the academic role, and thus, impacts the development and direction of faculty careers (O'Meara & Rice, 2005). However, due to the diversity of institutions and disciplines within the higher education system, how faculty groups and individual members enact the faculty role and assume a scholarly identity must be characterized by the flexibility that is demanded by distinctions in socialization processes associated with professional training, graduate education, and

institutional contexts (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Wulff & Austin, 2004). Thus, the above-mentioned framework on faculty scholarship will be used to understand how socialization to the clinical role helped to shape the academic role and scholarly identity of faculty members in occupational therapy.

Occupational Therapy: The Evolution of a Health Profession

A number of researchers have chronicled the history of the profession of occupational therapy beginning with the first documented evidence of practice in the early 1900's (Colman, 1990, 1992; Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992; Barker Schwartz, 1992; West, 1992). Present in all of the historical reviews were references to the many social, political and economic factors that coalesced to create the opportunity for this health profession to emerge. For example, the early 20th century was the beginning of the *progressive period* in United States history that was characterized by optimism, social reform, and the emergence of a new generation of well-educated doctors, businessmen, psychologists and educators (Barker Schwartz, 1992). In addition, the successive waves of European immigrants increased the demand for medical care, inevitably resulting in the need for doctors to delegate certain work responsibilities to subordinate health care providers. Moreover, because women were an underutilized segment of the population during the early 1900's, they came to be viewed as a potential workforce in designated "gender segregated" health worker roles, thus establishing new professional pathways (Yerxa, 1975; Mathewson, 1975; Frank, 1992; Punwar & Peloquin, 2000).

The entry of the U.S into World War I provided a further opportunity for women to enter the workforce and aid the war effort. Civilian practitioners called "reconstruction

aides" were hired by the military to provide hand-based activities including "handweaving, woodcarving, metal work and pottery", to patients in military hospitals (Reed & Sanderson, 1992, p. 282). The fact that the activities were graded, i.e. provided in a systematic manner to provide patients with challenge while allowing for successful participation, defined the therapeutic dimension. These early practitioners became the forerunners of the professions of occupational therapy and physical therapy.

Occupational therapy has evolved over a period of nine decades toward recognition as an autonomous health profession (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992; Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003). In 1917, the National Society for the Promotion of Occupational Therapy was founded (Barker Schwartz, 2003). The organizational culture coalesced around a belief in the power of occupations in restoring health and human dignity, and an assumption that society would benefit from returning individuals with physical and mental health problems to productivity within their families and communities. The founding objectives of this organization were "the advancement of occupation as a therapeutic measure; the study of the effect of occupation upon the human being, and the scientific dispensation of this knowledge" (p. 247) (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). In 1921, the organization changed its name to The American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA), and embarked on an initial course of *professionalization* that included recruitment, educational standard setting, and registration of qualified therapists (West, 1958; Yerxa, 1967; Reilly, 1969; Johnson, 1978a, 1978b; Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992; Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003).

Professionalization, has been described as a continuum between the "ideal type profession" on one end, the "semi-professions" in the middle, and the "non-professions"

at the other end (Vollmer & Mills, 1971; Stark, 1998). The true or ideal professions are represented by older fields such as ministry, law and medicine. Whereas, newer fields with long-standing traditions as baccalaureate careers are viewed as the aspiring professions in the middle of the continuum. Important indicators of the achievement of profession status are the requirement for a university degree, as well as a continuous flow of individuals who are committed to the ideals of service within the professional group. Official membership in occupational therapy in the United States climbed steadily from the 1930's, growing from approximately 900 to over 3200 by 1945 (Baum, 1983a; Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992; Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003). The growth of the medical field and specialty areas such as Physical Medicine had a significant impact on the growth of allied health fields such as occupational therapy.

As an extension of Physical Medicine, *rehabilitation* became an interdisciplinary field in the 1930's through the 1950's (Colman, 1992). Medical specialists called physiatrists began to use the services of physical therapists and occupational therapists for the purpose of maximizing patient care. Occupational therapy's affiliation with rehabilitation expanded the economic market for its services to include individuals with acute orthopedic injuries, arthritis, and heart problems, as well as chronic physical disabilities such as polio (Coleman, 1992). The growing rehabilitation marketplace required professional expansion, and thus, during the decades of the 1960' and 1970's the profession's membership more than tripled (Baum, 1983a). In the early 1960's, membership in AOTA grew to 7000, and by 1983, there were 35,000 occupational therapists nationwide (Baum, 1983a). Occupational therapy's expansion continued into the 1980's as the society moved to make social and behavioral problems the arena of

health care (Johnson, 1973; Baum, 1983a). Not only did the numbers of clinician's grow, but the variety of practice settings also increased to include community mental health centers, school systems, long-term care facilities, day care centers, and people's homes (Acquaviva & Pressler, 1983). The development of occupational therapy inevitably fostered competition with the fellow health profession of physical therapy.

The health professions of physical therapy and occupational therapy have historically developed in similar ways, given their common origin as "reconstruction aids" in the early 1900's, and their later relationship under the umbrella of rehabilitation, (Crepeau, Cohn, & Boyt Schell, 2003). In 1956, physical therapy was the first to mandate that its practitioners earn a baccalaureate degree. In the early 1960's, a Curriculum Study Committee of the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA), interviewed faculty within the profession as well as faculty members in other disciplines, in preparation for the development of new standards for occupational therapy education programs (Baum, 1983a). The results of this research yielded the 1965 *Essentials of an Accredited Curriculum in Occupational Therapy* that established the baccalaureate degree as the required entry-level credential (AMA/AOTA, 1965; Larson, Wood & Clark, 2003).

Physical therapy's struggle to achieve autonomy from the American Medical Association (AMA) is another example of parallel professional actions. The exercise of self-regulation whereby professional standards for academic programs, student performance, and faculty qualifications are developed without external interference, is recognized as a designator of the higher professions (Jones, Blair, Hartery & Jones, 1998). For over forty years, physical therapy sought control of its professional

curriculum and finally succeeded in 1977. Likewise, for decades beginning in the 1940's, occupational therapy sought to distance itself from the AMA and establish full authority over the content and delivery of its professional education curriculum (Colman, 1992; West, 1992). In 1994, AOTA was approved by the U.S. Department of Education to exercise this authority through the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE, 1997).

A final similarity between occupational and physical therapy is apparent in the transition to post-baccalaureate education. In 1979 physical therapy adopted a resolution to move entry-level education to the post-baccalaureate level, but it was retracted prior to implementation (Rogers, 1980b). The decision to upgrade clinical entry was re-established in the 1990's with a 2001 date set for academic program compliance. Likewise, debates about upgrading occupational therapy's professional education requirements beyond the baccalaureate degree began in the 1960's. Having observed the challenges faced by physical therapy in the 1970's and 1980's, AOTA waited until 1999 to advance professional legitimacy by voting to require a master's degree to enter practice (AOTA, 1999). As of 2007, all occupational therapy academic programs are required to offer an entry-level curriculum at the professional master's degree level. Just as compliance with the needs of medical and health care environments has been essential in the quest for clinical professionalization, the struggle for academic legitimacy requires a conceptual framework for academic environments and roles as well. Exploring the historical development of occupational therapy professional education will provide a context for understanding how the professional culture has shaped the professional identity from which faculty members in occupational therapy have evolved.

Professional Education: Shaping a Professional Culture

As discussed in the previous section, the context for the development of occupational therapy in the United States was society's increased need for medical care and the medical profession's demand for *allied health* workers to assist physicians with providing health care (Punwar & Peloquin, 2000; Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt-Schell, 2003). The need to supply a steady stream of practitioners established a reciprocal demand for the development of occupational therapy professional education programs (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). The first university instruction in occupational therapy was a three-credit course given at the Teacher's College, Columbia University in 1911 (Barker Schwartz, 1992). This was followed in 1914, by a six-month course consisting of lectures and laboratory work in areas such as kinesiology, crafts, games, and managing a therapy department that was offered at the Henry B. Favill School of Occupations of the Illinois Society of Mental Hygiene (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). By 1918, the first higher education-based school of occupational therapy was founded at Milwaukee Downer College. This college is also noted for offering the first baccalaureate degree in 1931 (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992).

Other schools of occupational therapy developed between 1918 and 1923, however they began as private or federal programs that were affiliated with universities but existed outside of the campus structure. It is important to understand that the few educational offerings that were available in the early decades of the twentieth century were geographically isolated, and inaccessible to women not in the upper middle to upper classes (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992; Crepeau, Cohn, & Boyt Schell, 2003). As

educational programs continued to expand into higher education environments, the need for legitimacy afforded by self-regulation and external standard setting became apparent.

The educational standards developed by allied health professions during the 1920's varied with respect to the required course and length of study. For example, whereas nursing required three years of training, physical therapy adopted guidelines that included two years of prior training in nursing or physical education as well as a nine-month course of study (Frank, 1992; Hummer, Hunt & Figeurs, 1994). According to West (1992), the first formal educational requirements for occupational therapy were established by the professional group in 1923, and consisted of a 12 month course of study that included 3 months of hospital-based training. By 1935, in addition to the profession's self-regulation of the curriculum, the American Medical Association (AMA) began to accredit occupational therapy educational programs (West, 1995). Further, as a means of controlling entry to the profession, educational programs in occupational therapy were subsequently *accredited* if they were located in colleges and universities, and if the curriculum was in compliance with established standards (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992).

By 1938, five schools of occupational therapy had been accredited by a joint commission of the AOTA and the AMA: The Boston School of Occupational Therapy/Tufts University; The Philadelphia School of Occupational Therapy/University of Pennsylvania; The St. Louis School of Occupational Therapy and Recreational Therapy /Washington University; The Occupational Therapy Program at Milwaukee Downer College; and the Kalamazoo State Hospital School of Occupational Therapy (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). Moreover, only graduates of accredited programs of

occupational therapy were permitted entry to the field. By 1945, graduates of professional programs were required to pass a national certification test in order to practice, thereby exerting further control over the number and quality of occupational therapy practitioners (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). These measures helped to establish occupational therapy as a legitimate health profession, and provided the foundation for the future development of professional education.

Graduate Education: Developing Academic Legitimacy

Professional program expansion continued at a steady rate growing from 5 programs in the late 1930's to 45 in the mid- 1970's, and to 66 programs by the late 1980's (Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003; Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992; Yerxa, 1991). One explanation for the rate of growth in the profession during the middle decades of the twentieth century is that it paralleled society's post-war interest in developing a more educated citizenry. Student enrollments in higher education across the U.S. rose strikingly from the 1940's through the 1970's (Heater, 1987). The large numbers of returning World War II veterans with federal money to spend on education through the *Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or the "G.I. Bill"* as it was commonly called, was a contributing factor in the push for a college education. A thriving post-war economy is also identified as a reason for obtaining post-secondary credentials (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumpert, 1999; Heater, 1987). As the market demanded more service-oriented professions, consumers responded by entering technological and professional fields. Evolving social norms also permitted women to enter the workforce

in larger numbers. Thus, females may have viewed professional education as a vehicle to career development.

The middle decades of the twentieth century represent an important period in the professionalization and development of occupational therapy. By the 1940's there were approximately 25 accredited occupational therapy professional education programs in existence in colleges and universities (Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). While a few were baccalaureate programs, many were post-baccalaureate certificate programs for individuals who had earned non-occupational therapy bachelor's degrees and were seeking a career in occupational therapy. In the late 1940's, occupational therapy also developed post-professional graduate education at the master's degree level for clinicians with baccalaureate degrees in occupational therapy (Schnebly, 1970; Rogers, 1980b; Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003; Reed & Nelson Sanderson, 1992). While post-professional master's degree programs were evolving, there is evidence that the deans of graduate schools were discouraging the development of graduate education in occupational therapy (West, 1992). Rather than pursuing degree advancement within the profession, higher education administrators recommended that baccalaureate educated occupational therapists seek graduate degrees in existing disciplines such as anatomy or human development.

Whether the lack of support from higher education was an effort to “define terminal tracks” in professional programs is unclear (Albach, Berdahl & Gumpert, 1999, p. 60). However, this did not deter the profession's leadership from studying the viability of graduate education at the master's degree level (West, 1992). The result of these scholarly discussions was the development of master's degree programs in occupational

therapy at the University of Southern California (1948), New York University (1950), and Western Michigan University (1955), and the approval of the first standards for occupational therapy graduate education (Schnebly, 1970; West, 1992).

Because social work had established the master's degree as the first professional degree for practitioners by 1939, occupational therapy may have been prompted to consider graduate education as a means of aligning itself with a more established professional group (Rogers, 1980b). However, given that occupational therapy developed advanced master's programs nearly twenty years prior to mandating the baccalaureate degree as the first professional degree for practitioners, it is speculated that the master's programs were intended as second professional degrees, i.e. to develop specialization and graduate role development. It may be useful to understand what was occurring elsewhere in professional and higher education during this critical period in occupational therapy's history that may have influenced the decision to develop graduate education, despite discouragement from some sectors of the academic culture.

Beginning with the arrival of the "academic revolution" in the 1960's the mission of the university became synonymous with the rise of the academic profession and the emphasis on faculty research productivity (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Thus, doctoral education became the mechanism for achieving academic legitimacy within the disciplinary and institutional hierarchies of higher education. Parallel trends to those occurring in higher education were also taking place in professional education during the decades of the 1960's and 1970's (McGlothlin, 1960; Spurr, 1970). For example, professional schools reduced their dependence upon part-time practitioner-teachers whose primary interest was practice and not education, and moved toward hiring full-

time academic professionals (McGlothlin, 1960). Furthermore, the advancement of the professions has also been associated with the development of graduate education programs and the mechanism of the professional or clinical graduate credential (Mayhew & Ford, 1974; Rogers, 1980b). However, except for the high status professions of medicine and law, the evolutionary stage of growth for many professions in the middle decades of the twentieth century was for the development of the master's degree as the first professional degree (Spurr, 1970). This trend occurred despite a lack of clear agreement on the nature and purpose of professional education at the master's degree level (Dinham & Stritter, 1986).

During the decades of the 1960's through the 1980's the allied health professions including occupational therapy, joined the ranks of professionals engaged in growing debates about transitioning baccalaureate careers to graduate entry-careers (West, 1958 1992; Reilly, 1969; Rogers, 1980a, 1980b; Pagliarulo, 1996). Conflicting data added confusion to this highly charged political and cultural issue. For example, after thirty years as a master's entry profession social work reverted to the baccalaureate degree for practitioners in 1969, in order to increase social work personnel with varying levels of social welfare responsibility (Rogers, 1980b; Pierce, Jackson, Rogosky-Grassi, Thompson, and Menninger, 1987; Hoberman & Mailick, 1994). However, despite the precedent established by the field of social work and the lack of consensus within occupational therapy, external pressure to augment the numbers of practitioners mounted. Thus, although baccalaureate occupational therapy programs progressively moved into liberal arts and comprehensive colleges, academic departments began to seek other ways to attract clinical candidates (Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Cambell, 1985). What the leadership

and membership of occupational therapy may not have envisioned as they embarked on the process of professional development is the degree to which external influences, e.g. market demand and institutional pressure, would shape the profession's destiny (Jaffe, 1985a; Coleman, 1992).

Although the advantages of graduate level preparation for practitioners were not clearly established, occupational therapy developed its first *entry-level professional* master's degree program in 1966, at the University of Southern California (O'Kane, 1977; Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Campbell, 1985). The first professional degree program at USC was designed for students with undergraduate degrees in areas such as education or psychology. In 1979, similarly undeterred by the experience of social work, physical therapy made a decision to move entry-level education to the post-baccalaureate level (Rogers, 1980b). However, physical therapy later rescinded the policy due to political pressure and didn't reinstitute it again until the 1990's. A Position Paper that was drafted in 1980 by the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education further implicated the influence of external forces on the health professions. The document advised against upgrading entry-level for the nursing profession beyond the baccalaureate level as it would "negatively affect the applicant pool" (p. 660, Pierce, Jackson, Rogosky-Grassi, Thompson & Menninger, 1987). Despite the climate of confusion within the health professions, by 1971, 10 occupational therapy academic departments were offering *entry-level* professional master's degrees (Schnebly, 1970; Lucci, 1974).

Understanding what forces compelled occupational therapy to divert resources from the early development of a single-entry educational pathway may provide insight into the professional culture. Because occupational therapy was simultaneously

developing undergraduate and graduate entry-routes to the profession in the 1970's, only ten years after the professional mandated the baccalaureate credential for practitioners, confusion within the occupational therapy membership resulted (Lucci, 1974). Whether the profession should remain a baccalaureate career field despite the development of first professional degree programs at the master's level became a highly contentious issue within the professional culture (Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Campbell, 1985; Leonardelli & Gratz, 1986; Storm, 1990). The lack of membership consensus may explain why AOTA commissioned a committee in the late 1970's to study whether both undergraduate and graduate entry points to the profession should be allowed to continue (Colman, 1992).

The AOTA study commission confirmed the value-laden, political nature of the professional credential by citing the resistance to multiple-entry routes by such organizations as the American Hospital Association and the Commission on Allied Health Education Accreditation (Colman, 1992). The commission ultimately recommended against changing the profession's educational policies however, because multiple-entry points were viewed as necessary for meeting market, student, educator and professional development needs. As a practical matter, if practitioners could be educated in both undergraduate and graduate programs, occupational therapy departments could increase student numbers and colleges could increase revenues.

Notwithstanding the issue of practicality, having both the baccalaureate degree and the master's degree as first professional degrees, as well as a *post-professional*, second degree master's pathway resulted in a structural degree pathology in occupational therapy that has resulted in implications for practitioners, employers and faculty scholars (Rogers, 1980a, 1980b). Competing needs within the profession culture provides an

explanation for why occupational therapy chose a course that resulted in a dual-master's degree structure. At the heart of the competing influences was the pressure to meet the external social demand for occupational therapy practitioners, and yet provide an avenue to meet the internal need for professional and academic advancement for practicing clinicians.

According to Jaffe (1985a, 1985b), one of many considerations regarding professional entry at the graduate level was that graduate level practitioners would threaten the existing baccalaureate professional culture of occupational therapy. This was apparent in the concern expressed by baccalaureate educated clinicians that new practitioners entering the field with master's degrees could undermine the standing and seniority afforded to experienced clinicians (Jaffe, 1985a, 1985b). In addition, the profession created degree ambiguity that would make it difficult for society and work environments to differentiate between the qualifications of individuals with master's degrees, some of whom were new to practice, and others of whom were experienced clinicians with research skills. Although there is no evidence that having a dual degree structure has been misleading to employers or consumers, there is also no data to the contrary. Moreover, the having two master's degree pathways inevitably required competition for scarce faculty resources.

There is reason to speculate that the diversion of resources toward graduating master's level practitioners slowed the development of occupational therapy academic professionals. For example, by the mid-1970's there were more entry-level master's graduates than post-professional master's graduates despite the fact that second professional degree programs had been available for nearly two decades longer (Rogers,

1980b). Given that the purpose of post-professional graduate degrees is to develop educators, administrators and scholars, it is clear that the professional culture was responding more to external pressure than to the internal need for faculty scholars.

Whether preemptive consideration was given to the faculty resource challenges associated with simultaneously moving occupational therapy ahead on both the professional and post-professional degree fronts or whether the profession came to understand this in retrospect, is speculative. However, a survey of occupational therapy faculty members in the late 1960's revealed that 57% held master's degrees and 3% held doctorates, as compared with 89% of four-year college and university professors who either held earned doctorates or were hired just prior to completing their doctoral education (Schnebly, 1970, 1971). Because the academic profession of occupational therapy was entering this new phase of professional development behind in academic credentials and doctoral research experience relative to other faculty in higher education, the challenges were likely to be significant. Moreover, given that a 1973 AOTA member survey identified only 7% of occupational therapists as faculty members during a time of unrestrained program growth, the need for concern regarding faculty resources was real (Punwar & Peloquin, 2000).

At the heart of the debates that have polarized practitioners and educators in occupational therapy from mid-century to the present was the purpose of professional education (Labovitz, 1986; Rider, 1987; Storm, 1990; Clark, Hill & Sharrot, 1985). The discussions centered upon whether faculty in professional academic departments were expected to socialize practicing clinicians or to socialize beginning scholars who would develop the profession's knowledge base. Unfortunately, the discussions remained

bogged down at the first professional degree level. The profession might have been better served to understand that professional level skills and competencies, whether at the baccalaureate or professional master's level, differ from those required in doctoral education where the goal is the training of academic scholars.

Supporting this proposition is the fact that prior to the 1983 educational standards there were no references to the development of research skills in graduates of professional programs (AOTA, 1983). Moreover, an inaccurate assumption that existed within the professional culture was that faculty members in entry-level professional programs routinely had the level of academic and research training needed to establish themselves as disciplinary scholars who would establish academic legitimacy in higher education contexts. During the 1980's, many occupational therapy faculty members held bachelor's degrees, and even those with master's degrees had limited training for the faculty role. Thus, departmental mentorship of new faculty members was heavily focused on the clinical identity and teaching, and lacked the socialization to the researcher role that was needed for developing the practice discipline. These discussions appear to highlight the competing interests of the professional culture of practitioners and the disciplinary culture of faculty members as it relates to the differing expectations for professional education verses doctoral training and socialization to the academic role as the basis for faculty preparation.

Whether entry-level programs are at the undergraduate or graduate level, the primary purpose of professional education has traditionally been to educate students in the practice of a particular profession and to develop practitioners who meet minimum standards of theoretical knowledge and skill competencies (Mayhew & Ford, 1974;

Coppard & Dickerson, 2005). In contrast, the purpose of graduate education in an arts and science discipline is to educate scholars who will conduct research to advance the discipline (Mayhew & Ford, 1974). Herein, rests the distinction between first professional degrees at the graduate level, and second or post-professional graduate degrees in a practice discipline such as occupational therapy. Rather than educating practitioners, the purpose of the advanced or post-professional graduate curriculum is to provide a mechanism by which experienced clinicians could specialize in a practice area and be provided with preliminary socialization to the faculty role. Moreover, post-professional graduates students were provided with research skills and mentorship to advance knowledge related to occupational therapy theory and practice (Coppard & Dickerson, 2005).

The second degree/post-professional master's program was designed for occupational therapists interested in advanced general knowledge, role specialization in clinical practice or administration, and beginning preparation for the academic career and researcher role (Rogers, 1980b). Between 1948 and 1974 post-professional master's programs expanded to 14 (Lucci, 1974; O'Kane, 1977). At the present time, the number of programs offering post-professional master's degrees to individuals with a baccalaureate degree in occupational therapy has grown to 48 (<http://www.aota.org>). The degree structure for the post-professional master's in occupational therapy that has evolved is similar to that of traditional disciplinary master's degrees in that it requires 30-36 credit hours to complete and culminates in a thesis research project (Keefe, 2007). The first advanced doctoral program in occupational therapy was established in 1970. Because advanced doctoral programs require faculty mentorship as well as original

research and a dissertation, they are primarily designed to prepare future faculty by socializing them as teachers and independent researchers in the field (Coppard & Dickerson, 2005). More than 15 years ago Yerxa (1991) expressed concern about the slow growth of doctoral program development in occupational therapy/science in terms of meeting the future need for qualified faculty.

Since the first doctoral program was developed, fewer than 5 new programs offering academic doctorates in occupational therapy or occupational science have developed, although some additional doctoral programs have emerged in related areas such as disability studies, therapeutic studies, and rehabilitation science (<http://www.aota.org>; Coppard & Dickerson, 2005). Limited access to Ph.D. programs in occupational therapy/science however, inevitably means fewer faculty scholars within the field who are available to contribute to the prestige of their academic departments and institutions. The development of clinical doctoral degrees in occupational therapy (OTD) over the last five years has further confounded the complex issue of balancing the needs of the clinical profession against the needs of the academic discipline. Because the professional or clinical doctorate is designed to focus on "sophisticated practice competencies" (p.64), and seldom requires a thesis or dissertation, the balance appears to have shifted away from academic interests (Pierce & Peyton, 1999; Coppard & Dickerson, 2005).

At the present time, there are approximately 1,786 occupational therapy faculty members in the United States (AOTA, 2009). Approximately 67% of the occupational therapy faculty members have earned doctorates. Over the last twenty years, occupational therapy faculty preparation at the doctoral degree level has been slow to

develop. The implications for the slowed pace of development of disciplinary scholars is reduced research to support clinical practice, as well as limited data to support the scholarship of teaching. Of concern is that there are too few new faculty members with doctoral training and research credentials currently in the pipeline to fill the vacancies resulting from the retirement of the current group of disciplinary scholars. The reality of this situation has surfaced anew in the face of persistent faculty shortages, and revised accreditation standards that mandate doctoral degrees for program directors and a majority of faculty in professional academic programs by 2012 (AOTA, 2006). In this challenging period in occupational therapy's history as an academic field, it may be useful to speculate on how this predominantly female profession has been advantaged or disadvantaged in developing an academic professional identity due to the primary influence of the clinical culture of practice. Thus, consideration should be given to how social norms relating to gender may have influenced the professional socialization process.

Socialization and the Professional Identity

Socialization is described as a process through which individuals entering a new group come to understand the values, beliefs and norms required for successful participation in that group (Sabari, 1985). Individuals are exposed to socializing experiences through membership in society and family groups, during educational training, and while enacting job roles. To understand how the largely feminine profession of occupational therapy developed the professional identity of its members, it may be useful to speculate on the social status of women in the United States during the first half

of the 20th century. Whether reverberations of that perceived status may have impacted the current professional lives of occupational therapists, may provide insights into the development of faculty careers (Yerxa, 1975). Because gender is one dimension that can be used to understand the professional characteristics of occupational therapy, feminist perspectives may be useful (Frank, 1992).

The claim that a strong relationship exists between occupational therapists' professional identity and their prior socialization within the society and the family has been discussed in the professional literature (Yerxa, 1975). Descriptions of the social environment of the early decades of the 1900's support the suggestion that the upper class values of the single, female pioneers of occupational therapy dictated that they would portray themselves as having a *profession* as opposed to a job (Litterst, 1992; Frank, 1992). The "society girls" who chose occupational therapy would have been permitted entry into the workforce "under no other less prestigious conditions" (Litterst, 1992, p. 21). During mid-century as the profession expanded into public universities accessibility for middle class women increased. The growth of educational opportunities combined with the social acceptance of women in the workplace, and the demand for health professionals, resulted in a surge of occupational therapy graduates during the 1970's (Yerxa, 1975). However, given that the society of the 1970's also continued to foster marriage and family as the ideals of womanhood, a workforce pattern emerged in the female profession that was not conducive to its development. (Flint & Spensley, 1968; Yerxa, 1975).

The profile of the profession of occupational therapy in the mid-1970's indicated that its membership was still gender segregated at 95% female, and was characterized as

predominantly white, middle class, 26 years old, married with children, and employed in a hospital (Yerxa, 1975; Mathewson, 1975; Frank, 1992). Unfortunately for the development of the profession, those therapists who were not working had averaged only 5.9 years of clinical experience prior to leaving the field. Researchers accounted for member's short working life by suggesting that it related to their social conditioning to be "feminine," i.e. work a few years, get married and then leave the profession for 20 years to raise a family (Mathewson, 1975; Johnson, 1978). The fact that as many as 34% of active, registered members of AOTA were not employed in a given year, indicated that society's expectations for women and their primary roles were being met, while the needs of a developing profession to expand the workforce, was not (Mathewson, 1975). To better understand how occupational therapists were socialized as clinicians to the roles and practices of this health profession, will require an examination of the medical context in which the socialization process occurred. Because of the historical reliance on the medical profession for educational standards and patient referrals, the influence of medicine on the cultural development of occupational therapy cannot be overlooked.

Yerxa (1975) characterized the medical field in the middle decades of the twentieth century as a professional work environment where male physicians assumed positions of authority. Moreover, the predominantly female professions of nursing, social work, occupational and physical therapy filled the supportive roles that required less education and afforded lesser status. Physicians established the doctorate as the terminal degree in the 1920's, and the health professions traditionally developed as baccalaureate career fields. For this reason, professions such as occupational therapy subsequently came to be labeled as semi-professions for failing to meet the accepted standards of

professionalism that only graduate professional degrees afforded (Altbach, Berdahl & Gumpert, 1999; Jones, Blair, Hartery & Jones, 1998; Stark, 1998). Thus, occupational therapists who were educated in the 1970's and earlier were socialized in clinical environments where male superiority in power, financial remuneration, and prestige, was the norm. Yerxa (1975), expressed concern that the feminine socialization process had become so effective that occupational therapists were becoming desensitized to unequal treatment, or tolerant of institutionalized behaviors that foster dependency. Instances of desensitization include the dependency relationship created as the result of reliance on physician oversight to treat patients, and tolerance of institutionalized sexism.

The influence of socialization on defining gender roles explains the findings by Mathewson (1975) that a desire to look feminine as defined by a lack of aggression, is an explanation given by therapists for a tendency to defer to men in competing for jobs or promotion. Mathewson also reported that experienced therapists were generally accepting of the lack of autonomy that was enforced by the use of prescriptions or referrals from doctors that authorized patient treatment and payment for services. In addition, Serrett (as cited in Hooper, 2006), hypothesized that the gender-based division of labor accounted for the fact that doing occupational therapy activities was appropriate for women, but that providing the conceptual rationale for why therapeutic activities were being done belonged to the male physicians. The fact that therapists felt comfortable in the less "uncertain" role of subordinate and uncomfortable with a collegial relationship, provides an additional instance of an unnatural dependency on physicians. Moreover, sexist attitudes conveyed to female therapists by male doctors and administrators were a symptom of an unbalanced relationship between physicians and therapists that

contributed to an atmosphere of professional disrespect and institutional inequity (Yerxa, 1975; Mathewson, 1975).

References to adult female therapists as "you girls" (p. 597, Yerxa, 1975), encouraged organizational dependence and interpersonal deference on the part of the practitioners. In addition, low-level work roles constrained self-confidence and fostered a professional identity with reduced expectations for professional achievement (Mathewson, 1975). In Yerxa's study of new occupational therapy graduates the data indicated that "... having administrative responsibility for the work of others, having leadership opportunities, and having autonomy" were low on the value scale as reasons for becoming occupational therapists (p. 598, Yerxa, 1975). Because the professional culture of occupational therapy socializes students to the clinical role through professional education, it is important to consider whether aspects of educational programming have sustained unwanted values and beliefs.

As discussed in a previous section, the development of an external accreditation process for educational programs in occupational therapy is considered a milestone on the road to clinical professionalization (Colman, 1992a, 1992b). Because the profession's educational standards guide program philosophy, curriculum design, course content, fieldwork requirements and faculty qualifications, the accreditation process must be viewed as a significant source of cultural influence for both the students who graduate from occupational therapy programs and the faculty who teach them. Sabari (1986) was one of the first researchers to explore how aspects of educational socialization have impacted the development of a professional identity in occupational therapy. For example, it is necessary to consider whether professional programs support traditional

attitudes regarding females including dependence on others and contentment with subordinate roles, at the expense of undermining the values of autonomy. Moreover, faculty must question whether they are mentoring the type of risk taking and professional planning associated with doctoral and post-doctoral training, and development for assertive leadership roles.

Notwithstanding social roles and gender issues in the development of identity, other considerations include the perceived status of faculty relative to the prominence of the clinical role. For instance, to the extent that faculty are seen as primarily transferring versus transforming knowledge, future clinicians and academicians alike will be socialized to those values. Moreover, in as much as students are provided with more clinical fieldwork experiences than research opportunities within the professional curriculum, students may develop a stronger identification with clinical supervisors than with faculty researchers as role models for future behavior.

The occupation therapy literature over the last four decades supports the assumption that faculty scholarship is fundamental to the profession's maturation as an academic discipline (Yerxa, 1967; Jantzen, 1974; Kielhohner & Burke, 1977; Johnson, 1978; Christiansen, 1981; Metaxas, 2000). Interest in revisiting the themes of disciplinary development, research on education and the role of faculty recruitment, preparation and development in the evolution of the profession, has also surfaced (Yerxa, 1991; Larson, Wood & Clark, 2003; Bonduc, 2005; Kielhofner, 2006). In addition, AOTA has established an official document suggesting that Boyer's (1990) model for faculty scholarship has currency for the future development of the academic profession of occupational therapy (AOTA, 2003). Just as professional development is predicated on

the socialization, expertise and commitment of practitioners, academic development within the professions relies to a great extent on socialization to the academic role that occurs as faculty scholars are trained in graduate school, and later hired and retained in educational programs (Vollmer & Mills, 1971; Becher, 1989, 1994; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Clark, 1997).

Academic careers in occupational therapy are subject to multiple external and internal influences having to do with the healthcare marketplace, professional training, graduate education, and organizational socialization in colleges and universities (Tierney & Rhoades, 1993). According to Becher (1989), the process of socialization to the disciplinary values and norms that direct faculty behavior and status is likely to be most intense during doctoral training and in the first faculty position. Inasmuch as the doctorate has only recently been designated as the terminal degree in occupational therapy (AOTA, 2004), it is assumed that the slow pace of development of doctoral education in occupational therapy over the last thirty years has limited the ability to socialize new disciplinary scholars at the doctoral level. Moreover, because it is a discipline's scholars that are expected to develop a paradigm and a guiding theoretical structure from which the directions for research are determined, one wonders whether the need for occupational therapy faculty to earn doctorates in other fields has encouraged them to work outside of the profession. If so, professional faculty careers would be reduced, and the field would experience a drain on disciplinary knowledge to support practice (Christiansen, 1981, 1986, 1987). The current concern about losing faculty to doctoral socialization outside of occupational therapy mirrors the anxiety in the 1970's that losing bachelor's level practitioners to master degree programs outside of the field

was an unsettling trend (Maxfield, 1975; Tanguay, 1985). Not unlike the context of the 1970's, it is just as plausible that doctoral training outside of occupational therapy has served to sustain faculty development, and the ability of the practice discipline to expand the knowledge boundaries of this health field. Nonetheless, it is less clear how diluting the ranks of occupational therapy scholars would serve to unify disciplinary consensus on theory and research within the maturing discipline. Notwithstanding doctoral education outside the emerging discipline, the accreditation process for professional academic programs also exerts a socializing influence on faculty careers.

It may be useful to understand how the specialized accreditation process has exerted a socializing influence on the evolution of occupational therapy as an academic profession. However, how standards that address faculty qualifications, roles and development have impacted the faculty role and work behaviors has not been addressed in the literature. Thus, it is necessary to review the role of standard setting in occupational therapy's history.

Professional Accreditation and the Academic Context

Accreditation is defined as “a status granted to an educational institution or a program that has been found to meet or exceed stated criteria of educational quality” (Bogue & Saunders, 1992). The institutional accreditation process results in accreditation status for colleges and universities, and the professional or specialized accreditation process results in accreditation status for individual professional programs (Hagerty & Stark, 1989). Professional or specialized accreditation was initiated in the early 1900's, as a mechanism for developing standards in professional education

programs in higher education. The first accreditation standards for occupational therapy were established in 1935, and subsequent revisions were ratified at 5-10 year intervals over the next sixty years (AOTA, 1943, 1949, 1965, 1973, 1983, 1991, 1995, and 1998). Another revision of the educational standards has just been completed (AOTA, 2006). To understand how policies that are designed for occupational therapy education may have shaped faculty preparation and scholarly behavior will require a historical examination of the accreditation standards.

An historical analysis of the standards pertaining to faculty and program director qualifications may provide insight into how occupational therapy faculty interpreted expectations for scholarship within the professional culture. For example, in the 1935 standards, nominations for faculty positions were made in accordance with "academic custom," and faculty qualifications included "successful teaching experience" (AOTA, 1935). Although the 1943 standards found it "desirable that the administrator should possess an academic degree," the 1949 revision pertaining to the program administrator's qualifications stipulated an "academic degree" (AOTA, 1935, 1949). In the late 1950's, in response to professional debates concerning degree requirements for practitioners, AOTA authorized a Curriculum Study Commission (1958-1963) to interview faculty in occupational therapy and other disciplines (AOTA, 1963). A major shortcoming that was reported by this commission was the lack of focus on faculty development. Faculty weaknesses identified in the commission's report included lack of academic preparation, inadequate preparation for teaching, and lack of faculty involvement in college and university activities.

The AOTA Study Commission's recommendations included higher academic qualifications for faculty in the form of graduate education (AOTA, 1963). While the committee's recommendations left open to interpretation whether graduate education for faculty should be at the master's or doctoral degree level, program directors were expected to have a doctorate or be working towards one. However, the 1965 standards that mandated baccalaureate education for occupational therapy practitioners, fell short of the commission's recommendations by only requiring occupational therapy faculty to be "well qualified instructors holding academic rank in the college commensurate with their training and experience," and to be "competent in teaching" (AOTA, 1965). This appears to be the first instance of documented deference to institutional prerogative by the profession's accrediting body, despite advocacy by leading educators for occupational therapists to demonstrate their own "authenticity" by earning doctoral degrees and conducting research to develop a unique body of knowledge (Yerxa, 1966).

It can only be speculated as to why occupational therapy avoided designating the doctorate as the acceptable academic standard toward which all professional faculty members should aspire, despite the fact that it was the established standard for faculty within the academic culture of the 1960's (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Moreover, it is important to consider whether permitting institutions to determine faculty preparation has well-served or ill-served the practice discipline and the development of qualified occupational therapy faculty scholars.

From 1965 through 1973, there were no degree requirements mandated for "instructional staff" in professional programs beyond the baccalaureate degree required for occupational therapy practitioners. Program directors however, were required to have

five years of experience in direct clinical service, administration or teaching, and to "to hold a master's or doctoral degree unless the institution permits special consideration or equivalency for professional experience" (AOTA, 1973). This provision was included because it was customary in the academic culture of the time to provide special consideration to professions such as business, whose terminal degree was the MBA. The allied health literature suggests that the health professions whose terminal degree was either the baccalaureate or master's degree took similar advantage of such consideration by developing promotion criteria such as teaching excellence and curriculum development, rather than traditional research and publication expectations (Mettler & Bork, 1985). The development of a divergent reward system however, was not without the risk that failure to expose students to faculty who are involved in research could undermine their interest in research careers (Covey & Burke, 1987).

Parham's (1985a, 1985b) study of academic award structures for occupational therapy educators found evidence that some colleges and universities accommodated professional faculty by rewarding them for different characteristics and achievements than other faculty in higher education. The differences included a higher potential to earn rewards for professional recognition and outstanding teaching, than is typical within the academic culture. Moreover, Parham found that journal articles or book publications played only a minor role in rewards. Thus, while the faculty members in Parham's study were having their contracts renewed and being given salary rewards, 64% of them were consigned to the rank of instructor or clinical assistant professor, and only 36% were tenured. The fact that this data was similar to the distribution of rank and tenure amongst occupational therapy faculty during the mid-1970's, indicated a disturbing trend with

clear ramifications for faculty career development. That is, if occupational therapy faculty could get hired and advance their careers within institutions that provided exceptions to traditional rewards, there would be less motivation for faculty to seek doctoral training and distinguish themselves as researchers. Thus, the implications of the profession's reluctance to self-regulate faculty preparation relative to advancing the science and the development of the practice discipline are unclear.

The call for research to advance the profession of occupational therapy may have impacted the development of the 1983 standards (Kielhofner & Burke, 1977; Christiansen, 1981; AOTA, 1983). Unfortunately, the profession's accrediting body again failed to designate the doctorate as the mechanism through which academic training and faculty research to support practice would emerge (AOTA, 1983). However, the 1983 standards did establish the precedent that occupational therapy faculty members were to be selected based upon "expertise" in a designated clinical area, and were to have academic responsibilities including "teaching, research, community service, student advising, and participation in institutional activities." In addition, students were required to "critique studies appropriate for application to occupational therapy practice." Academic degree qualifications for program directors remained at the master's or doctoral degree level, with the caveat that "equivalent educational qualifications" would suffice. Thus, the profession's leaders again chose not to standardize doctoral training for socialization to the academic role, and permitted institutional prerogative for faculty academic preparation to remain the norm.

In 1991, when the standards were again revised two degree levels of professional education were recognized, i.e. baccalaureate and entry-level master's degree program

(AOTA, 1991). In an apparent reversal of the language from the two previous standards revisions in 1973 and 1983, the 1991 standard regarding program director qualifications designated “a minimum of a master’s degree or have equivalent educational qualifications.” By formatively retreating from any language related to doctoral training for program directors, the 1991 standards represented an obvious regression from the previous two decades. Within the allied health education community of the time, this decision would have been viewed as representing values that were likely to lower the status of occupational therapy departments relative to their disciplinary peers (Covey & Burke, 1987).

The most compelling argument for why the AOTA/AMA accrediting body made a decision to reverse the language of the standards was to avoid superceding the credential requirements of liberal arts or master’s institutions and placing expectations on academic departments that exceeded existing resources. Because shortages of program directors already existed, there may have been a concern that requiring a doctorate would exacerbate the problem and undermine the profession's ability to adequately lead its educational programs (Rider, 1989; Sieg, 1986). As a practice profession, the leadership of occupational therapy would not have been able to ignore the consequences of the failure to grow its educational programs.

Because the need to educate a steady supply of practitioners is seen as paramount to the continued viability of occupational therapy, the external pressure from the medical field and from colleges and universities to grow academic programs may have been more significant than the profession anticipated (Jaffe, 1985a; Pierce, Jackson, Rogosky-Grassi, Thompson & Menninger, 1987; Coleman, 1992). Moreover, there may have been

concerns that challenging the primary mission of academic departments for educating practitioners by developing too many of the faculty as researchers, would limit the number of students being trained and result in occupational therapy's career niche being taken over by other competing allied health professions, e.g. physical therapy or recreational therapy. The literature has yet to address whether the ambiguity in standards language over the last forty years has yielded intended or unintended consequences for the development of academic careers in occupational therapy.

One wonders if the intent of the occupational therapy leadership was to take advantage of the variability of institutional norms relative to academic preparation, while permitting the baccalaureate and master's trained faculty membership to gradually develop into a cohort of educators with doctorates. If so, then the policy has had limited success based upon the persistent shortage of well-prepared faculty to staff educational programs (Posthuma & Noh, 1991; Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003; C. Baum, personal correspondence, 2005). Another possibility however, is that the policy had unintended consequences. For example, what if the cost to the profession of not requiring doctoral preparation in earlier standards was to limit the development of a researcher identity and thus, to perpetuate the misalignment of occupational therapy with the academic culture at large. Further, lacking the academic and research training that doctoral socialization provides, individual faculty members were ill-prepared to effectively engage in scholarship to advance the standings of their institutions and academic departments. Thus, this literature review will discuss how occupational therapy as a professional faculty group has evolved relative to faculty in more traditional

academic disciplines, and to speculate on how the development of the clinical profession has influenced the current status of faculty scholarship in occupational therapy.

The Faculty Role and Professional Development

The faculty role as distinct from the practitioner identity was first identified during the decades of the 1930's and 1940's as occupational therapy education programs first developed in public four-year institutions (Jantzen, 1974; Barker Schwartz, 2003). Similar to other allied health professions, the first occupational therapy faculty members were contextually displaced clinicians, with little or no socialization as formal educators and minimal knowledge of the faculty role, including scholarly responsibilities (Barker Schwartz, 2003). The unrestrained proliferation of educational programs into liberal arts colleges in the 1950's and 1960's, and comprehensive colleges and research institutions in the 1970's and 1980's (Jantzen, 1974; Heater, 1987) brought to light a recurrent issue that has plagued the profession since its inception, i.e. the relative disinterest of practitioners in graduate education and the academic career (Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003; Dickerson & Whittman, 1999; Sieg, 1986). By suggesting that the academic career be viewed as a "specialty" like other clinical specializations within the profession, Jantzen (1974) may have been attempting to elevate the faculty role. The necessity to adopt such clinically focused language, speaks volumes to fact that the professional culture was not successful in differentiating a distinct professional identity for occupational therapy faculty members.

The profession culture's indifference to the faculty role has resulted in a demand for qualified academic personnel that is frequently beyond the limits of the existing

academic workforce in occupational therapy (Mitchell, 1985; Tanguay, 1985; Baum, professional correspondence, 2005). Whereas only a minority of occupational therapists have traditionally considered the academic role as a viable career choice, those practitioners seeking leadership roles as department chairs are even fewer (Sieg, 1986). Because the occupational therapy academic department "organizes, defines, articulates, disseminates and develops the body of knowledge on which the profession is based", the importance of experienced faculty members who can assume leadership roles is critical to the survival of the profession in educational institutions (p. 89, Sieg, 1986).

Unfortunately, unlike most faculty in higher education, occupational therapists opting for the faculty role do so with primary socialization as practitioners and often with limited academic preparation, mentorship, and scholarly experience (Sabari, 1985; Yerxa, 1991). Thus, the higher education literature that distinguishes faculty in the arts and science disciplines from professional faculty will provide insight into the features that exemplify the faculty role in occupational therapy (Becher, 1989; Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998).

As discussed in a previous section of this paper, faculty in the arts and sciences disciplines have been classified according to their distinctive characteristics since the 1980's (Becher, 1989). However, with the exception of the more prestigious professions of law or pharmacy, there has been little interest in extending the classifications to more recently developed professional fields including occupational therapy (Stoecker, 1993). Research by Stark, Lowther & Hagerty (1987) and Stark (1998) identified this gap in the literature and explored the development of a nomenclature for longstanding baccalaureate career professions. Because occupational therapy required a baccalaureate credential

from 1965 through 1999 when the master's degree was mandated, the profession has a significant undergraduate career history (AOTA, 1999).

Stoecker's (1993) research indicates that the disciplinary schemes that have been utilized with mature academic disciplines are also valid for gaining insights into the faculty role in the professions. This is counter to the findings of Stark (1998) that suggest that baccalaureate career professions are unique sub-cultures that defy traditional disciplinary classifications. Thus, it may prove useful to construct a profile of occupational therapy faculty members based upon the knowledge dimensions and social features that characterize the disciplines, as well as on the descriptive aspects that are unique to professional careers (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998).

According to research on the traditional academic disciplines, how knowledge is perceived, transmitted and created is a function of subject area, disciplinary consensus, and the social features of the knowledge community (Becher, 1989). One of the social dimensions that distinguishes disciplines is whether they are considered convergent or divergent in terms of thinking and action. According to Becher "scientific progress stems from working in a context in which there is close agreement on theories, methods of inquiry, and the training of new comers to the discipline" (p. 10). Thus, because faculty in convergent disciplines are free to pursue knowledge for knowledge sake are more likely to be unified in their understanding of what members of their knowledge community need to know and how to study it. Alternatively, because theory, content and application are interdependent in professional faculty groups, and yet they must accommodate the overlap of practice concerns with other professions, they lack a unified understanding of knowledge boundaries. Moreover, because health professions must integrate the

competing roles of practitioner and faculty member, consensus about the purposes of professional education, the level of training required to enter clinical practice, and which research questions are the most important for the emerging discipline are lacking (Stark, 1998).

Several salient features explicate occupational therapy faculty as a divergent disciplinary community. How knowledge is defined and acquired within this health profession is one such feature (Becher, 1989). By contrast to the longstanding arts and science disciplines, less mature disciplines such as occupational therapy are assumed to lack consensus within the faculty membership on how scholarship should be defined and what academic functions and activities are most important for disciplinary advancement. As an example, the literature documents the lack of faculty consensus about the need for a unified theoretical perspective to ground occupational therapy and empirical research to validate occupation as a therapeutic agent (Christiansen, 1981, 1987; Kielhofner & Burke, 1977; Yerxa, 1991, 2005). Another consideration regarding knowledge in occupational therapy is that it is derived from multiple subject area sources.

Disagreements on theory and research interests may be explained by the need to integrate both hard and soft knowledge domains within the professional curriculum, as well as the profession's reliance on multiple conceptual models to support specialized practice issues. While most applied fields benefit from parent disciplines in either the hard or soft knowledge domains, occupational therapy uses both hard sciences and soft sciences as knowledge sources (Becher, 1989). Occupational therapy professional curricula require coursework in physics, anatomy, kinesiology and neuroscience, as a basis for providing treatment to clients with physical disabilities and as a basis for

designing and fabricating custom orthotics as part of post-surgical treatment. Further, occupational therapy students also study psychology and sociology, to understand the impact of cognitive impairments mental health problems on the ability to live independently and to appreciate the value of participation in home, work and leisure activities for health promotion. Knowledge sources are also dictated by the cognitive and functional boundaries established with neighboring professional groups.

According to Becher (1989), disciplines are distinguishable by the boundaries of their knowledge domains. Overlapping boundary issues in curriculum and practice matters with adjacent health professional tribes is an additional feature that characterizes occupational therapy. Schools of health science within colleges and universities often include occupational therapy, physical therapy and nursing programs. Competition for scarce health care reimbursement may account for the overlap of treatment issues with neighboring fields. In addition, common subject matter knowledge that extends into multiple fields provides a further explanation for the porous margins of the health professions. For example, knowledge about blood pressure is important for nurses who must observe patient reaction to anesthesia. Whereas physical therapists need to measure the effects of walking on blood pressure, and occupational therapists need to monitor the impact of function on blood pressure, e.g. climbing a ladder at work or standing during meal preparation. Despite the historical relationship with physical therapy that was discussed in a previous section, there is no research to indicate what impact such proximity to other health fields may have on occupational therapy faculty perceptions about knowledge production and scholarly behavior.

Occupational therapy is designated as an applied/life field according to Biglan's disciplinary dimensions (Stoecker, 1993). As applied health fields in which therapeutic outcomes are judged by their social utility and cost-based effectiveness, occupational therapy and physical therapy seek accessible knowledge that has practical, explanatory power. According to Becher's (1989) research on the distinctions between applied versus pure knowledge fields, the acquisition of information in occupational therapy is perceived to be a non-linear process. Thus, it is not surprising that reiterative information in the form of re-usable therapeutic protocols that are based upon a combination of expert therapist opinion, client input, and trial and error approaches are frequently the norm. Unfortunately despite the stated importance of using peer-reviewed research evidence to guide best practice in occupational therapy, unique or novel solutions are neither required nor coveted in pragmatic healthcare contexts (Kielhofner, 2006). Also confounding what information is deemed important to acquire is that occupational therapy is a professional culture that consists of sub-specialty practice areas (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

Kuh & Whitt (1988) characterized the academic disciplines as being comprised of many sub-cultural groups based upon the compartmentalization of disciplinary knowledge. Becher's (1989) exploration of professional groups revealed a similar differentiation based upon sub-group specialties. For example, pharmacists perceive themselves as "highly multidisciplinary" based upon having mixed subject matter and a heterogeneous set of professional concerns based upon specializations. Similarly, although graduates of occupational therapy professional programs are trained as entry-level general practitioners, the profession consists of multiple rehabilitation sub-cultures that are differentiated along specialty practice tracks e.g. assistive technology specialists,

mental health specialists, and pediatric specialists. Furthermore, some rehabilitation sub-cultures are comprised of both occupational and physical therapists. An example of a mixed profession specialty area is hand therapy. Specialty sub-cultures consisting of certified hand therapists are so influential that allegiance to the professional group is diminished in favor of the specialist identity. Thus, occupational therapy's sub-cultures drive the need for specialized subject matter knowledge to accommodate a diverse scope of practice issues and client populations. Moreover, the array of practitioners who are certified in specialized practice areas provides the basis for a heterogeneous set of potential research problems. It is important to understand whether the dominance of the clinical identity established thru clinical socialization and specialization has impacted the types of scholarship that differentiates faculty in occupational therapy. That is, whether it is focused primarily on applied research to answer clinical questions on treatment efficacy, research to expand theoretical knowledge, or studies to examine learning in practice disciplines.

The literature suggests that more interest in clinical education and service than in research is expected in occupational therapy because it is an applied discipline whose faculty members are socially connected to practice communities (Becher, 1989; Stark, 1998). Although conducting research to determine the most effective assessment tools as evidence for best practice is necessary, the integration of theoretical perspectives to support a paradigm for knowledge development to guide the emerging discipline is also required. However, the strength of the clinical identity as well external social pressures to improve the lives of patients with disabilities may explain why applied research to

legitimize clinical practices may be in competition with research to study an approach to help students to think critically about course concepts.

It would appear that a dilemma for many occupational therapy faculty members is not only the lack of academic training to develop research skills, but also a limited body of literature to guide the direction for future research. The importance of social and ecological validity in identifying research problems and designing research strategies is predicated upon the value that occupational therapy places on assessing and treating the impact of diseases and disabling conditions on individuals in specific life contexts (Kielhofner, 2006). Thus, the exclusive use of quantitative research designs that promote the generalization of outcomes may be philosophically suspect for some developing scholars, and thus, not on the forefront of immediate professional concerns. As an alternative to experimental research, qualitative methodologies that elicit narrative understandings of individual rehabilitation experiences by those who are living them, are finding their way into occupational therapy scholarship (Cook, 2001). The interest in broadening research methodology within the emerging discipline suggests that reliance on one research paradigm may be ill suited for the complex array of issues confronting occupational therapy practitioners.

As mentioned earlier within this section, Stark (1998) believes that human client professions such as occupational therapy require a descriptive typology rather than a dimensional approach to understanding the competing interests of practice and scholarship. Stark, further suggests that practice disciplines require classifications that address unique internal characteristics and external sources of control that are prescriptive of behavior. For example, practice disciplines are described as having core

values that traverse service delivery and higher education contexts, and dual role functions that include clinicians and faculty members. Influences internal to occupational therapy that distinguish it as a practice discipline include a curricular emphasis on multiple practice models, a focus on the clinical identity that is formed by professional socialization in professional programs and practice communities, and educational standards that transmit values regarding faculty preparation and a clinical teaching focus for professional development.

At odds with Biglan's finding that faculty in life vs. non-life fields have less involvement in teaching, occupational therapy faculty have a strong desire to teach (Stoecker, 1993). According to survey data of occupational therapy faculty conducted in the 1990's's, a majority of faculty indicated a strong interest in teaching, with some indicating that it was the primary reason for obtaining graduate credentials and becoming faculty members (Vasantachart & Rice, 1997; Dickerson & Whittman, 1999). Of concern however, is that clinicians have viewed their educator role narrowly as applicers of knowledge and as transmitters of skills and clinical competencies.

As discussed in a previous section, specialized accreditation standards for occupational therapy professional educational programs provide an additional layer of influence on faculty development. Educational standards require faculty to sustain clinical expertise in teaching areas which has encouraged faculty to maintain a role as clinicians. Further, because faculty members have failed to develop the researcher role, a normative imbalance that favors the clinical identity has evolved. Since the need to maintain clinical practice skills is mandated, occupational therapy academic departments have supported professional development goals for faculty to retain a significant

emphasis on a clinical identity. It could be argued that the accreditation standards have narrowly focused faculty members on retaining a clinician role at the expense of developing a clinician-researcher role to support a developing professional identity as a researcher, and to advance evidence-based clinical practice and scholarly teaching (Boyer, 1990).

The importance of internal pressures within a professional culture notwithstanding, Stark (1998) believes that the primary factor that distinguishes professional faculty from other academic faculty is the strength of the link to external sources of influence. A salient characteristic of occupational therapy and other professions such as nursing and accounting is that they are externally generated professions that evolved in response to a societal need and developed from market demand (Stark, 1998). From a practical standpoint this means that the profession is influenced by external factors that include governmental pressure during times of practitioner shortages, the changing priorities and demands of the health care industry, the requirement for post-graduate national certification testing to practice, and the oversight derived from state licensing (Colman, 1992; Punwar & Peloquin, 2000). Thus, making certain that the professional curriculum is aligned with current and emerging practice areas is the overriding focus of occupational therapy faculty work.

Because of the need for clinician-teachers to ensure responsiveness to external pressures from current practice contexts, an inward focus on research to support disciplinary scholarship and to generate evidence for current and emerging practice, is overlooked. Whereas the non-practice disciplines are not constrained by the need to focus on practical social problems, and thus faculty members are free to define their

disciplinary borders by focusing on knowledge for knowledge sake. Consequently, this might explain why applied disciplines like occupational therapy have been afforded a lower status designation in academic environments (Becher, 1989; Heater, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

An additional external source of influence on practice disciplines originates within the academic culture and includes the impact of institutional mission and departmental culture on faculty work roles and rewards, such as promotion and tenure (Stark, 1998). Because faculty in practice disciplines are required to spend more time in teaching and external clinical supervision, and are like to have expectations for community service, less time is available for research activities. A focus on teaching and clinical experience may be an advantage for clinician-teachers in master's colleges and universities where undergraduate and graduate teaching is the primary mission. However, one would expect disadvantages to accrue to this group of faculty in research institutions where promotion and tenure are contingent upon research and publications. Thus, although professional faculty may find adjustment to the faculty role easier in institutions with a teaching mission, the norms of the institutional culture in master's institutions may inhibit faculty progress toward graduate work and the development of research skills. Alternatively, if the institutional culture is committed to the research model, professional faculty such as occupational therapy would be expected to experience pressure to conform to the traditional standards for academic scholarship.

To understand how faculty members have adjusted to the internal and external pressures to develop academic careers, it is important to explore the demographics of occupational therapy faculty. The profile of faculty is one indicator of the extent to which

the academic profession of occupational therapy is aligned with the academic culture in higher education. Like other professional disciplines such as engineering and physical therapy, occupational therapy requires professional experience in the field to qualify for an academic position. For this reason, professional faculty tend to enter academia later in life than those in traditional arts and science disciplines, and may acquire tenured positions in mid-level institutions without doctorates (Becher, 1989). Also, during the years in practice that it takes to develop clinical expertise, clinical salaries often rise to levels that exceed those in academic positions. Thus, faculty in professional fields like occupational therapy and pharmacy may have to take a reduction in salary to enter academic life.

Another feature that distinguishes occupational therapy faculty is that they must be successfully socialized into two cultures. Clinicians who have selected an academic career have experience their primary socialization within the professional culture. These clinician-teachers are then secondarily socialized as academic professionals as they progress to graduate education (Sabari, 1985; Yerxa, 1991). The process of anticipatory socialization whereby aspiring faculty members are exposed to the knowledge, values, norms and mentoring necessary to be a disciplinary scholar, may begin during professional education but can only be completed during doctoral education (Tierney & Rhoades, 1994; Austin, 2002). Of the current cohort of occupational therapy faculty, 33% of them do not hold doctorates (AOTA, 2009). Thus, many occupational therapy faculty members are starting from a position of disadvantage with respect to socialization to the academic role, and may experience the political reality of representing an applied discipline with diminished status within the academic culture. In addition, while holding

faculty appointments in prestigious universities and high status academic departments is a goal to which many occupational therapy faculty would aspire, that is not a possibility for one-third of the faculty in this health profession.

While expanding professional education programs into comprehensive institutions and research universities has provided an important opportunity for occupational therapy to develop as an applied discipline, it also served to expose a disparity regarding academic credentials. This resulted in a dilemma for the field, because the institutional cultures of colleges and universities at the higher end of the institutional hierarchy were less disposed to approving terminal master's degrees as sufficient academic credentials, or in equating clinical doctorates with research doctorates. Thus, this has meant that occupational therapy faculty with master's degrees who want academic careers are being required to earn doctorates at mid-career and initiate research programs at a time when most faculty at this stage of academic development are winding down on their research productivity (Baldwin, 1996). The social reality of gender in higher education has also complicated faculty careers in occupational therapy. While there is some evidence that the opportunity and performance gap is reducing for women in some academic disciplines, gender disparities for female dominant professions such as occupational therapy that include being relegated to the clinical instructor level with disadvantages relative to salary, promotion and tenure may still amount to a 'accumulative disadvantage' (Parham, 1985b; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1986).

The literature on the academic disciplines and the emerging professional disciplines suggests that disadvantages for faculty may accrue from differences that are unique to professional fields such as occupational therapy. The factors that make

occupational therapy faculty members distinctive is the need to balance the demands of teaching and clinical supervision, the requirements of the accreditations standards for continuous curriculum revision, the need to maintain knowledge of current clinical practice, the necessity to pursue academic scholarship that advances the discipline, and the requirement to develop a successful faculty career in departmental contexts. The specific disadvantages for occupational therapy faculty have been predicated on limited graduate socialization to the academic role and the emerging discipline, and may have implications for individual faculty commitment to developing themselves as disciplinary scholars, and less ability to adjust to institutional demands for scholarship. How disadvantaged occupational therapy faculty are as compared to other faculty and how successfully they have overcome these disadvantages to develop a scholarly role as part of their professional identity, is of particular interest (Braxton & Berger, 1999; Stark, 1998) Whether professional distinctions in occupational therapy have narrowly limited faculty identity to the clinician-teacher role, or skewed commitment to the institutional mission over the needs of the academic department to develop disciplinary scholars is also important to consider (Tierney & Rhoades, 1994).

Scholarship in a Practice Discipline

How multiple tensions are exerted on practice disciplines to influence faculty preparation and work was discussed in the previous section. In addition, it is important to understand how knowledge is defined and developed, and how individual disciplinary scholars are supported in occupational therapy (Boyer, 1990; Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002). These understandings will provide an additional measure of whether this

applied discipline is aligned with the expectations for scholarship as defined by the academic culture in higher education (Clark, 1987).

Because occupational therapy education programs have historically had a strong presence in schools of allied health in colleges and universities, the literature on allied health education provides one vantage from which to understand how the health professions have influenced faculty beliefs regarding scholarship over the last thirty years (Masagatani & Grant, 1986). By 1975, the presence of health professional education was well established in academia as it was estimated that more than half of the 3000 higher education institutions in the United States had at least one allied health academic unit (Masagatani & Grant, 1986). The 1980's is acknowledged as a turning point for schools of allied health as administrators struggled to transition from a purely teaching and service mission to one that also advocated research (Holcomb & Roush, 1988).

Developing an emphasis on research became important for many reasons, including professional status, disciplinary development, and survival in the academy (Covey & Burke, 1987; Bruhn, 1987). The value of these issues to the leadership and faculty membership within the allied health professions is apparent in the increased number of journal articles and studies on faculty training, research, assessment, and promotion and tenure that appeared in the literature (Holcomb & Roush, 1977; 1988; Conine, McPherson Shilling, & Pierce, 1985; Broski, Olsen & Savage, 1985; Mettler & Bork, 1985; Broski, 1986; Pfeifle, Lacefield & Cole, 1986; Covey & Burke, 1987). While a common belief within the health professional culture was that the development of future academics was reliant on the development of research agendas by current allied

health faculty, researchers exposed multiple barriers to achieving that goal (Waller, Jordan, Gierhart, et.al., 1988; Covey & Burke, 1987; Holcomb & Roush, 1988).

Determining whether professional faculty are different from their disciplinary counterparts on the benchmarks of faculty scholarship is viewed as a starting point for understanding the development of professional faculty within the academic culture. Addressing the issue of research in schools of allied health, Covey & Burke (1987) and Holcomb & Roush (1988) uncovered significant incongruities between the purpose of professional education and the mission of academia. Because baccalaureate degree-granting schools of allied health were designed to educate practitioners, they are comprised of professional cultures that lack the faculty research traditions characteristic of the arts and science disciplines. Thus, unlike the academic culture in higher education that is predicated on the advancement of disciplinary knowledge, professional faculty members are less equipped to advance their professions as applied disciplines. Covey & Burke, took the position that scholarly outcomes such as faculty research productivity can not be expected to improve until a major change occurs in the preparation, selection and development of faculty in the health professions. Highlighting the lack of progress in advancing professions as applied disciplines, Covey & Burke questioned the long-standing tradition in practice professions of hiring and developing faculty based upon clinical expertise rather than scholarly attributes, i.e. doctoral credentials, and teaching and research experience.

Given occupational therapy's role as a core profession within the allied health academic community, it is not surprising that a parallel interest in the academic role and faculty scholarship is apparent in the profession's literature during the 1970's and 1980's

(Jantzen, 1973; O'Kane, 1977; Baum, 1983; Christensen, 1987). A common theme in the literature included the importance of maintaining a supply of faculty with doctorates to develop research skills needed in academic contexts (Jantzen, 1973; Baum, 1983a, Tanguay, 1985). Moreover, a consistent premise was the need to upgrade faculty preparation as a basis for disciplinary development and increased parity and viability in higher education (Christensen, 1987; Grady, 1987; Storm, 1990; Yerxa, 1991; Mitcham & Gillette, 1999). The pressure for alignment of allied health academic program missions with the mission of the university came to a head for occupational therapy during the decades the 1980's and 1990's.

While a recurrent theme in the literature was the primary role of professional faculty as educators of occupational therapy practitioners, a dialogue on the expectation that professional faculty advance the mission and contribute to the distinction of their academic departments and institutions could also be discerned (Tanguay, 1985; Masagatani & Grant, 1986; Yerxa, 1991). Faculty academic development was highlighted in a scholarly exchange that took place in the 1980's (Labovitz, 1986; Rider, 1987). The exchange identified a dilemma for occupational therapy faculty who are required to successfully bridge the professional culture and the academic culture. That is, how is it possible to establish a successful academic career with less academic preparation and research training than arts and science faculty, and yet still be expected to maintain the clinical experience that is valued within the professional culture?

Labovitz (1986) asserted that to meet the needs of academic programs for qualified and productive faculty a different perspective of scholarship was necessary. Because clinicians who became academics were not being rewarded for doing research in

their institutions, she questioned whether the expectation for faculty to become scholars was realistic. Labovitz recommended a combined approach that expanded the primary focus of professional education beyond meeting manpower needs to include more non-traditional activities as "research." Recommending that "research contributions" be redefined, Labovitz may have been echoing the emerging movement in higher education to reconsider the boundaries of faculty scholarship (Boyer, 1990).

Rider (1987) responded to the argument made by Labovitz by warning that complacency about meeting the expected criteria for empirical research and publications would threaten the profession's viability and have negative implications for the career advancement of individual faculty members. Rider concluded that academic programs must find a way to integrate research into the expected daily routines and roles of faculty, and not approach it as an "add-on" that requires special treatment to accomplish. This dialogue typified the quandary of balancing the distinctive needs of a practice discipline with the need to pursue knowledge for the sake of knowing (Clark, 1997).

Some researchers have suggested that allied health education programs including occupational therapy, have historically addressed the dilemma discussed above by operating autonomously from the norms of the academic culture (Johnson, 1978b; Broski, 2000). To overcome this predicament of balancing the dual practitioner/academic focus, academic programs have requested and received exemptions for professional faculty preparation and development. For example, Parham (1985b) exposed the fact that the role of research and publications in the reward structure for occupational therapy faculty has been "equivocal" (p. 145). In addition, there is evidence that promotion in academic rank has been predicated on excellence in teaching and institutional or

community service (O'Kane, 1977). Thus, it may be useful to explore the research on the development of occupational therapy as an academic profession to provide a perspective for understanding the current status of faculty scholarship in this professional discipline.

Research on Occupational Therapy as an Academic Profession

The last four decades of the twentieth century represent an important phase in the development of occupational therapy that was highlighted by an increasing body of professional literature. The 1950's and 1960's represent a time in occupational therapy's history when the field struggled to earn professional and academic legitimacy in the face of critics who considered it a semi-profession (West, 1958; Yerxa, 1966). In response to these critics, academic leadership within the profession emerged and the seminal research to unite theory and practice in occupational therapy came forth from the University of Southern California (Reilly, 1969). In addition, articles with a focus on the faculty role and the development of research to support practice began to appear in the occupational therapy literature (Schnebly, 1970; Jantzen, 1974; Baum, 1983a; Grady, 1987). It is not surprising that the discussions appearing in the professional literature mirrored the traditional debate in higher education regarding the value of teaching versus research in faculty work.

The concept of research in occupational therapy began to take shape during the 1970's, however there is evidence that those beginning the discourse found it necessary to approach the topic in such a way that practitioners would find it palatable (Ethridge & McSweeney, 1971). By establishing that occupational therapy was not a "research" profession, the focus remained clearly on the clinical role. While descriptive articles

relating to practice could be found in the American Journal of Occupational Therapy by the 1970's, experimental research was very rare. For example, research in the 1970's focused on the importance of graduate education for academic preparation and the need for occupational therapy faculty to develop the research skills that doctoral training provides (Schnebly, 1970; Jantzen, 1974; Lucci, 1974; Maxfield, 1975).

Schnebly, (1970) was one of the first occupational therapists to identify a beginning trend toward academic graduate study as a faculty characteristic, and to address the types of preparation needed by occupational therapy educators. In addition, understanding the importance of research credentials for faculty success in university environments, Jantzen (1974) stressed the need for occupational therapy graduate education to develop the research skills vital to the development of the profession's knowledge base. Jantzen (1974) also alluded to a concern about disciplinary drain on knowledge development and scholarship specific to occupational therapy, when she acknowledged that the leaders in occupational therapy were those with graduate degrees and academic socialization experiences in other disciplines.

To better understand the impact of graduate education on occupational therapists, Maxfield (1975), surveyed 100 occupational therapists who graduated with post-professional master's degrees in occupational therapy or a related area such as vocational rehabilitation, education. Maxfield's survey data indicated that from 1960 to 1968, more baccalaureate educated occupational therapists earned master's degrees in occupational therapy than in other fields. The primary reason provided by the survey respondents for choosing graduate education in occupational therapy was that the academic programs permitted them to get a degree in five years while working full-time, prepared them for

academic or clinical supervisory roles, and familiarized them with scientific methods of inquiry and theory building. Thus, although the profession appeared to be situated to continue the development of future occupational therapy disciplinary scholars, the trend was short-lived.

According to Maxfield (1975), the trend in type of master's degree earned was reversed between 1969 and 1971, as occupational therapists began to move outside the field for graduate training. In retrospect, the trend is not surprising given the rising number of discontented practitioners who experienced the limitations of a baccalaureate career, and the limited availability and geographical accessibility of graduate programs in occupational therapy for a large proportion of the membership. Moreover, because occupational therapy's paradigm development was in its infancy, practitioners interested in faculty careers may have wanted to develop knowledge in areas beyond the limits of newly developed graduate programs. For example, Johnson (1978) pointed to the lack of resources for the development of graduate education and research, and the resultant "paucity" of faculty researchers in occupational therapy with doctoral preparation (p. 355). A member data survey conducted in 1982, indicated that less than 2% of all occupational therapists held doctoral degrees (AOTA, 1982).

The above explanations notwithstanding, the implications of potentially losing the cream of the professional crop of occupational therapy clinicians to other disciplines, bears consideration. One reason why losing practitioners to graduate education outside of the field was significant in the 1970's is that a higher percentage of occupational therapy master's program graduates were represented in the faculty cohort, than were those with master's degrees outside of the field (Maxfield,1975). Maxfield found that 32% of

graduates of occupational therapy master's programs were employed as program directors or faculty members in occupational therapy education programs. While Maxfield's data had no predictive validity, given the unconstrained growth of professional education programs and the fact that only 7% of occupational therapists were faculty members, the perception that potential faculty members might be lost would have been a source of concern (Punwar & Peloquin, 2000).

A study by O'Kane (1977) compared the status of occupational therapy graduate programs against standards established for graduate allied health education programs in the United States. Data analysis identified two major weaknesses in occupational therapy graduate education that were attributable to less faculty preparation for the academic role than other allied health faculty. The first weakness was lack of faculty knowledge in the areas of learning theory, curriculum design, and teaching. A lack of knowledge in research design and methodology was identified as the second weakness. While the unpublished dissertation by O'Kane identified the need for doctoral program development in occupational therapy, the study also suggested that the reputation of the profession's graduate programs was a potential problem with recruitment.

During the 1980's, the concept of research in occupational therapy editorials and scholarly discussions evolved to include themes such as research as a social responsibility, as a measure of academic success, as a means to enhance professional image, and as a vehicle for public policy (Christiansen, 1981, 1986 & 1987; Tanguay, 1985; Rider, 1987; Broski, 1987; Baum, 1987; Grady, 1987). Professional researchers began to compare occupational therapy faculty performance to faculty in other fields and uncovered troubling trends and issues relating to faculty development and credibility in

higher education (Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Leonardelli & Gratz, 1986; Holcomb, Christiansen & Roush, 1989). One of the primary issues that reappeared in the literature was the limited number of occupational therapy faculty with doctorates to serve as role models and research mentors to future faculty scholars. Christiansen (1986) made it clear that the individuals who were most likely to conduct scientific research were those who had academic graduate degrees, and who had benefited from participating in research with experienced faculty mentors.

The limited ability of under-prepared faculty to conduct scholarly research and thus, to contribute to the success and status of their academic programs and institutions also became an issue of great concern during the decade of the 1980's and beyond (Radonsky, 1980; Tanguay, 1986; Sieg, 1986; Christiansen, 1981,1986,1987; Rozier, Gilkeson & Hamilton, 1991). In an effort to understand the characteristics of occupational therapists who were publishers of research versus those who did not publish, Radonsky (1980), used a randomized sampling design and geographical clusters to survey 50 occupational therapy "publishers" and 50 "non-publishers." Of the 62 respondents (62% return rate), 19 were "publishers" and 43 were "non-publishers." The survey data revealed that those who published tended to be older in age, held graduate degrees, and were clinical specialists. This data suggested a link between experienced clinicians, graduate degrees and publications.

Sieg (1986) raised an additional concern by discussing the relationship between the lack of graduate academic credentials and the shortage of qualified faculty to assume the chairmanship of academic programs. With an attrition rate for department chairs as high as 20%, it was not surprising that in 1984, 14.3% of the professional education

programs were headed by acting chairs. Thus, the need to establish the doctorate as the gold standard for faculty preparation was realistically counterbalanced by the persistent problems of faculty recruitment, and the implications of setting a standard for faculty credentials that could further exacerbate the number of program directorships and faculty positions left vacant (Mitchell, 1985; Rogers, 1986; Metaxas, 2000).

Parham (1985a, 1985b) was the first occupational therapy researcher to capture distinctions in faculty characteristics, performance and rewards as a function of institutional type. Survey research conducted in 1981-1982 captured data from 55 institutions and a total of 275 occupational therapy faculty members in an effort to establish a database for faculty rewards (Parham, 1985a, 1985b). This study grouped faculty by institutions according to the classification system developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The institutional groups included research universities, doctoral-granting institutions, comprehensive colleges and universities, and medical schools/centers (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>.) The grouping of institutions by type improved upon the utility of the faculty data collected as institutional mission is known to influence reward systems in traditional academic environments.

Analysis of the survey data revealed that occupational therapy faculty respondents that were located in research I & II universities represented 37% of the sample (Parham, 1985a). The research institutions had the highest percentage of faculty with doctorates (30%), as well as faculty members who held academic rank at the full and associate professor levels (41%). In contrast, faculty respondents from master's colleges and universities, represented 28% of the total sample. Unlike the research universities, the

mid-range institutions were found to have a higher percentage of faculty with master's degrees (75%) who held the rank of assistant professor (57%).

Parham (1985a) hypothesized that faculty from comprehensive institutions would have less of a research focus than faculty from research institutions. Data analysis revealed a negative relationship between research publications and classification as a comprehensive college or university, as 86% of faculty in the comprehensive category were found to have no research publications (Parham, 1985a). Parham explained this phenomenon as a function of the missions of comprehensive colleges and universities that stress teaching and not research. An additional factor that bears consideration is that only 10% of the faculty from comprehensive institutions held doctorates. Thus, 90% of faculty in the comprehensive group had not experienced the doctoral socialization process from which the values and the skills associated with original or collaborative research would have emerged.

The second part of the study by Parham (1985b) analyzed faculty reward structures across institutional types to understand if occupational therapy faculty are measured using the same standards as other faculty for promotion and tenure. Analyses to identify faculty characteristics that are predictive of rewards and those that are predictive of scholarly productivity were conducted on the survey data. Parham's data revealed that academic rank, type of institution, size of department and gender were characteristics that predicted salary.

While research article publication has a central role in the reward structure of the academic disciplines, its role for occupational therapy faculty is more "equivocal" (p. 145) (Parham, 1985b). The fact that higher academic rank and having an appointment in

a research institution were positive predictors of salary was not surprising in light of the higher status associated with full and associate professor ranks, and the increased level of prestige of academic departments in research universities over comprehensive institutions (Bentley & Blackburn, 1990). However, a startling finding was that while research publication was implicated in tenure decisions, it was not a predictor of salary or academic rank in occupational therapy.

Data analysis led Parham (1985b) to conclude that occupational therapy faculty members had different profiles than higher education faculty in general, because they were not operating under the same reward structure. Thus, the academic activities that were pursued by occupational therapy faculty were related to outcomes that offered the greatest potential for reward, i.e. earning an advanced degree while a faculty member, professional recognition, and outstanding teaching. The influence of gender on faculty rewards in the female dominant faculty membership of occupational therapy has also been discussed in the literature.

Consistent with findings in the higher education literature that a gender differential exists in academic socialization and rewards for women faculty in general, being female was found to be a negative predictor of salary in occupational therapy female faculty (Parham, 1985b; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Fogg, 2003). Although the data from both phases of Parham's study (1985a; 1985b) revealed that female occupational therapy faculty outnumbered males nearly nine to one, as compared to a four to one ratio across higher education, the proportion of male faculty in occupational therapy (13%) was more than two times the percentage of males in the profession overall. Thus, male occupational therapists may be more drawn to the academic role than their female

counterparts. Moreover, because gender ratios were reversed for faculty positions versus administrative positions in occupational therapy, male faculty may seek leadership positions such as program directorships more often as well.

Rider (1989), investigated the characteristics of program directors, faculty aspiring to directorships, and core faculty members in professional academic programs to identify what characteristics might be predictive of future academic leaders. Survey data was obtained from 58 of 61 directors (95% response rate) and 343 of 564 faculty members (62% response rate). Data analysis indicated that while approximately 5% of AOTA members were male, they chaired 14% of academic programs, generally outranked their female counterparts and were more likely to hold a doctorate. The comparative distinctions in academic rank of female occupational therapy faculty members versus male educators is consistent with research on female faculty in higher education in general (Clark & Corcoran, 1986). Thus, Rider's findings provide support for the position that female professional faculty are at a disadvantage in a higher education system that "favors men in the distribution of rewards" (p.149) (Parham, 1985b).

Rider speculated that male faculty interest in administrative positions and success as academic leaders is consistent with heightened male aspirations for career advancement. This perspective might also explain the higher percentage of males in research I & II universities (16%) versus comprehensive colleges and universities (10%), where achievement variables such as doctorates, academic rank and an interest in research are linked to status within the academic culture and salary rewards (Parham, 1985b).

Leonardelli & Gratz (1986), surveyed full-time and part-time occupational therapy faculty in all of the 56 accredited professional education programs, and documented an emerging pattern within the field. The data indicated that 18% of the respondents held doctorates, while 71% had master's degrees. Only one of the 35 respondents who had a doctorate had earned the degree in occupational therapy, while 77% had concentrated their doctoral study in education or a related area. Of those faculty members with master's degrees, 37% of the sample had remained within the field, while 35% chose a master's degree in education.

While the impact of graduate socialization in other disciplines on faculty careers in occupational therapy has not been studied, Holcomb, Christiansen & Rousch's (1989) survey research comparing productivity in occupational therapy faculty to other allied health science faculty found that 64% of the sample indicated that academic preparation was a factor in their current level of scholarly productivity. Unfortunately, the data did not differentiate faculty by area of graduate study, and thus, whether graduate training in certain disciplines more or less influenced subsequent faculty work roles and functions could not be determined. Data from the study by Holcomb, Christiansen & Rousch however, indicated that the level of scholarly productivity in occupational therapy faculty was lower than that for other health science faculty members. Because some occupational therapists attributed the discrepancy in research productivity to professional education, they advocated for post-baccalaureate entry to the field as a means of correcting this problem. The assumption behind this position was that clinicians and faculty members who were trained at the professional master's degree level would be capable of doing research.

It is speculated that the debates about remaining an undergraduate career field or upgrading professional education to the master's level were unfortunately misconstrued by some practitioners as addressing the need for "graduate education," when the development of research doctorates in occupational therapy was really the issue. While studies on the relationship between level of education and research productivity are evident in the literature, they provided conflicting results rather than providing clarification on this issue. For example, Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Campbell (1985), found evidence to suggest that graduates of certain professional master's programs could be differentiated from their baccalaureate educated peers in terms of post-graduation professional productivity. Findings by Storm (1990) however, indicated that no significant differences were found between the baccalaureate group and the professional master's group in terms of scholarly activity. Thus, Storm (1990) concluded that the profession's focus on upgrading professional education to advance research and knowledge development was not supported by the data.

The data by Storm (1990) further indicted a significant relationship between the group with master's degrees in areas other than occupational therapy and academic awards and honors, as compared to the group with a professional master's degree in occupational therapy. While the data suggests that there are differences that favor graduates who earned non-clinical master's degrees in other areas of study over the graduates of entry-level master's program, the reasons for those differences are unclear. However, with less than 2% of occupational therapy clinicians nationwide holding doctorates, and approximately 20% of faculty members with doctoral degrees, the perception that faculty members in professional master's programs could provide research

training, and more importantly, produce socialization and mentoring to develop disciplinary scholars, was ill-founded (Storm, 1990).

Of particular interest in the study by Storm (1990) were the results that indicated a significant relationship between the number of research studies, publications, awards and honors, and therapists with doctorates. As an example, respondents with doctorates contributed more than 85% of the research publications that were reviewed for Storm's study. For this reason, Storm recommended that the profession should concentrate its efforts on the development of academic doctoral programs in occupational therapy, where the potential for building theoretical knowledge that is supported by research is the greatest. Thus, identifying what factors have served to encourage or discourage occupational therapists from pursuing doctorates is important for understanding how the current status of scholarship within the academic profession.

Kamp (1994) explored doctoral study in occupational therapy as a career decision, and the constraints and enablers to graduate education. The data identified finances, time, and scholarly ability as the three most prevalent constraints to doctoral education. Given previous research in the 1970's regarding gender issues and self-confidence, the fact that less than a third of the participants mentioned concerns about scholarly ability indicates a positive change in the attitudes of the female respondents about their academic abilities. Kamp noted that the participant's enhanced confidence in themselves as scholars was also consistent with the trend toward more female enrollees in graduate education. A comparison of the data from the Kamp study with survey research by Schnebly (1971) twenty years earlier, identified a persistent trend toward seeking graduate degrees outside of the discipline.

According to Kamp (1994), the current number of occupational therapists getting academic doctorates in the discipline as compared to those continuing to seek doctoral degrees in outside disciplines, is only 6% higher than it was twenty three years ago. Understanding the reasons why occupational therapists pursue graduate education may shed some light on why they are going outside of the discipline for graduate study. Dickerson & Whittman (1999), surveyed 750 members of AOTA who did not have graduate degrees to determine what percentage would consider pursuing an academic master's degree in occupational therapy and why. 78% of the sample indicated that they had no interest in graduate education. The lack of clinician interest in graduate education is consistent with findings from over two decades earlier (Yerxa, 1975; Mathewson, 1975).

The survey data by Dickerson & Whittman (1999) identified the three primary reasons for not pursuing graduate education as a lack of desire to return to coursework (53%), the belief that it would not advance their career (52%), and family or work responsibilities (28%). Other deterrents included a lack of motivation to leave clinical practice, financial considerations, and concerns regarding the research demands of graduate programs. Of the 22% of respondents who indicated an interest in pursuing graduate education, the reasons for doing so included personal development (83%), increased skills and knowledge (79%), and the positive value of learning (50%). Moreover, only 37% of respondents indicated a desire to teach as a reason to go to graduate school which was similar to the earlier findings of Vasantachart & Rice (1997). Even fewer clinicians (17%) expressed a desire to use graduate education as a pathway to a faculty career.

Consistent with Kamp's (1994) earlier findings that occupational therapists were not compelled to get a doctorate within the discipline, Dickerson & Whittman's (1999) study found that 41% of the respondents preferred a graduate degree in a field other than occupational therapy. Thus, despite a twenty year focus in the literature on the need for knowledge to develop as a practice discipline, occupational therapists are continuing to pursue degrees in other fields. It is not clear why this trend persists or what impact it may be having on the development of a professional identity in occupational therapy faculty.

As a sign that a change in values regarding faculty preparation is occurring, a higher percentage of respondents in Kamp's study (1994) who had graduated within two years of participating in the survey versus those with more work experience, indicated that they valued faculty members with doctoral degrees. These findings appear to indicate that the most recent graduates of professional programs more likely to have been educated by faculty with doctorates, and thus, been socialized to the values and norms of the academic culture regarding faculty scholarship. Thus, while positive changes in faculty preparation are occurring despite continued clinician disinterest in graduate education and the faculty role, it may be useful to determine how much change has actually occurred over the last twenty years.

A research study by Paul, Liu and Ottenbacher (2002) randomly sampled 350 occupational therapy faculty members to compare the current profile of occupational therapy faculty with data from the mid-1980's (Parham, 1985a, 1985b). The comparative findings indicate that the percentage of female faculty members (89.2%) remains high. Slightly lower than Parham's (1985a, 1985b) findings, the data by Paul et al. indicates

that 11% of faculty members were male. However, the fact that just over 34% of the female faculty respondents in this study are tenured, whereas 65% of male faculty respondents are tenured, suggests a continued gender discrepancy in the ranks of occupational therapy faculty that favors males. This data is consistent with findings in many academic fields in higher education, where male faculty are promoted and given tenure at rates surpassing their female colleagues (Baird, 1991).

The study by Paul et al. (2002) also indicated a 27% increase in the number of occupational therapy faculty members with doctorates over the last two decades (47%), and 90% of this cohort have earned them in disciplines other than occupational therapy. Thus, despite Yerxa's (1991) call for doctoral programs in occupational therapy as a primary avenue for developing faculty scholars, it appears that the pattern of going outside the discipline for doctoral training appears to be continuing. The data also indicated an improvement in the academic longevity of faculty, and a reduction in the number of faculty that are being hired at the instructor rank (Paul et al.). In addition, research and publication rates are growing especially amongst the increased numbers of higher ranked and tenured faculty. Moreover, faculty are securing grants in higher numbers than ever before, and a beginning trend toward post-doctoral training is noted. Thus, earlier concerns about the depletion of professional scholars as occupational therapy faculty choose graduate socialization in other disciplines, does not seem to have materialized (Jantzen, 1974).

Summary

Faculty scholarship in higher education is a multifaceted topic which explains why it continues to be debated and refined (Boyer, 1990; Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002). The development of occupational therapy academic professionals is at the center of the recent organizational interest in faculty scholarship and the current change in educational standards requiring faculty to have doctoral preparation (AOTA, 2004, 2006). To provide a basis for understanding the complex issue of faculty scholarship in occupational therapy, scholarship in the academic profession was traced from its origin in the universities of the early 1900's to the present time. Of particular interest is a reform effort in higher education to expand the vision of faculty work to include scholarly outcomes in discovery, integration, application and teaching, based upon the type of institution in which the academic role is performed (O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Braxton, Luckey & Helland 2002; Boyer, 1990;).

The values, beliefs and norms of the professional culture of occupational therapy is presumed to be a primary influence on faculty understandings about developing a scholarly identity and performing scholarly work. The literature reviewed for this research provides support for the proposition that the feminine role in society as well as the socializing influences of professional education and clinical contexts are strong contributors to the largely female professional culture of occupational therapy, and to the professional identity of individual members (Yerxa, 1975; Mathewson, 1975; Rogers, 1986; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Litturst, 1992; Fog, 2003). Conclusions drawn from the literature suggest that this health profession's pursuit of clinical professionalization via the professional degree structure, and the professional culture's lack of interest in

graduate education, the faculty role, and a research career, is a function of the influence of feminine socialization and the professional acculturation process on a majority female membership. While the influence of the professional culture is paramount, the academic culture in higher education and the institutional culture specific to colleges and universities also impact the academic role and faculty behavior in occupational therapy.

Higher education literature on cultural perspectives and the academic profession that have been reviewed for this research study, provide the foundation for understanding occupational therapy as a professional discipline and for considering frameworks for future faculty development (Birnbaum, 1988; Ott, 1989; Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989). Specifically, research on the professional and disciplinary cultures and their role in defining knowledge and guiding the scholarly development of the academic profession, has permitted a profile of occupational therapy faculty to be developed (Becher, 1989; Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998). The overarching core culture of the academic profession provides a general identity to faculty as scholars beginning as early as the undergraduate experience. However, the academic role remains largely conveyed through the medium of doctoral education and the mechanism of the anticipatory socialization process (Wulff & Austin, 2004; Tierney & Rhoades, 1993; Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989).

Based upon occupational therapy's developmental history, it is concluded that the professional culture has been slow to appreciate the disciplinary perspective of doctoral training leading to the academic role and knowledge development (Becher, 1989; Yerxa, 1991; Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin, 2000; Wulff, Austin, et al., 2004; AOTA, 2006). While faculty preparation and scholarship in a professional discipline is a complex issue that has no simple answers, it is further concluded that occupational therapy's reticence to adopt

the doctorate as the standard faculty credential until recently, has had far-reaching implications for knowledge development, departmental influence, and faculty careers (Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998; AOTA, 2006).

An additional level of influence on the academic role occurs once faculty members are hired at colleges and universities. It is the culture of the institution that continues to shape scholarly identity through the organizational socialization processes for new members, as well as for faculty at varying stages in their academic careers (Baldwin, 1996; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Kuh & Whitt, 1986). A synthesis of the higher education and the professional literature permitted some conclusions to be drawn regarding the processes by which occupational faculty are socialized to the expectations of institutional cultures, how they have responded and whether they have been advantaged or disadvantaged by the process (Johnson, 1978b; Tierney, 1988, 1991; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Braxton & Berger, 1999; Broski, 2000).

An analysis of the academic research on occupational therapy over the last 40 years provides a foundation for understanding the development of the academic profession as a basis for drawing conclusions regarding the current status of faculty scholarship (Yerxa, 1975, 1991; Jantzen, 1974; Kielhofner & Burke, 1977; Christiansen, 1981, 1986, 1987; Posthuma & Noh, 1991). Unfortunately, the published articles and studies on faculty work represent a pattern of isolated efforts that failed to coalesce into a common theme of faculty scholarship within the professional culture. Thus, the literature as a whole provides a narrow understanding of the faculty role in occupational therapy and limited direction for developing future faculty.

Much of the research on the academic role in occupational therapy that was reviewed in the previous section is characterized by survey or questionnaire research that provided demographic data on gender, age, and highest degree earned, and comparative data of faculty publication outcomes related to research (Maxfield, 1975; Radonsky, 1980; Sieg, 1986; Leonardelli & Gratz 1986; Storm, 1990; Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002). With few exceptions however (Parham, 1985a, 1985b), the studies failed to disaggregate the data on faculty publication history by type of institution, i.e. research, comprehensive, liberal arts or community college. Consequently, the findings from this survey research are subject to interpretation that is grounded upon two major assumptions. The first assumption is that occupational therapy faculty members represent a unified disciplinary culture across institutional contexts. The second assumption is that comparing research publications in occupational therapy faculty members to the publication records of other faculty groups will provide useful for understanding how disciplinary scholars are succeeding within the academic culture.

While quantitative data on the number of published research articles, book chapters, and grants as measures of faculty productivity is one approach to characterizing faculty outcomes, it provides a narrow perspective given the discrepancy in faculty preparation and institutional diversity represented across occupational therapy professional education. According to Braxton, Luckey & Helland (2002), using a quantitative template fits the scholarship of discovery, but fails to fully capture the domains of teaching, application, and integration. Further, when 33% of the faculty membership in the country continues to lack doctoral training and socialization to the researcher role, and a significantly higher number have not advanced to post-doctoral

training, the value of using hypothesis driven research and publications as the primary measure of productivity, needs to be questioned (AOTA, 2009). Moreover, given that 43% of professional departments are located in "striving colleges" where research may not be valued or rewarded, it seems ill-advised not to consider a broader model to characterize faculty scholarship that includes scholarship in teaching, application and integration, as well as discovery (AOTA, 2009; AOTA, 2004; Boyer, 1990)

Because the issue of faculty preparation and the development of scholarship are seemingly value-laden issues, answers to important questions about what faculty feel about academic life and what scholarly activities make the most sense given institutional expectations, remain currently unanswered. For instance, are the characteristics of occupational therapy faculty as an applied disciplinary tribe consistent with the diversity apparent in higher education in general, or do they represent a counter culture with separate values and norms? Moreover, do occupational therapy faculty members in diverse institutional contexts feel that they have been disadvantaged as scholars based upon professional characteristics or institutional accommodations? Given that both Biglan (in Stoecker, 1993) and Becher's (1989) disciplinary schemes failed to capture the perspectives of average faculty in the "striving colleges" in the middle of the higher education hierarchy, this research study provides useful information.

In closing, despite occupational therapy's eighty-year presence in higher education institutions within the United States, the academic world of this profession remains an enigma. This is due in part to the fact that the health professional fields have been largely ignored in studies of faculty scholarship in higher education despite the fact that nursing, and speech, occupational and physical therapy are a growing presence on

college and university campuses (Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1986; Stark, 1998).

Moreover, the professional culture of occupational therapy has afforded less value to the academic role, as demonstrated by the paucity of research on teaching, and the development of disciplinary scholars (Storm, 1990; Yerxa, 1991; Bondoc, 2005; Coppard & Dickerson, 2005).

Possibly in response to pragmatic or political considerations regarding reform, survival, and changing priorities in higher education, advancing frontiers of knowledge development and faculty scholarship appear to be converging within occupational therapy (Haertlein & Coppard, 2003; Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002; AOTA, 2003; Bondoc, 2005). It is posited that the scope of these developments and their interconnections represent a fundamental shift in values toward a national disciplinary identity (Wilcox, 1998; Mitcham, Lancaster & Stone, 2002; Larson, Wood & Clark, 2003; AOTA, 2003; Yerxa, 2005; Provident, 2006). Thus, this research study explains how faculty in professional departments describe their faculty roles and prioritize work behaviors despite competing influences that are characterized by personal interests, professional values, academic norms, and the institutional expectations. Documenting faculty views about scholarship during this transformative period in occupational therapy's history is a preliminary step toward the development of an interpretive framework for a professional identity for faculty in occupational therapy.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter begins by reintroducing the conceptual framework for this study that is drawn from previous research in higher education and interpreted in light of a historical perspective and research on the practice discipline of occupational therapy, as described in Chapter Two. Furthermore, the theoretical support for the research design, and the case study methodology selected is discussed. Finally, the chapter provides an overview of the data collection and analysis process and how it was organized for credibility, authenticity, trustworthiness, accuracy and rigor.

Conceptual Framework

This research project interpreted case study data within a conceptual framework (see Figure 1) that is grounded in theoretical propositions regarding: the reciprocal influence of the academic culture, institutional culture, and professional and disciplinary communities on shaping faculty scholarship; the distinctive characteristics of faculty in practice disciplines; and the importance of socialization in the development of a professional identity (Stark, 1998; Stoecker, 1993; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Boyer, 1990; Becher, 1989; Kuh & Whitt, 1988). The premise of the proposed study is that the departmental culture represents a nexus between competing forces both internal and external to colleges and universities and that *making sense* of those forces influences how teaching, research and service roles are institutionalized, and how faculty members

develop as scholars (O’Meara & Rice, 2005; Weick, 2001; Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002). This research study will build upon existing evidence in the literature to further such understandings.

Knowledge in higher education is defined by academic disciplines that are characterized by intellectual and cultural differences (Tierney, 1988; Clark, 1987, 1997; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Becher, 1989). Disciplinary distinctions influence how faculty




Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

groups are afforded status within the academic culture, how faculty members acquire a scholarly identity, and how graduate students are socialized to the expectations of the academic role. Nonetheless, a feature that is common to the functioning of faculty members in disciplinary groups is reliance on the intellectual activity of original research

to develop knowledge (Boyer, 1990). Faculty members in the relatively immature health professions also represent diverse applied disciplinary communities that exhibit distinct cultural beliefs, values and norms related to faculty preparation and behavior (Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998).

In contrast to faculty in the traditional disciplines however, faculty members in occupational therapy have historically favored the needs of the professional culture by relying less on the "...pursuit of science and truth for its own sake" (p. 182, Clark, 1997, and more on the application of existing knowledge and the clinical socialization of future therapists (Stark, Lowther & Hagarty, 1987). Also crucial to the development of faculty roles in occupational therapy given the potency of the clinical identity, is the high value placed on: maintaining clinical certification for social recognition; the accreditation process that directs departmental goals toward curriculum development and high post-graduate certification examination pass rates; and clinically experienced faculty members who enter academia at mid-career (Stoecker, 1993; Baldwin, 1996; Stark, 1998; Zaytoun, 2005). Neither the differences that are unique to professional faculty, nor the similarities that cross professional/disciplinary boundaries however, are sufficient to explain how occupational therapy faculty members differentiate their clinician and academician roles in the conduct of day to day faculty work.

In contrast to Becher (1989), who assumed that the academic world could be understood by viewing faculty members separately from their environments, there are researchers whose primary focus has been on the role of the organization in socializing faculty, the intersection between disciplinary culture and institutional culture, and the impact on faculty behavior of forces beyond organizations (Menges, 1999; Braxton &

Berger, 1999; Tierney & Rhoades, 1993; Alpert, 1991; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Clark, 1987). Research findings regarding the relative influence of the disciplinary culture versus features such as mission and leadership, that characterize institutional cultures, are not equivocal. This suggests that while the influence of the professional culture in the development of a scholarly identity in occupational therapy is important, the role may be less salient than expected (Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1987; Braxton & Berger, 1999).

Because occupational therapy is a relatively new practice discipline it is speculated that a broad perspective on scholarship is fundamental to the ability of faculty to successfully compete in higher education environments (Christiansen, 1981, 1986, 1987; Boyer, 1990; Yerxa, 1991; Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002). An expanded definition of scholarship permits faculty members at all levels of the institutional hierarchy to conduct research and publish findings, and to produce other forms of unpublished scholarship to benefit diverse aspects of the applied discipline, e.g. testing clinical efficacy, linking theory and practice, developing teaching approaches for clinical reasoning, and proposing models of professional identity to influence the development of future faculty (Yerxa, 1991; Kielhofner, 2006). This dissertation used Braxton, Luckey & Helland's (2002) expanded work on Boyer's (1990) model of scholarship to explore whether occupational therapy faculty are differentially engaging in the scholarship of discovery, integration, teaching and application, based upon institutional type. There is a need for occupational therapy faculty to be recognized for the non-traditional scholarly pursuits that characterize faculty work in practice disciplines. Given that Boyer's expanded definition of scholarship provides a model that may be aligned with the disciplinary culture of occupational therapy, it will be useful to know if faculty members

are conforming to Boyer's prescriptive expectations for academic work in master's colleges and universities.

In summary, perspectives on the characteristics of professions and disciplines directed the inquiry toward a better understanding of how occupational therapy is developing as a soft, applied, low consensus discipline within the academic culture of higher education (Becher, 1989; Stark, 1998). Of particular interest is whether occupational therapy faculty are still held to reduced standards for faculty scholarship in colleges and universities that was evidenced decades earlier (Parham, 1985a, 1985b). Demographic data indicate that 33% of occupational therapy faculty members still do not have doctoral training (AOTA, 2009). Thus, because academic socialization to the researcher role remains lacking in academic departments, it is important to understand the impact on faculty careers. Whether faculty expectations for the academic role are congruent, or at odds with institutional norms, is salient given occupational therapy's emerging interest in building research knowledge to support the discipline, and given higher education's re-examination of the academic role and how best to develop future faculty (AOTA, 2004; Boyer, 1990; Austin, 2002; Weidman, Twale & Stein, 2001; Weidman & Stein, 2003).

Research Design

Cultural researchers have drawn upon the qualitative tradition because of a belief that subjective perceptions can only be made explicit by those inside the culture (Cook, 2001). However, an argument against the use of qualitative methods is that there is a reluctance to build upon existing theory, making findings less plausible for social benefit

because they are unguided by prior knowledge (Yin, 1994). Case study inquiry, unlike some qualitative methodologies, is a comprehensive research strategy that "benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis" (Yin, 1994, p. 13). By permitting the meanings and interpretations of those experiencing a given reality to remain the product and process that is highly valued, yet also meeting the need for a focus on pattern and context in knowledge development, the case study methodology conforms to standards of scientific rigor.

A case study is the preferred design for investigating occupational therapy professional identity because the boundaries between personal preferences, clinical training, academic roles, and institutional context are not clearly evident (Zaytoun, 2005). Moreover, case study methodology was selected for the research project because it matches the type of research questions being proposed, i.e. how and why research questions. The primary research questions that guide this study are: 1) how is scholarship conceptualized by faculty members in occupational therapy programs and how are faculty roles and work behaviors prioritized in diverse college and university settings?; and 2) how do these faculty members make sense of the influences from the professional community, the academic culture, and institutional contexts in the development of a professional identity? Secondary questions include: how has the personal background and experiences of these faculty members influenced preferences for faculty functions; how has institutional context accentuated or diluted the views of these faculty members regarding the researcher role; and how has the departmental culture impacted how these faculty members view their identity as disciplinary scholars?

Scientific rigor was demonstrated in the case study design by the presence of a conceptual framework based upon previous research, and by the use of strategies to control the trustworthiness and authenticity of the inquiry process. Thus, the data was interpreted in light of existing theoretical perspectives regarding the role of disciplinary culture and institutional context in influencing faculty behavior, a historical view of the development and characteristics of occupational therapy as an evolving professional discipline, and on current literature regarding occupational therapy faculty research productivity (Becher, 1989; Boyer, 1990; Braxton et al., 2002; Stoecker, 1993; Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002). In addition, this study controlled bias and reported evidence equitably as required in case study designs (Yin, 1994).

Case study investigators are prone to bias because they must have an extensive grasp of the issues under investigation. For this reason, researchers must exercise caution about attempting to substantiate preconceived notions regarding study outcomes. The researcher for the study is an “insider” within the professional discipline under investigation. Consequently, to reduce the potential for bias findings were reported to a specific occupational therapy faculty member who is not involved in the research study. This strategy permitted alternative explanations and interpretations to be considered in the analysis (Cook, 2001; Lysack, Luborsky & Dillaway, 2006). Additional tactics that were used in the inquiry to maintain scientific rigor include multiple evidence sources, i.e. surveys, informant interviews, and document analysis. Moreover, conducting post-interview focus groups permitted member checking to confirm individual informant perceptions and provided new insights that added to the reliability of the findings.

Cultural research is focused on the meaning associated with both group and individual levels of behavior, although there is reason to believe that individuals within specific contexts have been relatively neglected (Harris, 1994). Embedded case study designs prevent problems associated with a narrow focus on sub-units of analysis by insuring that the larger organizational unit is not allocated to the context of the study (Yin, 1994). Thus, the case study methodology selected for this study permitted the perceptions of individual occupational therapy faculty members to be incorporated into a more extensive analysis of academic departments.

Units of Analysis and Site Selection

Academic institutions in the United States operate within a higher education system that consists of institutional rankings, disciplinary and professional hierarchies, and institutional and specialized accreditation structures that exert explicit demands on organizational performance (Alpert, 1991). A primary tension for colleges and universities is that they must remain true to their respective academic missions, yet responsive to their external contexts. Thus, although research institutions see graduate training and disciplinary research as a primary function, there are social pressures to focus more on undergraduate education and applied research to solve practical problems. Furthermore, while providing high quality instruction to undergraduates is a core function in teaching institutions, faculty members must also remain responsive to societies need for graduate level professionals whose preparation requires research training.

The presence of occupational therapy professional education programs in highly ranked research universities and mid-level master's colleges, suggests differing

expectations for faculty roles depending upon institutional mission and goals. Research universities are distinguished as large institutions that focus on research excellence and graduate education, and offer a range of doctoral degrees in disciplinary and professional areas. Coined as "striving colleges," master's institutions lie on the border of the teaching-research debate and are characterized as educating both undergraduate and graduate students, conferring bachelor's and master's degrees in the arts and sciences and the professions, and offering one or more doctoral degrees (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Boyer, 1990). Understanding how faculty members make sense of academic roles and work behaviors in such diverse settings, provides the context for exploring the academic department as the primary unit of analysis (Yin, 1994; Weick, 2001). Thus, occupational therapy faculty members from elite departments in research institutions who represent the discipline's "pacemakers," as well as faculty members representing the constituency of those "who follow behind them" in master's institutions, need a representative voice (Becher, 1989, p. 3).

The case study treated occupational therapy departments as units of analysis that consist of natural sub-units capable of revealing relevant information (Yin, 1994; Depoy & Gitlin, 2005). The sub-units or embedded units of analysis are the full-time faculty members within each department, including the director. AOTA's database of professional programs by degree level and institutional type was used to obtain the names of all potential programs. An important consideration in selecting academic departments was whether the sites were information rich (Yin, 1994). The opportunity to interview all full-time faculty members or a representative cohort of the faculty membership so that a breadth of information would be obtained, was a primary criteria. Despite the exigencies

of investigator travel and time limitations, and the availability of faculty informants for face to face interviews, the study met proposed standards for site selection.

The following criteria were used to select the institutions for the study: 1) one institution that is categorized as a master's institution, and one institution that is categorized as a research university (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications>); and 2) academic departments or programs that offer an entry-level professional master's degree program in occupational therapy that has been accredited by ACOTE for at least five years; and 3) academic departments having a minimum of 5 full-time faculty members (depending upon the size of the institution) who represent a diversity of demographic characteristics (e.g. gender, age, race, academic credential, clinical credential, experience in higher education), and who were willing to participate.

The program directors of two institutions were contacted initially via e-mail to request participation in the study. A follow-up letter with a formal invitation to participate and a description of the study purpose and methodology was mailed to each program director. The letter described why the program was selected, the required time commitment, and how the findings would be disseminated. Program directors who agreed to participate were sent a second letter and follow-up information regarding the procedure and anticipated timetable. Faculty informants provided each program director with verbal consent to participate. The investigator obtained signed informed consent documents from the faculty informants prior to beginning the interview process (See Appendix A). The informed consent also served as verification of the informant's qualifications as registered occupational therapists.

Neither the identity of the academic program, nor faculty identities have been disclosed as it is not considered necessary for the purpose of the study. Informant anonymity ensures the confidentiality of interviewee responses. While the topic of scholarship in occupational therapy is not controversial, keeping the identity of the institution and department anonymous is necessary so that there is no risk of attributing opinions and insights to individual faculty members. Disclosure is not deemed necessary, as the categorization by institutional type will permit academic departments across the country to make their own judgments as to whether the conclusions of the study are pertinent to their context.

Overview of Case Study Methods

Naturalistic inquiry is based on an inductive thinking process that is characterized by designing a system to organize qualitative data for purposes of analysis (Morse & Field, 1995; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Rather than deducing expected observations about occupational therapy faculty roles or making predictions about faculty member's behavior, this investigator began with the idea that how occupational therapy faculty members develop a scholarly identity is important for the evolution of the profession and for the support and recruitment of future faculty. This idea was transformed into a set of working assumptions about faculty functions in a practice discipline. These assumptions were subsequently examined in the context of an occupational therapy department in a research institution and a master's institution to determine their accuracy. The inductive approach to organizing information permitted the investigator to provide a descriptive structure for understanding and classifying the statements, phrases and words of

individual faculty informants and then to ascribe understandings of faculty work to the larger context of the academic department.

Establishing reliability in case study research involves the creation of a plan that permits an external observer to clearly identify the logic of the inquiry (Yin, 1994). The reliability of this case study was achieved by implementing a case study protocol that provides a transparent trail of evidence from the initial research questions used, through the interpretations made and the conclusions drawn. The trail of evidence for this study consists of primary and secondary sources. The primary sources of evidence are fifteen, in-depth faculty interviews, on-site field notes, and a follow-up focus group with each academic department. Verbatim narratives were transcribed from digital audio recordings of the interviews and the focus groups. The secondary sources of evidence include a faculty demographic survey, an inventory of scholarly work, and site-specific documents including a faculty handbook, promotion and tenure guidelines, and electronic website information from each institution.

For purposes of this study, the institutions were assigned pseudonyms. The master's college is referred to as Determination College, and the research institution is called Eminence University. Five informant interviews were conducted in February and March, 2008, with the complete cohort of full-time occupational therapy faculty at Determination College. Due to limitations in the availability of faculty members, as well as restrictions on the researcher's time it wasn't possible to interview all full-time occupational therapy faculty members at Eminence University. Thus, the program director recommended faculty members that met the researcher's criteria for breadth of participant characteristics including age, gender, academic appointment, degree type

held, level of academic experience and role within the program. Ten additional interviews were subsequently conducted in March and April, 2008, with a representative sub-group of the occupational therapy faculty population at Eminence University..

A demographic survey and an inventory that documents faculty scholarship activities was provided to each faculty informant at the interview session. Field notes were made during and immediately following the informant interviews. The field notes identified information such as the interview location, emotional expression, physical demeanor, or selected aspects of the interview discussion that the researcher found cogent. Follow-up focus groups with the faculty informants from Determination College and Eminence University were conducted on March 10, 2009, and May 5, 2009, respectively. The purpose of the focus groups was to explore the congruity between perceptions of faculty at an individual level and commonly held beliefs at the departmental level. The focus group questions were also designed to explore whether occupational therapy faculty perceive Boyer's (1990) expanded definition of scholarship to be relevant to the prioritization of work roles and activities as prescribed by their institutional contexts.

The data from individual faculty informants was integrated into an extensive analysis of each academic department and then consolidated across programs to refocus attention on the case as a whole. Given that this study explores two distinct departments, it is important to understand how institutional cultures function to influence how priorities for faculty work are being decided. Documents such as the faculty handbook were reviewed for institutional information, and website information was reviewed for departmental information. These documents are informal reflections of an institution's

mission, and yet are formal sources of information on policy and procedure related to faculty work and expectations for career advancement.

Data Recording and Analysis

Managing and analyzing the data for this study was a multi-step process whereby the researcher acquired information and immediately began the process of organizing it for interpretation. A preliminary survey of faculty members was administered as a first step in the data collection process. The survey documented demographic data on gender, age, race/ethnicity, dates when academic/clinical degrees acquired, years of clinical experience prior to entering academia, years of experience in academia and number of institutions, etc. (See Appendix B). The next step in the process was a systematic interview with the informants.

The purpose of the interview was to record the faculty informant's "terminology and judgments and to capture the complexities of their individual perceptions and experiences" (Patton, 1990, p.290). The researcher conducted each focused interview with a view towards discovery that did not presume similarity of experiences between informants. For example, the opportunity to discuss congruities or incongruities between the departmental culture and the larger campus culture was made possible by interviewing the program director of the department, in addition to other faculty members. The role of the researcher in conducting in-depth interviews is not to gather facts, but to provide a context within which an interpretive framework can emerge from the constituent voices of the informants (Yin, 1994). Thus, the current and past *sense*

making as revealed by the faculty member's narratives about their academic roles and work activities, served as the primary source of evidence (Weick, 2001).

The informants were asked to provide their perceptions about faculty roles, work priorities, and how scholarship is defined within their institutions, by using an interview guide to direct the questioning (Lysack, Luborsky & Dillaway, 2006; Yin, 1994) (See Appendix C). The interview guide included both open-ended and semi-structured questions and thus, informant responses included a depth of explanation and meaning, as well as objectivity and corroboration of factual information. The strategy of active listening permits informants to use their own words to respond to open-ended questions. The following is an example of an open-ended question that was posed: how did you decide to become an academic? This type of question provides little direction as to the boundaries of the informant's response. Semi-structured probes were used as needed to encourage informants to embellish those factors that most influenced their understandings of the faculty role based upon their experiences. The following is an example of a semi-structured probe that was used during the interview process: of the activities that you regularly perform as a faculty member, which ones do you consider scholarly and why? This type of question limits broader reflections by guiding the responses on the part of the informant to the specific parameters identified.

The comparability of responses was increased by asking the informants the same questions in the same order (Patton, 1990). The informant interviews lasted on average 75 minutes and each interview was recorded using a digital voice recorder. The interviews were saved as digital files and were then downloaded into a computer for enhanced accuracy and ease of access for transcription and analysis. Each interview was

transcribed verbatim by the researcher. In addition, the researcher's field note impressions were documented during the interview process and consolidated following the completion of the interview. Finally, departmental focus groups were conducted with faculty informants to supplement and corroborate perspectives obtained in individual interviews. The focus groups permitted the investigator to record dynamic interactions across members of the informant group including commonly shared viewpoints and contradictory perspectives, and to identify salient issues that might not have been tapped in individual interviews.

The final phase in the data collection process included recording and analyzing faculty informant responses from the Inventory of Scholarship that documented specific scholarly activities, unpublished scholarly outcomes and publications over the last three years (Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002) (See Appendix D). Data from the demographic survey and the inventory were entered into Excel spreadsheets, and mathematical and statistical calculations were reviewed for accuracy. In addition, institutional and departmental documents including faculty handbooks were reviewed as secondary sources of evidence regarding areas such as faculty appointments, promotion and tenure.

Trustworthiness

Qualitative researchers attempt to make known the lived experiences of those being researched (Patton, 1990). However, because the findings from qualitative studies also need to be trusted, researchers have established criteria for establishing trustworthiness (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Gay & Airasian, 2000). The researcher in this case study took several actions to enhance the quality and accuracy of the data that

was collected, and the credibility of the resulting interpretation. One criterion for raising confidence in the data is credibility. Credibility refers broadly to increased assurance that the study was conducted in such a way that the research problem was accurately described, and appropriate methodology to manage bias and reduce erroneous interpretations was applied. Credibility was demonstrated by insuring that the participant's perspectives were legitimately represented in the evidence sources that were utilized, as well as in the study findings that emerged (Yin, 1994). Because the purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of faculty scholarship in occupational therapy, in-depth face to face interviews and focus groups were conducted to permit the informants to articulate their experiences, beliefs and values regarding faculty work. The interview guide that was used in the study was piloted in January, 2008, with an occupational therapy faculty member who was not involved in the study. The pilot testing resulted in a rewording of the interview questions for clarity, thereby avoiding a weakness associated with bias based on poorly worded questions. Credibility was also achieved by demonstrating that the study results are similar to previous studies in nursing and other health professions (Stark, 1998; Stoecker, 1993).

Authenticity is described as the effort to have the interpretive findings "fit" the data as provided by the participants and their context (Kielhofner, 2006). The results section in the following chapter will report how the informant data matched the researcher's definitions of key concepts including faculty roles, socialization related to clinical training, doctoral education and departmental norms, and faculty scholarship. In addition, the data from this study were reviewed by an occupational therapy faculty member who was not involved in this study to authenticate that the conclusions drawn

represent the interviewees perspectives and that alternative explanations were given equal consideration (Yin, 1994). Furthermore, a comparison of multiple sources of evidence permits “converging lines of inquiry” that adds to the confidence and accuracy of the evidence obtained and the conclusions reached (Yin, 1994, p. 92). The study used the process of data triangulation to corroborate findings within and across individuals, academic departments, and institutions (Kielhofner, 2006). The triangulation of data from the demographic survey and inventory, the multiple informant interviews, the focus group, and the institutional/departmental documents, provides multiple points of confirmation to validate the conclusions reached and the interpretive framework developed in the study. Further, because the interviews were analyzed as multiple sources of evidence of the same phenomena, the construct validity of the study was increased. Moreover, the accuracy of the informant's responses were secured by audiotaping and then exactly transcribing what was said, regardless of whether the responses to questions were brief descriptions or more extensive imagery based upon opinion or insight.

Summary

The case study methodology was selected as the preferred qualitative design for viewing how occupational therapy faculty members enact their roles and functions on a day to day basis. Moreover, a case study was able to provide understandings of how a professional identity is formed despite a lack of clarity on the contributing influences of clinical training, individual preferences and institutional context. Scientific rigor was established by expanding upon existing theory on disciplinary culture, faculty

socialization, and clinical acculturation to impart a particular understanding of the current and past *sense making* used by occupational therapy faculty members to advance their academic careers. Site selection met the proposed criteria for recruiting individual faculty informants from academic departments in a highly ranked research university and a moderately ranked teaching institution.

The researcher met established standards for the trustworthiness of data collection and analysis including triangulation, pilot testing of interview guide, member checking and generating an audit trail. Composite analysis of the interview narratives revealed conceptual patterns in the data that surface as key themes. As emergent research, the themes yield specific explanations regarding the development of a professional identity in occupational therapy faculty members, and highlights the roles and activities that are most valued by faculty members in different institutional contexts. An interpretive model for viewing the thematic relationships between the characteristics and preferences of individual faculty members, the institutional environment, the academic department and the clinical profession is developed.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from a case study of two occupational therapy academic departments. One of the departments is located in a master's college, and the other is located in a research university (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/> classifications).

The chapter begins by reviewing the conceptual framework and the research questions that are the basis for this dissertation. The sites are then briefly described to provide context for the case study. The second section of the chapter describes the approach taken by this investigator to analyze the data from this study. In the third section of the chapter, the demographic profiles and narrative findings regarding academic roles and functions emerge as themes from which explanations about the case are provided. The demographic profiles of the informants, and the types of scholarship that are being supported within the departments, are interwoven with the thematic descriptions to provide background for the faculty viewpoints discussed. Finally, the chapter will close by providing an interpretive framework for situating the institutional settings in which the faculty informants work, and for visually depicting the sources of influence that coalesce in the academic departments as a basis for understanding how a professional identity is shaped in occupational therapy faculty members.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework that guides this study suggests that while work behavior and scholarly outcomes in occupational therapy faculty are influenced by professional socialization and academic socialization in graduate school, the impact of institutional culture on departmental socialization to the faculty role may be the most salient factor to consider (Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Campbell, 1985; Dickerson & Whitman, 1999; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Boyer, 1990; Tierney & Rhoades, 1993; Braxton & Berger, 1999; Wulff & Austin, 2004). Thus, the research questions were designed to describe how occupational therapy faculty members in different institutions give voice to their professional identity, and enact faculty scholarship in daily activities as members of an academic department (Boyer, 1990; Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002; O'Meara & Rice, 2005).

This study is designed to describe how the professional culture of occupational therapy influences the faculty role and the direction of academic careers through socialization to the clinical role (Dickerson & Whitman, 1999; Stark, 1998; Yerxa, 1991; Sabari, 1986; Dinham & Stritter, 1986; Parham, 1985a, 1985b). Socialization is a process by which new members of an organized unit become insiders by acquiring the beliefs, values and normative behaviors that characterize the cultural group (Van Maanen & Barley, 1984). Occupational therapists are socialized to the norms of the clinical profession including the language of medical terminology, client assessments and appropriate methods of intervention. Furthermore, occupational therapists are acculturated to the norms of practice environments and clinical functions where roles are tied to using existing knowledge to solve practical problems, and where rewards are

derived from developing expertise in a specialized practice area such as mental health, physical disabilities or pediatrics. Finally, the study portrays how socialization processes in professional education, and practice experience in diverse clinical environments shapes a clinical identity, i.e. a person who thinks and acts like a clinician, and who is responsive to the recognition and rewards associated with clinical experience in a specialized area of practice, rather than academic credentials.

In addition to the influence of the professional culture, this study illustrates how institutional culture impacts the development of disciplinary scholars based upon faculty socialization in academic departments (Dey, Milem & Berger, 2000; Braxton & Berger, 1999; Alpert, 1991). The academic department was revealed to be an important source of academic socialization for the faculty informants in this study. Thus the research explains the function of the departmental culture in supporting or constraining faculty priorities.

Inherent in cultural perspectives on faculty behavior is the assumption that culture, i.e. meanings and knowledge that is shared by members of a group, is understood by observing what is done by the members of the group, who does it, and how it is being done (Tierney, 1988). Thus, to investigate the meanings that occupational faculty informants assign to the faculty role, they were asked how they came to choose academia, what activities they did for work, and what specific tasks they considered scholarly. Faculty members were also asked if there was alignment between what they value in faculty work and what is valued in the department, what or who has most influenced their faculty careers, and what surprised them about faculty scholarship at their institution. The purpose in this line of questioning was to focus attention on the level of congruency between daily work activities, how scholarship is perceived, and how individuals view

their identities across academic institutions, i.e. Determination College and Eminence University.

Description of Sites

Determination College¹ is a private teaching institution that was founded in the late 1800's. The college is located in an urban setting with a total student body that numbers approximately 5,000 (including undergraduate and graduate students).

Determination College is one of 663 institutions that are classified as master's colleges and universities according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=805>). Master's colleges are listed in the classification structure below research and doctoral institutions, and above liberal arts colleges and community colleges. Approximately 43% of the occupational therapy programs across the nation are located in master's institutions. Determination College prides itself on its commitment to student learning that is integrated with applied field experiences.

Determination College confers undergraduate degrees in areas including arts and science disciplines and professional programs. Students can also earn master's degrees in 15 areas, and doctorates in 2 professional areas. Determination College has achieved recognition for its teaching mission and its focus on community service. However, because it is positioned amongst mid-level institutions in the higher education system Determination College strives for national recognition. Thus, the college takes pride in being recognized by a national educational foundation for its commitment to community

¹ Determination College is a pseudonym for the master's college site.

service. Moreover, Determination College is ranked in the top tier for its category, as rated by the US News and World Report's 2009 edition of "America's Best Colleges." Finally, the occupational therapy program at Determination College is ranked in the top 50% of all graduate programs nationwide.

By contrast, Eminence University² is a private research institution that was founded in the late 1800's. The university is in an urban environment and is nationally and internationally renowned as a center for teaching and research excellence. Eminence University is one of 199 institutions that are classified as research universities according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=805>). Approximately 34% of occupational therapy programs across the nation are located in research institutions. The university's mission establishes learning as a core component, and underscores the importance of teaching and generating new knowledge through research.

Eminence University offers bachelor, master's and doctoral degrees in the traditional disciplines and in interdisciplinary fields. Eminence University strives for international and national acknowledgment of its scientific accomplishments, as well recognition of the quality of its academic departments, and the scholarship of its faculty. The U.S. News and World Report's 2009 National Universities ranking placed Eminence University in the top tier for its category. The occupational therapy program in particular is ranked within the top 40 programs of all graduate programs across the country.

² Eminence University is a pseudonym for the research institution site.

Data Coding

Qualitative data analysis is an inductive process in which patterns and categorizations generated in a study emerge out of the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1980). The approach selected to order and derive meaning from the data in this dissertation combines coding methods, the development of taxonomies and the use of displays to visualize the results (Morse & Field, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994, Bailey, 2001). It was important to this researcher that the voices of the faculty informants be heard and that categories not be imposed a priori. However, it is also this investigator's role to consolidate the insights and interpretations made during data collection in light of the case study as a whole. Thus, data analysis emerged through a process that began by organizing the survey data, and then reviewing the audio files of the individual informant interviews and transcribing each one verbatim.

Guided by the research questions, the analytical process progressed to a comparison of individual faculty perceptions in the context of their departments. Individual viewpoints were then consolidated with focus group data. Further analysis of the informant's perspectives across departments revealed the unexpected presence of three distinct sub-cultures within the composite informant group. This finding required the investigator to identify congruities and incongruities in faculty perceptions between the sub-cultural groups. See Appendix E and F for examples of data coding and analysis by sub-culture. Finally, data analysis concluded by providing an interpretive framework for conceptualizing professional identity in the practice discipline of occupational therapy.

Data reduction and analysis was organized around four major cognitive process phases (Morse & Field, 1995). The primary method used to make sense of the large amounts of data from the interviews was to develop codes. Codes are named units of narrative data that describe phenomena and permit comparisons of related phenomena to discover categories. The data analysis coding process in the study was conducted in three phases, i.e. open to descriptive, descriptive to analytical, and analytical to axial.

In phase one of data analysis, the investigator individually appraised over three hundred pages of transcribed interview and focus group data, and field note impressions that were consolidated into text documents. Open coding was used as a preliminary strategy for conducting a line by line review of the narratives to gain comprehension. The words and phrases of each informant were closely examined to extract initial impressions about an academic career, faculty work and scholarly outcomes. The open coded statements were then organized by naming the data units descriptively on specific dimensions to which the informants gave voice. For example, in response to a question about the choice of an academic career, descriptors included *need for a change, unplanned career transition, hit clinical ceiling, teaching in area of expertise, researcher as priority, unintended outcome, and active pursuit of academic career.*

In the second phase of data coding this investigator named data conceptually based upon the meaning conveyed by the informants. Referring to a second interview question about what activities faculty members considered scholarly, the analytical codes generated included *expanded view of scholarship, academic role evolving, contributing to the disciplinary culture, and lack of academic socialization.* Because qualitative data analysis is an iterative process, the terms and operational definitions of the codes were

continuously refined as the coding process continued across informants. From reading and rereading the interviews, impressions were synthesized and further refined into new or revised codes. However, because the preliminary coding process yielded over fifty codes, a method for categorizing them according to similarity of phenomena was necessary.

In the final phase data coding process, relationships between codes were identified and categories were identified across the data. The process of building categories involved making connections between the descriptive and analytical codes and identifying patterns in the content or intent of the codes. Matrices were developed to assist the investigator to organize codes and to observe recurrent topics that linked codes across interview questions and across academic departments. This process of identifying broad conceptual labels that were relevant to the research questions resulted in the development of axial codes. Axial codes link content by group on the basis of the similarities or interactions that defined them. Each matrix arranged the identified axial codes on the x axis and the departmental units on the y axis. See Appendix G for an example of a data analysis matrix in which informant views from multiple interview questions were grouped according to the axial codes *academic culture & institutional context, disciplinary culture/graduate training, departmental socialization, professional training, and personal priorities*. This type of display permitted the investigator to interpret individual viewpoints as sub-units within the departmental unit of analysis, and compare similarities and incongruities across departments (Yin, 1994). See Table 1 for examples of the data coding scheme beginning with index coding, and progressing to axial coding and finally to thematic development.

Table 1: Data analysis coding scheme for informant responses: Why did faculty members leave clinical practice to pursue an academic career?

OPEN CODING	DESCRIPTIVE CODING	ANALYTICAL CODING	AXIAL CODING	TAXONOMIES	THEMES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I got married and wanted the summers off” • “It wasn’t something that was well thought out” • “I was at the top of my clinical game it had nothing to do with research” • “I was interested in teaching and student activities” • “I was teaching employers as part of clinical work” • “I saw teaching as a way to be a huge change agent.” • “In 7th grade I decided to become a scientist” • I trained as an academic...” • “Didn’t plan on it...” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for a change • Unplanned career transition • Hit clinical ceiling • Teaching in area of expertise • Easy career transition • Teaching to contribute to practice • Researcher as priority • Active pursuit of academic career • Unintended outcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family considerations • Teaching as a secondary goal • Undeveloped researcher role • Teaching as a primary goal • Teaching as a primary goal • Contributing to the profession • Personal goal • Doctoral training • Field needed researchers 	<p><i>Faculty beliefs about an academic career</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal priorities & needs • Available professional role • Clinical experience led to interest in teaching • Active pursuit • Interest evolved 	<p>Personal Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Career stage • Graduate training <p>Clinical Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply knowledge • Level of experience • Specialization 	<p>Clinical Profession as an Emerging Discipline</p>

Data Analysis

The final result of the data analysis process was the exposure of key underlying patterns and thematic meanings about the role of socialization in the institutionalization of scholarship in occupational therapy programs. The themes that emerged from the findings indicate that the development of a professional identity in occupational therapy

faculty is a dynamic process that is on-going, evolves as a function of the convergence of multiple layers of cultural influence, and is enacted in the situated context of academic departments. The themes include: clinical profession as an emerging discipline; scholarship and context; and department as nexus.

Clinical Profession as an Emerging Discipline

As identified in Chapter Two, researchers have been challenged to portray the academic profession as a common cultural group given the distinctions in disciplines and professional communities, as well as the diversity of institutional contexts (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Stark, 1998). This study of occupational therapy faculty provides data that clarifies the salient distinctions between the professional culture of clinicians, and the disciplinary culture of academics, and the socialization processes that contribute to both.

While professional groups are often viewed as sub-cultures that defy traditional disciplinary classifications, research on the influence of disciplinary culture is also valid for gaining insights into the faculty role in professional cultures (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Becher, 1989; Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998). Occupational therapy is founded upon knowledge from multiple low-consensus parent disciplines such as psychology and sociology. Thus, parallels between this professional field and low-consensus academic disciplines is possible. It follows that faculty in the immature, applied discipline of occupational therapy would be expected to be oriented more towards teaching than research. Moreover, occupational therapy academic departments would be expected to have program directors that place a higher value on teaching than research.

Although occupational therapists have a general identity as a multi-specialized, professional culture of clinicians, the data analysis from this study suggests that career transition to academia has yielded insecurity in professional identity for faculty. This insecurity is fueled by a system where the rules for promotion and tenure differ depending upon institutional context. A mid-late career faculty member from Eminence University described the dilemma in this way:

...but the public, people don't see me as an occupational therapist anymore....the professor...I mean even when I fill out these different surveys or whatever, what do I put down that am I. Am I a health care professional, or am I a researcher, or am I a professor, what am I? I mean I'm not a professor here obviously, that's not even partially in my title. Here, I'm an instructor. But, if I were somewhere else I could be a professor right now. Yeah, and what am I?

In addition to a primary clinical identity, demographic data from this study revealed that additional distinguishing factors were found to shape the disciplinary identity of individual faculty members. Analysis of the demographic data provides a starting point for understanding how the personal characteristics, as well as clinical and academic backgrounds of individual faculty influence academic roles and scholarly behavior at the level of the academic department.

Analysis of the faculty demographic data on professional and academic training was conducted by site, then compared across sites, and finally, was combined to identify composite trends. See Table 2 for a summary of the demographic data. The data reveals that both Determination College (80%) and Eminence University (80%) have a higher percentage of faculty with doctorates than the national average for occupational therapy core faculty (67%) (AOTA, 2009).

Table 2: Demographic analysis by setting and by sub-cultural groups

	DC N=5	EU N=10	ML N=11	E N=2	NT N=2
Average Years Between Bachelor's and Master's	8	6	8.3	3	5
Average Years Between Master's and Doctorate	23.5 (N=4)	8.6 (N=8)	15.4 (N=10)	<1 (N=1)	4
Entered Academia with Bachelor's	0	3	3	0	0
Entered Academia with Master's	5	5	8		
Average Years Accrued in Current Position Prior to Earning a Doctorate	14	10.5	13.6 (N=10)	1 (N=1)	0
Entered Academia with Doctorate	0	2	0	0	2
Average Years in Higher Education	17	16	18	3.5	16.5
Number of Institutions as Faculty Member	1.4	1.2	1	1	3
Doctoral Degree Type	2 Ph.D. 1 Ed.D. 1 OTD	6 Ph.D. 3 OTD	6 Ph.D. 1 Ed.D 4 OTD	1 OTD	2 Ph.D.
Faculty Appointments	3 Associate 2 Assistant	1 Full 1 Associate 3 Assistant 5 Instructor	1 Full 3 Associate 4 Assistant 3 Instructor	2 Instructor	1 Associate 1 Assistant
Faculty Who are Tenured	5	2	6	0	1

Code: Determination College (DC), Eminence University (EU), Mid-Late Career Sub-Culture (ML), Early Career Sub-Culture (E), and Non-Therapist Sub-Culture (NT)

Faculty in the arts and sciences disciplines view an earned doctorate as the point of entry to academia, and the medium through which faculty training occurs. This data analysis revealed incongruities in academic preparation for occupational therapy faculty members relative to the norms of the academic culture. For example, all of the faculty informants with the exception of those in the non-clinician sub-culture, entered academia without doctoral training. On further review, the variation between years accrued in their current position prior to getting a doctorate favored the faculty from Eminence (10.5 years) over their peers from Determination (15 years), suggesting that institutional type may play a role in influencing faculty careers. Following additional analysis of the mid-late career sub-culture that comprises the largest number of informants (11/15) the Eminence University faculty still earned a doctorate on average three years earlier, than did their peers at Determination College. This data compares to the non-clinician faculty members who both came to academia with doctorates, and the two early career faculty members one of whom earned a clinical doctorate within a year of beginning teaching.

The demographic survey data further revealed that the informant group as a whole was white, and disproportionately female, i.e. 13 out of 15. This data is not surprising given that the occupational therapy profession as a whole is disproportionately white, i.e. 88.3% of the AOTA membership compared with the demographics of the U.S. in 2006, where only 66.4% of the population was white (Coppard et al., 2009). 87% of the faculty members in this study were female, while women make up 35% of the faculty nationally, and women accounted for 67% of the appointments in education, the health sciences, and English and foreign languages in a National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1992-1993 (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/index.asp>). Taking into account that the informant

subgroup from the research institution was twice as large as the sub-group from the masters college, comparisons across departments revealed that the Eminence faculty exhibited more diversity in age, gender, career stage, clinical experience and type of academic appointment than did the faculty from Determination College. See Appendices G & H for the individual informant data by institutional site.

A summary of the faculty informants from Eminence University revealed that they range in age from 27 to 65 years. Eight members of the group are female and two members are male. Seven faculty members are married, while two are divorced and one remains single. Three of the ten informants have children still living at home. Despite entering academia with up to 20 years of clinical experience, the faculty informants at Eminence University have given up clinical practice but remain clinically active through consulting and research activities. Two of the ten members have trained in other disciplines and are not occupational therapists. In contrast, the faculty members at Determination College are a relatively homogeneous group consisting of five women, who range in age from 52 to 58 years. All of the informants are married, and three of the five still have children living at home. Although the faculty members from Determination College reported having an average of 17 years of experience as clinicians, like their counterparts at Eminence, they do not view themselves as active practitioners.

A composite analysis of faculty informants across institutions yielded commonalities and distinctions in personal background and academic experiences that differentiated the informant group as a whole into three sub-cultures. The mid-late career sub-culture is the largest, consisting of 5 informants from Determination College and 6

informants from Eminence University. This sub-culture is characterized by faculty with extensive clinical experience, limited academic training prior to taking their first faculty position, and who earned doctorates while working as faculty members on average within the last eight years (mid-late career stage). A second, early career stage sub-culture is distinguished by two new faculty members who came to the university to get master's degrees, and became interested in an academic career as a result of being in a supportive research environment. The final sub-culture is comprised of two non-clinician faculty members from other disciplines who have not trained as occupational therapists, who entered academia with doctoral training, and who came to their current position with established research paths.

Situating the informants within descriptive categories defined by personal context and professional experiences provided a structure for shaping the researcher's interpretation of individual informant interviews. Moreover, by organizing the analysis of the total informant group by category, the researcher refocused attention on the case as a whole by consolidating the data.

Professional Culture of Clinician-Teachers

The data analysis from this study reveals that similar to other applied, professional fields such as nursing, occupational therapists were drawn to clinical practice by social norms and personal motivations. As one informant from the mid-late career sub-culture from Determination recalled:

Oh, sure, I'm sure that wanting to be in a helping profession and the fact that I grew up in the 50's and 60's had a lot to do with the need to make a difference. I think that many people... that there were other career choices along the way, that I for one reason or another I didn't follow, and will

always think about....Um, so it was clear that I wanted to make a difference in whatever I did. I wanted to make a contribution.

Further, occupational therapy faculty appointments have traditionally been made based upon clinical expertise rather than scholarly attributes, also consistent with practices in other health professions (Covey & Burke, 1987). The assumption that experienced clinicians in occupational therapy are strongly influenced by a clinical identity that prescribes faculty roles in academic environments was supported by the findings of this study.

Extensive clinical backgrounds amongst the mid-late career informant sub-culture, was associated with faculty members who became academics to teach rather than to conduct research. Some of the views regarding teaching that were expressed by the experienced clinicians included: “I did a lot of workshop teaching;” “I was teaching employers as part of clinical work and I liked teaching;” “It was an outgrowth of over 20 years of experience as a clinician;” “I didn’t want to spend all of my time in a clinic...I saw teaching as a way to be a huge change agent;” “I needed a change of pace because I was at the top of my clinical game...it had nothing to do with research.”

In contrast to the faculty informants with extensive clinical training, the non-clinician faculty sub-culture from Eminence who had been traditionally socialized as researchers in doctoral education prior to coming to academia, provided distinct perceptions about teaching as a piece of their scholarly identity. While these two informants valued their teaching role, when asked what faculty activities they considered scholarly they responded:

....doing my research obviously to me is probably the premiere activity that I consider to be scholarly. And one of the major things that defines it as such is the idea that you are going to contribute new knowledge and

that you are going to make that knowledge public to the scientific profession. Now teaching I also consider to be scholarly because you are training the next generation of people that are going to be going out there and practice or conduct research on their own, and so I take that role as a scholarly role as well but it's a little different.

Oh, the research is the most scholarly, without a doubt. {And why is that?} Well, it's the most fulfilling, in my...for me it's the most fulfilling. I think that, and the most fulfilling part is to...is to generate the problem. Have someone develop an idea, and this kernel of a question. And then develop a proposal that could be submitted and planning of it. Once it's funded and you carry it out well, there may be a surprise here and there, but really...for the most part its straight forward. You make a plan and now it's carrying out the plan..... and "I think I have a strong allegiance to the students, but that's only on a need to do basis. I want to do the best job I can, present information to the students in the best way I can.....But no one's going to fire me if I don't teach well. But I like to teach well – that is an important thing.

Another distinction that differentiated the clinically experienced faculty informants from the non-clinician informants is the role that an interest in science played in shaping their academic careers. The non-clinician faculty members expressed their reasoning in this way:

I got an MS.... and wanted to know more about [my area of study]...so I trained as an academic and followed the money to medicine; and

In 7th grade I decided to become a scientist... Yeah, so I did a series of post-docs ... and sort of discovered that I wanted to apply [my area of study] to some of the questions I had about stroke recovery.

Yet another perspective on the reason for choosing an academic career came from the two early career informants:

Ha...I don't know that it was ever actually decided, I think it just happened. [laughter] I was working on the research staff...coordinating and managing some research projects on research grants. And I was kind of helping more as a teaching type assistant. So I don't know if it was something that I really planned, it just kind of happened. But, I don't know....it wasn't something that I was in school saying this is what I'm

going to do....or really seeking this out I guess, but I'm just really glad it happened.

Well it was kind of a transition. I never really thought that that's what I wanted to do. Once I started getting into this environment, I did my graduate work here at Eminence University. And started getting a little bit more involved in the research that was going on here, and I started to become really attracted to it....And I had the great opportunity to be involved in some of the Centennial Vision Planning, and realized just how at the forefront the research agenda was for our profession. And so as far as a need that I was fulfilling, I thought I will be an academic in a field where we desperately need academics.

Why an individual chooses a career and how they want to be remembered at the end of a career may or may not reflect the same professional priorities. As an indication of how a professional identity has become internalized, the faculty informants in this study were asked what they would like their academic epitaphs to say. There was consensus in the early career and non-clinician sub-cultures that research was the priority that has evolved. These informants wanted people to remember that they: "...discovered some important principles of rehabilitation that effected people's lives;" "changed the face of work rehabilitation;" "generated a question;" and "helped to advance the importance of community-based research and disability research."

Defining a professional identity was less equivocal in the mid-late career faculty members who were also experienced clinicians. This informant sub-culture most often prioritized the teaching role, i.e. "that she/he trained a generation of pediatric clinicians;" and "a caring and competent teacher who helped students to be caring and competent.... and who wished that I had published along the way." A combined clinician-teacher identity was also uncovered, i.e. "a very dedicated clinician and professor...that I really strove, I mean OT had really been my life;" and "helped get recognition for family

caregivers....and a wonderful teacher who cared about student's thinking and development." However, the youngest member of this faculty sub-culture focused on her research area, i.e. "...made it possible for people with disabilities to participate because of changes in the environment." Finally, a combined identity as a researcher, teacher and leader was expressed by the program director from Eminence who stated that "I want to make a difference in the lives of people with disabling conditions. So, I do it though generating knowledge, through training professionals, through my policy initiatives."

Time as a Barrier

Due to the tendency for professional faculty members to spend significant time in teaching and clinical mentoring activities, the issue of time as a barrier to maintaining multiple faculty functions emerged from the data analysis. Faculty informants from both departments expressed frustrations with balancing roles whether it was remaining clinically active or conducting research, given the time demands of teaching and student advising. Two faculty informants from Determination addressed the time issue in this way:

Well I think my main frustration would be time and financial support, I mean to do some of this scholarly stuff, there is no time, there is just no time. The teaching takes up so much time that there is no time.... So, certainly that has been a real frustration. Frustration in just being able to pursue these things, I mean how many years do you keep saying I want to do X and not even start it.

I don't think that I do. I think...I think that...right now I don't do that well. Because I end up letting the time prioritize things for me. What is due seems to always have to take precedence over what I think is more important. Which of course will eventually leads us to why I haven't published... [laughter] much. Um..but yeah, as well as students knocking at the door, I don't want to say... and I do and feel badly about it...I don't want to say I'm too busy.

One of the mid-late career faculty members whose appointment covers 45% teaching and 55% research admitted to having second thoughts about an academic career at Eminence due to the time constraints:

Sometimes it doesn't feel doable.I have a lot of data now and I just don't have time to write and that's just the bottom line. [Program director] might argue with me about that but...anyway, I don't know if it's a good model for what we really have to accomplish here....That the expectations are you know writing and grants and everything, but you get so far and there's just no time.... Next year they will interface students and so I will have 14 [master's] students beside my research and that 45% [teaching] time, and I was teaching 20 hours a week....I have five OTD students getting ready to defend proposals..... And so sometimes I don't think the model is as conducive to being really academically productive. I think we need to rethink some of it. I'm still presenting at conference and I'm still trying, but I'm not getting writing done that I'd like to do... that's where the drawback seems to be.

Furthermore, even though the youngest member of the mid-late career sub-culture has an appointment on the clinical track that is 75% research and 25% teaching, the constant tension between roles and how faculty members prioritize work is exemplified in the following discussion:

I'm the primary course master for a huge course and making sure that my lab instructors and TA's are all on board. So that right now is my main priority. I personally prefer to prioritize my research first, but I'm trying to balance those two right now [teaching and research] so that they both come out very successful in the end....and sharing the information in dissemination of my results whether it be in abstracts or publications is my top priority. But it's falling by the wayside as my teaching requirements and demands are kind of in my face this semester.

The occupational therapy informants were asked how they balanced their faculty roles.

The following views from mid-late career faculty informants from Eminence and Determination, respectively, describe how they have balanced the multiple identities of clinician and academician:

Well, it's just very challenging, just like it is now. It was just another juggle, it was just depending what the ball was that was in the air. Your clinical practice has to be at a place that understands your teaching and the ups and downs of your teaching schedule. And, you do at the same time have to respect the clinical practice's needs. So, it's like a dance you have to do, that everyone has to really understand each other. So that it can turn on and off. But when it turns off, it's sometimes hard because like people have forgot about you for a whole semester, so you've lost your following of doctors that might refer to you....I mean it's not ideal.

Umm, I have always had this one day a week consulting or part time job which I have had....And the only reason I have been considering giving it up... to do the research, because I was just like, well you know if I have x number of hours [laughs].

One informant from Eminence for whom the researcher role is most valued describes a struggle with the demands of teaching in this way:

Um..I also, I think I have a strong allegiance to the students, but that's only on a need to do basis. I want to do the best job I can, present information to the students in the best way I can. But there becomes a point of diminishing returns. And I think... I try to know....OK, the next thing I do is not going to be helpful. If they don't get the point by this time, they're not going to get it. And then I try to stop.... and I'm struggling with it.

Professional Accreditation

The faculty members in this study provided mixed support for the research that suggests that work priorities and faculty behavior are strongly influenced by the professional culture in the form of academic program accreditation (Stark, 1998). The accreditation standards establish minimum levels of performance for professional curricula in areas such as course content, fieldwork education, and academic resources. Faculty informants from both sites acknowledged that the standards have directly influenced them in their roles as curriculum developers and teachers, but even this impact

is not universal. The following perceptions are from a faculty member from Eminence who commented on the limited role that the standards play even in teaching:

I guess I see them as guiding more what we have in our courses and curriculum but I don't know that it did too much for my own. The last time we went thru this was just a few years ago, but I'm not sure that it pushed me that much.

Aside from the most recent standards that have established the doctorate as the entry credential for the program director and the majority of faculty in a department, the last three decades of standards that pertain to faculty credentials have been ambiguous on the issue of academic preparation (ACOTE, 2006). This ambiguity has functioned to afford colleges and universities the prerogative to establish institutional parameters for faculty credentials, academic training, and career advancement. Thus, it is not surprising that the data analysis suggests that the influence of the accreditation standards on faculty behavior has been varied. Describing the impact of the standards on her scholarship a faculty member from Determination recalled:

I'm not sure if it had too much [influence]..... as a faculty scholar, I think it certainly had a lot to do as a faculty person..... Um...I don't think ACOTE [accrediting agency] really has done much to promote it asscholarly.

In contrast, one informant from Eminence University was clearly impacted as seen in the following response to whether the standards influenced the decision to earn a doctorate:

Yeah, they did. They definitely did. Well I looked around at all the master's [educated] faculty here...who have been here so long, and who have interwoven with faculty such that they will be the ones that will stay. And I wasn't in one of those positions. And so that had a big influence, it did...I can't lie. It did have an influence on me. I thought I would do it one day, but it sped me up.

Thus, although a direct influence was less equivocal, the data analysis suggested that the accreditation process has also indirectly influenced the role of faculty members as researchers by including standards for students to achieve graduate level learning outcomes relating to research activities (ACOTE, 1983, 2006). For example, at Eminence University where research is a priority and the faculty informants are all involved in funded research activities, the curriculum design includes student participation in on-going faculty research in department run clinics. A faculty informant from Eminence characterized the linkage in this way:

.....certainly there's a push for research and a push for evidence based practice, and things like that that... that you didn't see ten years ago. I think some OT's as scholars are looking at curriculum, and that might be what you're interested in too..... we have to keep doing projects with students and that's a good thing. And so it [standards] guides us to that extent since we have to infuse the curriculum with some of these things, it encourages the development of our own lines of work.

In the midst of social pressures to refocus faculty work toward the teaching role, the argument being debated is whether increased faculty time spent in research activity results in less time devoted to student learning (Braxton, 1999; Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000). Students at Eminence are routinely exposed to on-going research activities that are designed to answer the types of clinical questions that are being discussed in didactic courses. Providing a rationale for the type of student experience in the clinical model being implemented at Eminence, one faculty informant described the benefits in this way:

I do clinical research...we have a community practice that has several different practice initiatives...We want to have best practices for our students to learn in the field from clinicians, and so we have this clinical model, it's a source of revenue. It's a way to invent new services that we think are really great, and to test them out to make sure that they're viable. So that students can then practice and replicate our models.

Further, reflecting on how students at Eminence benefit from having research as the number one faculty priority in the department, one faculty informant framed the benefits to the students from a slightly different vantage:

...because we all do a nice job of bringing them into our research and having it be a part of our teaching. I think that they see that our research makes us better teachers, and they see that it gives them learning experiences. And so I don't think that where we are is a bad place to be. Or if you asked a school that doesn't do research...that's all teaching, that they would...I mean they could market that *our teachers just teach*...but I'm not so sure that that would necessarily be a good thing. Because we do make our students a priority.

These perceptions imply that the type of benefits gained by exposing students to research in clinical environments exceeds whatever gains might be accrued by students whose faculty instructors spend more time on lecture and course preparation.

Research suggests that academic departments need to counterbalance the pressure from disciplinary communities for increased faculty research, by recognizing and rewarding other faculty activities including teaching (Alpert, 1991). However, the findings from this study indicate that occupational therapy as an emerging applied discipline, offers a reverse perspective on the idea of an imbalance favoring research. On the contrary, referring to the recent visit from a consultant, the program director from Eminence suggested that the overriding influence of the professional culture continues to foster an imbalance favoring teaching:

And [consultant] brought that up too. She said one summer I spent the whole summer working on a class, and I got nothing done for my research. The next summer I decided that I would spend 10 days getting ready for my class, and I got a tremendous amount of my research done, and my class was just as good as when I spent the entire summer.

Possibly contributing to a faculty focus on teaching is the breadth and depth of content knowledge and clinical competencies required in a professional curriculum. The

frustrations of faculty members who need to prepare clinicians for increasingly challenging areas of clinical practice, and yet meet the demands of an institution with a research mission were apparent in the views expressed by two informants from Eminence. The statements are telling in that they provide insight into a contested identity:

I still think OT is going to academia to teach, to impart their...clinical expertise. That's why they entered it, that's what they value. I think so.... I think the research, particularly when you get on these tenure tracks, its tough, its really tough..and you know our track record here, we're not that good at it. Because we chose to be in a Research I Medical School. [Program director] is the only OTwho has gotten tenure.

...It's hard to be an OT Ph.D. in this place. The demands from our students are incredible and we have so much work to do to get them prepared. So, I think we can't do it all...and we'll have to figure out a way to make it happen. Whether some people spend more time on teaching and less doing research...or somehow we put more value on teaching and give people credit for it in meaningful ways. Our profession is not unique in this.

Thus, an unexpected finding of this study was that differing expectations for the breadth of content faculty are required to teach is related to faculty appointment at Eminence. Discussing that the teaching expectations for faculty whose primary role is researcher (75% research and 25% teaching) should be limited to their research area, the program director commented:

That is their primary role and they teach what they know from their work. But the rest of us kind of diddle around because we need to. And I have a real hard time getting OT's to see themselves that way.

Further, a faculty member from Eminence whose primary role is researcher described how she/he balances the responsibilities of being a clinical researcher and teacher. The description highlighted a distinction with her/his faculty counterparts at Determination who teach multiple courses per semester, have expertise in their teaching areas but no

longer consider themselves active practitioners, and are more likely to teach across topical areas:

I teach, I practice [clinical research]...I do everything related to my topic..... If you asked me to teach the group process class I could certainly do it, I'd be really good at it, but it would take a lot more work than it does for me to teach the [topical area] course. I would have to read new literature, and right now it's the same literature I read anyway and I can infuse things and make it work.

Finally, an example of the broader teaching expectations at institutions with a teaching mission is illustrated in the following commentary by a faculty member from

Determination as she describes the frustrations of balancing roles. She compares the fact that she has to teach multiple types of courses with her husband who teaches English at a local community college:

But I also have a WAC... which is a writing across the curriculum class, in which I have numerous students so, when I'm teaching that class I probably spend as much time correcting, as he does for one of his classes. Um...so, it's frustrating that I spend so much more time having to also prepare and keep up with changes. So, yeah, I think that's, that's real difficult. And I think to keep up with things you have to both do...I mean typically we keep up by reading the journals, now I'm also hoping to keep up by spending some more time in the clinic. And then... feeling that frustration of feeling like I should also be publishing. While what's very important and top on the list is teaching.

The data from this study supports the influence of clinical socialization on why occupational therapists entered academia and what they valued in faculty work. The data also suggests the influence of the professional accreditation process on faculty development. However, because the demographic profiles of the occupational therapy faculty in this study pose challenges to the assumptions inherent in training for an academic career, the data provided further understandings of how these faculty members

are adjusting to the faculty role and establishing themselves as successful scholars in diverse institutional contexts.

Scholarship and Context

Professional education and the development of a clinician-educator identity alone, is insufficient to explain faculty adjustment to the academic role. The literature suggests that the anticipatory socialization process that occurs in graduate school, combined with the organizational socialization process in academic departments are the mechanisms that transfer the beliefs, values and norms of the discipline (Tierney & Rhoades, 1994). The findings from this study provide insight into how faculty careers develop given diverse institutional contexts and profiles upon entering academia that are counter to traditional doctoral preparation for the academic role and the development of a scholarly identity.

The results of the data analysis suggests that the presence of a stable, core group of faculty with similar backgrounds in the same department, helped to made up for the lack of academic socialization experienced prior to taking faculty positions. This view was expressed by two faculty members from the mid-late career sub-culture:

I think that the beauty of our program is that there has been a core faculty for twenty years together, and that's rare. And I think together we grew and we grew the curriculum. And having non-OT Ph.D.'s helping us to see scholarship and what we did was scholarly. And the whole faculty growing together and being proud of our product and being proud of what we do and considering it scholarly.

Faculty scholarship...I had no background, no clue. That's why I think, none of us did, and we grew together. And we made it work. I think that it maybe gave us a certain amount of freedom in shaping that. And I think we were similar minds, we were similar ...not personalities, but the way we worked.

These findings might explain why the faculty informants in the mid-late career sub-group who assumed academic roles without the benefit of doctoral training and were socialized to a researcher many years later, have been slow to assume responsibility for developing the science of the emerging discipline.

Disciplinary Culture of Academic-Researchers

The profession's faculty scholars are shaping a disciplinary identity in occupational therapy. Unfortunately, two factors have plagued occupational therapy's development as an applied discipline. The first is the relative disinterest of clinicians in doctoral training and academic careers (Crepeau, Cohn & Boyt Schell, 2003; Dickerson & Whittman, 1999). Data from this study provides support that this characteristic has impacted faculty careers in the mid-late career sub-culture. The following statement is an example of the influence of personal priorities and the professional culture on occupational therapists. This exemplar also supports the notion that master's level training provides insufficient socialization for the academic role. When asked whether professional education inspired academic aspirations a faculty member from Determination responded in this way:

I don't think so. I do recall um, adamantly telling one of my professors, who surprisingly became my boss the same year I graduated, [laughter] that I would never, ever go back to school to get my doctorate. Um, but I, no I, I don't think so. I don't think it was ever discussed. And, it was never of interest to me. You know, I think most students like us wanted to get out there and be an OT.

Furthermore, the second factor that has negatively impacted the development of the applied discipline in occupational therapy is the professional culture's indifference to the faculty role and what it takes to become an academic scholar (Posthuma & Noh,

1991). The understanding some faculty came to academia as a passive change from clinical work, and that the lack of academic preparation influenced expectations for the faculty role was expressed in yet another statement from a faculty member from

Determination College:

... I didn't come here because it was a college that had what I was looking for... to be a part of a college.. 'cause I didn't want that yet. And I didn't even know what scholarly work [was]...I didn't know that publishing and research was part of what we should be doing.

The above statement is in stark contrast to the comments below from a faculty member in the non-clinician sub-culture who reflected on how she/he came to understand what it meant to become an academic scholar:

Oh, let's see....I think when I was in graduate school it was hammered into me that you needed to publish. The publish or perish thing was really strong. There were people on the faculty when I was getting my Ph.D. that didn't make it. They had to go to someplace else. So it became quite apparent that the thing to do was to publish, get grants, and publish information...that was the thing. Get grants, go to conferences, present your information, and after you presented you write a publication for it.

For prospective academics in the disciplines, the entry-route and the mechanism for transmitting the values and norms of the disciplinary culture is doctoral education (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Tierney & Rhoades, 1993; Wulff & Austin, 2004). Because all of the faculty informants in this study who are occupational therapists entered academia without doctorates, they pose a challenge to the assumptions inherent in the academic socialization process. Thus, how a delay in doctoral training has influenced occupational therapy faculty members in the development of a professional identity is a focus of this study (Dickerson & Whitman, 1999). The data analysis suggests that there are negative implications for entering academia with little or no graduate socialization to the roles and functions that constitute an academic career.

Researcher Role

The researcher role is a common component of professional identity in faculty members in the traditional academic disciplines. However, given that a preference for research appears less developed in faculty from the allied health professions this study examined the role of academic training in the development of the researcher role (Boyer, 1990; Covey & Burke, 1987). Data analysis revealed a series of negative implications that arose from the absence of academic training. The implications that surfaced during the interviews and focus groups with the faculty informants include a general naivete about the academic culture, limited exposure to research mentors, the delayed socialization to the researcher role, and limitations to the development of a researcher identity. For example, an innocence that suggested a lack of understanding of the norms and practices of the faculty role was suggested by informants from Eminence University and Determination College, respectively, as they reflected:

I thought that if I just worked hard and...that that would be enough.

Well I know when I took the job, I was really kind of miffed...of having to get a doctorate because I felt like you know I had been a clinician for so many years, I know how to teach people how to be a clinician.

One informant from Determination brought the issue of mentorship to light by discussing the kinds of master's level socialization experiences that might foster an interest in research. By then revealing how her own educational training fell short, she exposed limitations to developing a researcher identity:

I think it would also be dependent on... the experience that they personally had as they went through. Were they a grad associate? Or did they get involved in research projects? And then get excited about that? Did they do a fieldwork where they went to NIH or something. Yeah, I feel if I had been a grad associate with [OT researchers] I think that I

might be doing more research now. Because I would have been launched a little bit earlier, or with more depth.

Two faculty members in the mid-late career sub-culture illustrated the disadvantage associated with a lack of socialization to the researcher role by discussing their unexpected surprise at an interest in research:

...I think my interest in research really came due to the fact I had to get doctorate and prior to that I would have never thought I would have ever been interested in pursuing research. And I think I am doing...thinking about doing some professional writing and some other things that I probably would not have considered had I just remained a clinician.

I never thought of research really until within the last few years, after I finished my doctorate. That's when I started to think about research because I really enjoyed doing my dissertation....Not the stats part, but... [laughter.]

Likewise, a faculty member from Eminence conveyed amazement about a shift in priorities following doctoral training through the following comments:

Surprised at this point that my focus and attention...I still enjoy teaching, but I'm surprised at how much I enjoy my research. It's purely the love that I have working on my research. I started out teaching so much, but now that I have this [research] area.....so now the teaching that I love is not so much the coursework but mentoring students in that [research] area.

Further, the literature suggests that earning a doctorate in mid to late career is a disadvantage for developing the skills and experience necessary to build an academic career as a researcher (Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002; Baldwin, 1996). Because the majority of occupational therapy faculty members in this study had extensive clinical experience prior to taking a faculty position, this informant group found themselves teaching and earning a doctorate in their 40's and 50's. This situation has resulted in a developing researcher identity that is contested by the boundaries of time and opportunity. These boundaries were clarified by an informant from Eminence as she

discussed how post-doctoral training was the norm for the basic scientists on campus, but has not been the norm for occupational therapy:

You know [program director's name] said at the time, oh it would be nice if people did post-docs. But, where are we going to go, we're doing a lot of this stuff mid-career. Many of us are or were....Do we really have flexibility to go elsewhere?

Supporting the literature regarding the barriers associated with a delayed start to a research career, one mid-late career informant from Eminence expressed frustrations with completing a doctorate so late in life:

And, well what am I going to do with it? And somebody at my point in the profession who has already practiced 18 years before I came here, and so I've got over 20 years of practice experience. That's not going to be what's going to do it for me. And that's where most of us are at, except for those few new faculty who we've hired who are just out of school who may be going for clinical practice and some research and teaching.

Another faculty member from Eminence suggested that it was the socializing influences of the department that prompted her decision to pursue a doctorate in mid-life:

Now I didn't start until 1993...you know there are a few of us who went after me...but... probably five or six of us who went back to work on doctoral degrees. It did take seven years, and I was raising a family and working here half-time. But, yeah, you kind of got inculturated...even though I would say back when I started we were master's level clinicians teaching.

Institutional Culture

Implicating the role of the academic culture in influencing faculty priorities, the literature implies that an institution's place in the academic hierarchy influences the nature of faculty work and the time allocated to various academic roles and functions (Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000; Fairweather, 1993). In addition, the findings of a study by Braxton & Berger (1999), acknowledged the role of disciplinary consensus in influencing

faculty behavior, but also uncovered evidence of the saliency of the institutional setting in the new faculty adjustment process. Furthermore, the findings revealed that regardless of discipline, research institutions supported the tendency for new faculty members to adjust easier to the researcher role, and master's institutions supported a more comfortable faculty transition to the teaching role. However, across institutional types, high consensus disciplines are more adaptive to their context than their applied disciplinary counterparts.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the majority of occupational therapy faculty in this study did not have doctoral preparation prior to taking their first faculty appointment. Under the circumstances of limited or no academic socialization, one would expect faculty members in this study to be less adaptive overall to the academic role, and more specifically to the researcher role, regardless of the institutional environment. However, some institutional cultures may be more forgiving of the disadvantages that characterize occupational therapy faculty. For example, Determination College is a master's institution with a teaching mission and a strong history of professional education. Thus, it is expected that occupational therapy clinician-teachers would find adjustment to the campus culture less difficult. In contrast, Eminence is a highly ranked research institution with an institutional culture that is oriented toward basic medical research and a faculty reward structure that is based on grant funding, research, and publication. Accordingly, it is expected that faculty members in professional training programs that are required to meet accreditation standards for curriculum development, teaching and clinical education, would find adjustment to a campus culture that affords status to research scholars, challenging at best.

Limited adaptation to the norms of the academic culture may account for the findings in a study by Parham (1985a, 1985b) that suggested that occupational therapy faculty members were afforded differential treatment in colleges and universities. For example, rewards were modified to include promotion and even tenure for teaching, curriculum development, clinical mentoring, and service to the campus community, rather than research activities. Although establishing a different reward system for bachelor's or master's trained clinician-teachers permitted health professional programs to expand into master's colleges and research universities, it perpetuated diminished status for certain faculty groups within the professional hierarchy and may have had unintended consequences for the development of faculty careers (Stark, 1998; Christiansen, 1987).

The results from this study reveal mixed findings on past differential treatment of occupational therapy faculty members at Determination College and Eminence University. In one statement by a mid-career informant from Eminence, the notion of a continuing pattern of differing expectations emerged from her discussion of the distinctions between a basic scientist at the institution and professional faculty in the program in occupational therapy:

He does have to get grants, so that's harder...that may be harder although that is the expectation from day one. You come with post-docs, I think sometimes in OT we should require post-docs. But we're different, is it good to be different? Should we be making those exceptions? I'm not sure....

In contrast, the faculty narratives from Determination College did not reveal a past history of differential treatment. It may be that no special considerations were provided to this faculty group, or it may be the case that the norms for faculty hiring and

advancement at this teaching institution were more aligned with the profile of occupational therapy faculty members thereby precluding the need for a different reward structure. In reality however, the functional implications for the development of research careers may be similar for some of the faculty informants across institutions. For example, as illustrated in the remarks of a faculty member from Determination, the fact that the college advantaged teaching careers might be a mixed blessing:

[Determination] is not a publish or perish situation, which in one sense makes me greatly relieved because I don't feel like I have to deal with that pressure. Uhh... on the other hand I wish it were that, because I feel that we don't really get any support to do research and it would be nice to have that support.

That reduced expectations for faculty research productivity in colleges and universities have been at once advantageous and disadvantageous, is a paradox for occupational therapy faculty members. On the one hand, some faculty members from both Determination College and Eminence University reported a value in being protected from the pressure to develop a researcher role. The consequences of being protected however, underscores the negative implications for faculty associated with a limited professional identity as a researcher, and therefore reduced scholarly status within the discipline. Suggesting that being a faculty member at Eminence has resulted in a contested identity, an instructor from the mid-late career sub-culture reminisced about a changing institutional culture as follows:

And we have been very protected here. Because in any other institution all of us would have been gone....We did have protection, we're losing our protection. People coming out now will not be able to do what our core faculty did. You know hang out for twenty years and just do whatever we want and not be accountable for grants and publications, and that's sad. But....[so you see that as a negative?] Yeah. I mean the other way to play the game is you get on a clinical position...every year I get a letter... you're hired for another year.

Thus, although faculty members in the mid-late career sub-culture from Eminence acknowledged past differential treatment, in the view of one informant from this group, those days are over for professional programs:

It's beginning to change, but it's beginning to change other places. The School of Social Work just brought in a new Dean, and he's upping the expectations for funding and a couple of people didn't get tenure and that had never happened before, so it isn't just us.

As Eminence University has begun to bring professional programs in line with institutional expectations in recent years, the faculty informants at this research institution find themselves scrambling to meet institutional demands and departmental norms as researchers. Acknowledging differences in norms for faculty rewards based upon institutional type, two informants from Eminence commented:

Oh you're talking [master's college], like my friend at [master's college] was an associate professor and she hadn't finished her Ph.D. yet.

And yet our [other college] colleagues who we trained here, and the [other university] colleagues who we've trained here all have tenure at their respective universities. And we would too if we went there because it's based predominantly on teaching and service.

Interestingly, despite the fact that Eminence University's reduced expectations for research productivity allowed occupational therapy faculty to renew contracts and continue academic careers, it in effect, also permitted them to avoid the necessity for progressive promotion and earning tenure. Data from this study suggests that a past history of differential treatment may be one source of a dynamic tension that currently exists at Eminence between faculty members and departmental leadership. For instance, individual faculty members who are pursuing personal priorities as clinician-teachers

find themselves at odds with the program director who is responsible for developing disciplinary scholars. As the program director from Eminence offered:

And I think the biggest problem that we have here, is that people want to do such an incredibly wonderful job with their teaching that they compromise their science... And so I think it's a real tension especially for the OT's.

Another faculty informant from Eminence acknowledged that assuming the mantle of a researcher has had an impact on her professional identity. She illustrated this understanding by describing her transformation from a "local" mentality as a teacher in a professional program to a "cosmopolitan" identity as a researcher in the larger applied disciplinary community:

So now as I do more research focus... I think it is more valuable. [It's becoming more meaningful for you?] It is, and.... so that's becoming more meaningful as I feel comfortable in developing projects. [What is it doing for you, what is it giving you?] It's probably a professional identity outside of the department. Because teaching is a professional identity probably inside the department. You know you're valued by colleagues and students and others there. This has certainly expanded my horizons probably within the university community and also professional.

Past patterns of institutional accommodation to occupational therapy faculty members notwithstanding, the data analysis from this study reveals that the faculty informants from Determination College and Eminence University are demonstrating successful adjustment to their faculty roles in the context of their institutional cultures. Faculty members from both programs have earned and maintained accreditation in their respective environments, and have successfully educated practitioners for over 25 years as indicated by high pass rates on the national certification examination. In addition, the teaching mission of Determination College is aligned with faculty values regarding the reason for entering academia, contentment with primary roles defined by teaching and

service, and desire to remain at the institution. The data from this study however, is less equivocal on the alignment of the faculty informant values with the values of the institutional culture of Eminence University. Although the research mission of the university has been influential in developing a researcher identity as well as launching research careers and supporting research productivity in the Eminence faculty informants, not all faculty members expressed a preference for a balance in faculty work that favors research over teaching, mentoring and clinical socialization.

While this research was not designed to establish comparisons with the occupational therapy faculty members from Parham's (1985) study, reviewing faculty informant credentials by institutional type for similar or changing trends may prove useful for understanding faculty adjustment and success in higher education. Indicating a positive trend, Parham's findings indicated that 30% of the faculty in research institutions were trained at the doctoral level, whereas 90% of the informant group at Eminence have doctorates. Further, the program director at Eminence reported that only faculty with doctorates in hand will be hired in this program in the future. However, demonstrating a trend at odds with the findings from decades earlier that research institutions had a higher percentage of faculty who held the rank of associate and full professor, the data from Eminence revealed that 10% were full professors, and there were no associate professors in the therapist faculty group. Further, 13% of the informant group were assistant professors, while 75% were at the instructor level. Although this begs the question of whether fewer occupational therapy faculty members are being promoted to senior faculty status, this negative finding may have as much to do with a changing culture as it does with individual faculty members. As seen in the tenure data from Eminence

whereby only two faculty members are tenured, institutional expectations may be progressing faster than individual faculty priorities.

With respect to the master's institutions in Parham's study (1985), findings revealed that only 10% of the faculty surveyed had doctorates and that 86% of the faculty reported having no publications. Confirming a positive trend toward doctoral training and interest in research/publication in occupational therapy suggested by Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher (2002), 80% of the faculty membership at Determination college have doctorates and only 40% reported having no publications. Furthermore, whereas Parham's data found that 57% of faculty at master's colleges held the rank of assistant professor, 60% of the faculty at Determination College have appointments at the associate profession level. Thus, the positive relationship between doctoral preparation and research and publications identified by Parham, and the positive effect on publication rates for higher ranked and tenured faculty members by Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, is somewhat apparent for the informant group from Determination College. However, given that all five faculty informants from Determination College are tenured despite a low level of research productivity, incentives to take on the challenges of future research may be lacking.

Finally, if faculty rewards are the measures that are being used to judge academic adjustment and success, then the faculty members at Determination have been successful in their academic careers. Using the rewards criteria however, the faculty members from Eminence have been less successful as indicated by continued instructor status for some, and the presence of fewer tenured faculty members in the program. As the shift in normative standards toward faculty research continues, the occupational therapy faculty

members in this study could be feeling insecurity about their future. Although the views of the informants from Determination did not indicate concern, these faculty members also appear less convinced that the culture will shift toward research in the near future and have an impact on their careers. However, the faculty from Eminence seem assured of the inevitability of change, and even those faculty who have been promoted and are on track to earn tenure are feeling the pressure to “publish or perish.”

Professional Identity as a Disciplinary Scholar

Implicating the role of the academic culture in influencing faculty priorities, the literature suggests that an institution’s place in the academic hierarchy influences the nature of faculty work and the time allocated to various academic roles and functions (Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000; Fairweather, 1993). The data from this study support the role of institutional culture and mission in effecting how faculty scholarship is defined and how status accrues to academic departments as a function of achieving academic success within the institutional community. Thus, given Eminence Universities’ position as a highly ranked research university it is not surprising that the occupational therapy faculty informants from this institution have been more strongly influenced in their roles as researchers, then their faculty counterparts at Determination College. There are clear distinctions between the two academic departments in how the faculty informants are making sense of their role as scholars within the context of their institutions.

Determination College

What the faculty members perceive successful scholarship to be reflects on their view of themselves as scholars, and whether they are viewed as scholars by others. For example, two faculty members from Determination College described themselves in this way:

I am not sure I would ever reach my standard of successful scholar because I never feel like I read enough... I will never be knowledgeable enough....I would like to do some professional writing, I think that would be a mark of a successful scholar to be able to really disseminate that information for people.

.... I wouldn't label myself as a successful scholar. And, so one of the things that I'm working on is publications, and I still have this in my head that publication is the gold standard of scholarship. But I also think that at an institution like this, scholarship should influence how we teach.

Given that a teaching and service mission prevails at Determination College, the work activities that are considered scholarly are those that involve teaching and mentoring of students, community service, clinical collaborations, fieldwork development, leadership and conference presentations. A faculty member commented on her work in this way:

I think preparing for the lectures... I would say that, because I want to be on top of the material, I want to make sure that I am getting them the most current data and the best practice information. So I would consider that to be scholarly.

Another informant from Determination also characterized her teaching role as primary, but also discussed how she created a professional portfolio that integrated the institutional demand for service with her clinical research:

I spend a lot of time reading... I spend a lot of time in the classroom, I spend a lot of time with students one to one, in small groups... I spend very little time in committees these days. I don't get much out of that... and so I do service to the community as my practice and my research area in a way....Um I think that everything I do is scholarly....in fact for my promotion application I framed it all around my clinical practice being a clinical research activity. Which.... it worked and I was promoted so...

Yet another faculty member whose primary focus is fieldwork education described what she considers to be scholarly in this way:

There's a concept that's called.... scholarly practice. Which basically is, expertise in a particular area of practice. I firmly believe that fieldwork education is an area of expertise, and to that end I have been presenting at those state and national conventions on this.....posters, presentations, workshops....it is my goal to be recognized as a contributor to this body of practice. I believe that is scholarship. There's got to be some evidence behind it, there's got to be some expertise, and there's got to be recognition from the field.

Finally, clever describing what activities she considers scholarly, one of the faculty informants portrayed the reality of faculty work at this teaching institution in this way:

Well, I guess of the activities that I should definitely include are the ones that I aim to do when I'm not trying to keep up with the things that have to be done. Trying also to present papers.... Because I think I always felt getting out and doing research projects was scholarly, and I still do. And I think it's important to to publish, and I haven't published much.

The composite group of occupational therapy faculty members at Determination College are not conducting research, writing papers and publishing as part of their daily work routine. However, the narratives suggest a contested professional identity between what is valued in the larger academic culture, what activities they value as scholarly and would like to pursue, and what is expected in their institutional context. Providing a further impression of the scholarship that is institutionalized at Determination College, the program director at Determination explained:

Well the definition of scholarly activity in some people's minds is doing research and publication. I think there's a scholarly aspect to teaching. I mention that but the brunt of that is keeping up with what are the teaching methods, evidence based practice and teaching. I didn't think that service has a very hefty scholarly piece to it. But, as part of the reconfiguring of standards for promotion and tenure, it is still a part of it.

One faculty member described the link between her concept of scholarship and what the college supports as scholarship, and yet acknowledged that this perspective is institution specific:

...this institution is not a research university and so our concept of scholarship really rotates around some publications, a lot of presentations, and a lot of national and statewide presentation. Um, I would hope that, and I think that the whole idea of leadership within the profession is another piece of that scholarship here. I can't imagine that that would be equated to scholarship in another institution. I think it would be very different.

Alluding to the beliefs, values, and formal and informal norms that characterize faculty scholarship at Determination College, two faculty members provided insights into their institutional culture as they explained what surprised them about scholarship at the College:

Um...hmm...I think...it is like the best kept secret, you know when I actually hear about one of my colleagues doing something I'm like surprised number one that they did it, and number two that they got it done. And it's really interesting... like I wish I had heard of it sooner... So, so sometimes I feel disappointed, I guess you could say that, more isn't going on that I could tap into even on my own campus.

I think that's what surprised me is that the institution is spending money on it [research] now.

Further, frustrations with time as a barrier to conducting research given the heavy teaching demands at this master's institution were expressed by the program director in these comments:

But the time to really do research is never adequate. So for example, [name of program director at a Research I institution] teaches one course a year. And when I see her I cringe, because she says [name] where's that article... and I teach 7 courses a year.

Given that the faculty members from Determination College do not have a strong perception of themselves as being successful scholars, the comments from the informants

that suggested that their external profile as scholars was reduced as well, was not surprising. Less anticipated however, was the implication drawn from the faculty responses that lacking a higher scholarship profile wasn't perceived as being much of a disadvantage on their campus. For example, three faculty members characterized their views as follows:

Umm...I think we are viewed as scholars by other OT's in the area, I am not sure we are viewed as scholars by other departments. ...Um although there are certainly... I hear that other departments are very pleased with what we are doing. But, I don't hear of anybody saying, wow so and so is really a scholar. But I don't hear about that in anybody. It could be because we are all in that boat that we don't talk to each other in that way.

I'm not sure who is paying attention. And, I think we're not. Nobody is doing original research. We're not doing much research and writing.

Um, probably not as a department because...I think probably [program director] is. Um...You know, I don't think we as a department, we don't publish alot. Although there are a couple individuals that do. Um..so I think generally they'd probably say no. That we don't do alot of scholarly activity. Yeah, I think if people were to rank some departments, we wouldn't be on the top.

Eminence University

In contrast to their peers at Determination College, faculty informants in the mid-late career sub-culture from Eminence University expressed more confidence in their self-perception as scholars. Although as expressed by one faculty informant, developing an identity as a scholar has been an evolving process:

See, I didn't see myself as a scholar for a long, long time, and I kind of surrounded myself with people that are and they think I am, so I'm OK now.

Two other faculty members confirmed that scholarship is a process that consists of meeting progressive benchmarks as indicators of success with the following comments:

I don't think I've arrived. I think I'm making progress, but I think it's taken longer than I thought. But so, I'm a project coordinator on a grant now, I'm learning the ropes.... That would be my next step to applying for my own grant. So I think I'm on my way... I've had four or five publications this year, but I'm not first author..... So I think I'm getting there, but I'm not arrived.

I've had post-doctoral training... I recently was a K-12 scholar in clinical research...I think I'm on my way there. I think that a successful scholar has certain milestones that you reach in a university setting, and I'm on my way there.... I'm not expected to be there yet...I'm nervous about getting there, but I'm on my way there.

While the research mission and academic standing of Eminence University would be expected to narrow the perspective of scholarship for occupational therapy faculty members, three mid-career faculty informants from Eminence portrayed a broad window of scholarship in their work roles and functions that integrates teaching, research and publishing, and service:

Well, certainly the research is scholarly. And the teaching, I feel that I inject a lot of scholarly work into my teaching and help students understand the role of the scholar. And how scholarly work can guide clinical work, and how they're not separate camps, I see them as important areas to integrate. And then my work with students... sometimes it's things like organizing a fund raiser, or organizing some social events, or organizing a lot of community service work.....

I mean the teaching has become more scholarly as we've become evidence-based. Keeping up with the literature is an important piece now. Maybe it should have always been, but I feel it more now... working on these grants and certainly learning skills that I will use even as I develop my own lines of research. And of course then taking the information and writing the papers is certainly scholarly. I think just about all aspects of what we do is scholarly...

I think all of them are scholarly. And I would define scholarly as promoting knowledge. And whether it's promoting knowledge of the student, promoting knowledge of the agencies that I'm involved with, or promoting my own knowledge. Or sharing aspects of our curriculum, I think it's all scholarly.

A mid-late career informant from Eminence made the connection between the researcher identity and a parallel focus on allegiance to the emerging discipline in response to a question about which faculty activities she considers the most scholarly:

I think research activities are certainly scholarly because they contribute to the discipline.....

Finally, the program director from Eminence highlighted faculty development as an important contribution to scholarship that is unique to the role of director, in the following description of what was considered scholarly in work activities:

My teaching, my research, my development of faculty....a lot of the things that I do out and about in the university I consider scholarly because that's all that they care about around here. I mean you know excellence. The real scholarly stuff of course is the research and teaching.

In comparison to their peers at Determination College, members of mid-late career informant sub-culture at Eminence highlighted the underlying normative challenges at a research institution. The oldest member of this sub-culture reflected on her surprise about:

...OT becoming recognized as an academic discipline in a top university. I mean I strove for it, but we're not here because we're a training program, we're here because we're an academic discipline.

One of the younger members of the mid-late career sub-culture conveyed her surprise about scholarship in this way:

That it's not a transparent process. There's no rule book. There's no trip-tic to help get you from point A to point B. So what surprises me most is that people can do it.

On the issue of whether occupational therapy faculty members are viewed as scholars by others, the data revealed that the faculty members from both settings have found respect as scholars hard to come by. A distinction between the departments

however, is that the Determination College faculty members did not feel particularly hindered by this reality, whereas the faculty informants from Eminence University implied that they have been disadvantaged by how others view them in this highly competitive environment. One informant from Eminence characterized whether occupational therapy faculty compare favorably with other faculty on campus in this way:

Um, I think more so now. I think that certainly [program director] has done a lot to advance...you know, she's just always inviting the Deans to come here to see what we're doing. Or talking to them, or attending the executive faculty meetings. It's all about visibility and getting the programs that we're doing well written up. There's a lot of PR to be done. I do believe that Deans see us as....within the university...as primarily a teaching program.

Yet another faculty member also responding to the question of external respect highlighted a problem at the core of the issue of scholarship in the medical community, i.e. professional hierarchies that place hard/basic fields above soft/applied fields:

If they've worked with us, then they would be much more likely to say yeah...they're really research oriented, they're basing their work on research, they're building on it, they're thinking critically and analytically, they're synthesizing information very effectively they're expanding the field. If they haven't worked with us, they're a lot less likely to appreciate what we do.

In a similar scenario, still another Eminence faculty member portrayed frustration at wanting to be seen as a research scholar and yet being treated as a clinician. She responded to the question of whether occupational therapy faculty are viewed as scholars in this way:

No! I had been on the [disease] team wanting to do research, and had been pretty successful in getting research going and I had like four different projects. And about every three months the head of the [disease] team would call me in....he couldn't come out and directly tell me what he wanted me to do, but I knew very well what he was wanting me to do. He wanted me to provide OT to the kids in his clinic. And I kept saying "you know [program director] allows me come over and do research because I

have students with me and they're learning research. But I'm not your OT clinician for the clinic..... So it's just really odd to me...so no, no...I don't think we're valued at all.

Finally, an informant from Eminence put into perspective how occupational therapy is viewed by others during a reflection on the field's current status. The following comments imply a prism structured from her/his institutional experiences:

I think we're a baby profession...we're just so new at this. And we don't have the depth of history that psychology has....we just don't, and we're struggling with being basically a vocational program, and bringing a science to that.

The perceived disadvantages of working in a professional program especially at a research institution like Eminence University are illustrated in the following narratives.

Comparing her academic position to that of a basic researcher in genetics a faculty informant observed:

.....there's very little teaching required....Mostly his grants cover everything. I think that's really different than a profession where you're training a lot of students at the same time that you're trying to do scholarship. It's not unlike social work or PT or other disciplines like that, but it is different from the basic sciences. [... it sounds like there are some frustrations?] Especially when you are in the same place.... And the expectations for promotion are the same as for him, but we have about a hundred and some students.

Further, the frustrations born of a lack of understanding of what it is like to be a professional faculty member who needs to educate new clinicians for the profession, and simultaneously contribute to the distinction of the department and the institution, another faculty member responded:

..... my only frustrations are trying to explain to my brother in law who taught at Harvard and is at UC Berkely that I really am a faculty member, he doesn't see me as one. Because what I do is not in his mind what you do... do as a faculty member.

The Academic Culture and Faculty Careers

Despite the diversity apparent within the system of higher education, the academic culture in the United States places a high value on the advancement of disciplinary knowledge through faculty research and scholarly productivity regardless of institutional type (Boyer, 1990). One result of this shift toward faculty research has been a devaluation of the teaching role in faculty rewards. Acknowledging that this standard exists at Eminence University, one informant commented that:

You might be the worst teacher in the world, but they'll never fire you if you have money coming in and you're publishing. Sorry, I'm being really pragmatic here.

While also acknowledging the distinction between espoused and enacted value of teaching at Eminence, another faculty informant leaves the door open for a re-evaluation of the teaching role at this institution:

So the institution we're immersed in doesn't value teaching. I don't think they really falsely lead us on tenure, it really is they're looking at publications, money, international presentations. I think that they don't... they say we value teaching, but here's the rubric you're gonna be... judged on. So I think everyone who works here thinks it's pretty clear. In fact, it was just this year that they've now started having teaching awards that the Dean hands out. So it's never been on the front burner. [Do you think they're beginning to question themselves on this a little bit?]. Yeah, I don't know why... actually that's an interesting question....why all of a sudden this is emerging. Except that we're losing good people, because NIH money is getting tighter, so....

Further complicating the development of academic careers are the findings that faculty research productivity is increasing across the institutional hierarchy, suggesting that institutions are becoming isomorphic with respect to pressures for faculty to spend more time on research (Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000; Dey, Milem & Berger, 1997). The data in this study provides some support for the trend identified in the literature. For

example, the faculty from Determination College noted that they are experiencing a subtle shift in the norms toward support and acknowledgement of research and publishing. Illustrating the concept of *institutional drift*, one informant discussed what is occurring at the college in this way:

I think the whole college is...kind of view of itself is changing, they want to see more research, they want to see more scholarship. Um, they're encouraging that, it's an evolution at this point. This is a college which has been big into athletics and coaching, and I'm seeing in that area, there's an awful lot more being published about their research projects. I think that the, ah, the allied health area is going to be next to push on more of that kind of scholarship, in some fashion I'm not sure how its...what it's going to look like.

Given that Determination College is a respected mid-level institution in the academic hierarchy, it is not surprising that the college community is responding to the pressures of the academic culture by beginning to hire faculty in some programs who are expected to conduct research and publish. However, one of the faculty members who perceives that research has not been institutionalized into the faculty reward structure, conveyed the realities of developing a researcher role on the Determination campus in this way:

I feel that we don't really get any support to do research and it would be nice to have that support. I mean we are not supported time wise, and we are not given...very little support money wise, and yet the college is very thrilled to have people doing research and very thrilled to be able to broadcast to the world, 'Look at the research we are doing.' But we are not given that support..... If you asked for reassigned time, and a reduction in salary then you can have time off [to do research]. I cannot have a reduction in salary ...and to wait for my sabbatical, I mean that will be many years in between...to be able to wait for a research project....here it is kind of like if you can squeeze it in amongst everything else you are doing. Go right ahead... we will be happy to take the credit for it....

A second faculty member from this master's institution provided additional observations to indicate that any change in the expectations for faculty work has not been codified into the practices and reward structure:

...to be promoted there are certain areas that you can excel in and research is one of them, but it's not necessary. I think to become a full professor you have to excel in all of them. So, I'll probably end up staying at the Associate level. But teaching is...this college does profess that teaching is the most important. I mean we've got a lot of teachers for each of the students, whereas if you go into a research university you have teaching fellows teaching the students, and that doesn't happen here and certainly not in OT. I mean it happens here a little bit, but not in OT.

Another faculty member from Determination succinctly portrayed her limited identity as a researcher as she described the reality of daily life for occupational therapy faculty on this campus:

When the workload exceeds the resources of the faculty...the scholarly stuff goes away.... which seems to be a continual situation here.

The faculty narratives report that involvement in research activities is not a part of the everyday work routine at Determination College. However, the collective faculty group view themselves as doing many scholarly activities, some of which are related to research, and some of which are not. Further, with respect to their professional identity, two of the five faculty members view themselves as researchers, although only one of them has published. Moreover, the faculty group as a whole remains skeptical that Determination College is a place where their development as research scholars is likely to happen. Consequently, how the incongruities in the values of the academic culture are reconciled with the cultural realities of a master's institution like Determination College is important for the development of faculty careers. The comments of one faculty member from Determination indicates an understanding of the norm for research to

promote the status of disciplines and institutions, yet underscores her dilemma regarding how to achieve that goal:

That is really frustrating and you know if they would like us to bring more prestige to the college by writing books, by writing articles, by doing... I mean you need time, you can't do this all in your own time after work. Because you need a life, and you have a family....

In contrast to the structural and cultural barriers that limit the faculty members at Determination from meeting academic or personal goals for developing research skills, one issue at Eminence is supporting a professional identity for faculty as disciplinary scholars. The notion implies that occupational therapy faculty members have a responsibility as scholars to advance the mission of institutions, and to contribute to the distinction of their discipline within academic departments. To provide guidance for the faculty on need to subordinate a sense of "me" to permit a sense of "we" as they evolve as disciplinary scholars, the program director from Eminence brought in a consultant to talk to the faculty about building an academic career:

And we had this two hour meeting that was really phenomenal, in which she didn't let people get away without getting a sense that they were building their careers, but they're also building the strength of this program. And that, there was a young person....who said, *I have to be concerned about my career*. And she posed questions that they had to answer, what you want to be known for 10 years from now, but also what you will have brought to the table, and that you are being paid to do something for the university, in the process you're going to have your growth.

This study provides data to indicate that disadvantages have accrued to the faculty informants based upon a delayed development of a researcher identity. Although faculty informant views are mixed regarding the perceived disadvantages that they face in their institutional settings based upon their status as scholars, and the disadvantages of past differential treatment, this data provides insights into why the development of

disciplinary scholars has been slow in occupational therapy. While some impacts of a limited professional identity may be apparent to faculty as they advance their careers, other consequences may not even be considered.

Career Mobility

High level institutions routinely compete for faculty who have established research careers, publication histories and grant money to contribute. Consequently, within the academic culture career mobility is an indicator of academic success. To understand how faculty members with differing priorities for teaching, research and service roles view mobility as a measure of faculty development, the faculty informants were asked if they had ever considered taking faculty positions at other institutions to advance their academic careers. The responses of the informants from the mid-late career sub-culture suggest that getting ahead in the academic culture by upgrading to a more prestigious institution is not a notion to which they have given serious consideration. This suggests that although achieving a successful career as a faculty member within the context of their institutions is valued, advancing their careers according to the standards of the academic culture may not be. Whether this represents an additional disadvantage for occupational therapy faculty for whom research identities and reputations are lacking is unclear.

Analysis of the narrative data from this study revealed that 93% of the faculty group who are occupational therapists reported that the institutional site in which they currently work is the college or university in which they began their academic careers. However, the two non-clinician informants reported working in 4 and 2 institutions,

respectively, over the course of their careers. These findings suggest that while some faculty groups change institutions to advance their careers, the occupational therapy faculty members in this study are not one of those groups. One of the non-clinician informants at Eminence University expressed frustration with the consensus view amongst occupational therapy academics regarding the recruitment of respected occupational therapy researchers from other institutions:

And then the other thing that we're working against is people have the impression that someone isn't moveable. So they'll say...when we're talking among the OT's I'll say who are the best people in your field, that's who you ought to be trying to recruit. And they say "oh no, that person would never leave there." And I say, "make them an offer they can't refuse and let them decide if they want to move. Make them an offer that they had not even considered was possible. And that's not in the psyche..... And I think gender is wrapped up in that too. People think you're not moveable if you have kids or they think you're not moveable because you're spouse isn't moveable. And I'm like... you guys are crazy.

This frustration was reiterated by the program director at Eminence when asked if academic career mobility was important for occupational therapy. She responded:

I definitely do because that's how an academic environment works. You recruit people who have expertise to fill voids but you bring your money with you. The problem is that people aren't building their academic careers with money that's transferable, or even money. Coming here... right now we've got a mid-level position open and it's for somebody who is a scientist. I've got to have an OT scientist, I've got to...I can no longer... Grow..grow..grow, grow [laughter, you've got to have some who are already grown?]. We grow our babies, but we can't grow the middle. There are starting to be people who can do that, which is kind of exciting. Have a grant history... maybe even bring grants with them.

Highlighting the personal issues and changing professional priorities associated with a decision to move to another institution, one faculty member from Determination College reflected upon her decision to stay in this way:

Until now I've always rejected the offers because I was comfortable here....There are days when I'd be gone in a heartbeat.... But overall this

is better for me. It's more personal than professional now. I've done a lot of stuff that has contributed to the world, and now I have kids...and I'm already working full time. And so wouldn't it be disingenuous if I kept pushing my career over them. I don't feel like I need it ...maybe I would...but I'd be too old. I don't feel this huge need to achieve academically or to be recognized anymore. The answer is I don't know.

However, the data provides some indication that career immobility may be changing as younger faculty take root in academic departments. The comments from one early career informant illustrated the view that the current academic market is ripe for following a research area to another institution, and that this is something to which he/she has given consideration, despite finding the current institutional fit to be a good one:

Well, especially in OT programs right now, if you have a Ph.D. and you have some research money you can pretty much go where ever... and that's nice, it's a good thing.

I think one of the reasons that I haven't left here yet, is because I feel like I fit here, and finding that fit other places I'm having a difficult time seeing how my interests and the level where I'm at right now...of where I'd go.... And I don't see other places being able to be fit at the level that I fit here. And so I definitely have looked around at what else is out there.

The observations of the other early career informant conveyed a similar perception of being contented with the current institutional fit. However, this faculty member acknowledged that the faculty profile is likely to change over the next 10 years as current faculty members retire. Thus, this informant is open to the possibility of following career opportunities in the future:

I really don't see myself doing it. I know that a lot of academics do it. I haven't ruled it out, but at the same time, to me it's much more of a value to have roots somewhere and to really entrench yourself in a program through good and bad. Over time that might change. Now, I don't know what the future holds. I mean you come into a faculty where the average faculty age is 55, so a lot of people around here who I'm working with won't be here for my whole career. But right now that's not a value.

Despite known and unconsidered barriers to the successful pursuit of an academic career, some faculty members in both institutional settings have overcome the shortcomings in their academic training and professional experiences to develop as successful disciplinary scholars. Thus, other explanations must exist for how faculty members challenge themselves to assume an identity as a researcher. Given that faculty members have made sense of their professional identity amidst an array of institutional forces and external influences from the academic and the professional culture, suggests that the departmental culture and the leadership of the program director may play a vital role.

Department as Nexus

The higher education literature suggests that the academic department is an important context for organizational socialization that occurs after faculty members take positions at colleges and universities (Wulff & Austin, 2004; Tierney & Rhoades, 1993; Clark, 1987). In addition, departmental socialization processes support faculty adjustment to the academic role, and are the mechanisms thru which institutional culture is manifested (Braxton & Berger, 1999). Alpert (1991) further substantiated the role of the academic department in mediating between the competing interests of the institutional culture and the disciplinary communities who exert considerable influence from outside of the institution.

Acknowledging the imbalance that favors disciplinary research over teaching in research institutions, Alpert (1991) believed that elevating the value of teaching in academic departments could be achieved by increasing financial incentives for teachers

in university settings. Based upon the data analysis from this study however, a contrasting contention for the role of academic departments may be more appropriate. That is, given the salient influence of the professional culture in the form of program accreditation and national certification testing for program graduates in occupational therapy, the external pressure to prioritize teaching remains high for this profession's faculty members. Furthermore, findings from this study suggest that an imbalance that favors teaching over research for occupational therapy faculty members is the current norm. The implications of this analysis at a time when research evidence to support current practice and beyond demands a shift that favors research, is important for the development of future faculty in occupational therapy (Stark, 1998; Stoecker, 1993).

Socialization as a Manifestation of Departmental Culture

Research on the traditional disciplines indicates that anticipatory socialization to the academic role begins during doctoral training, and continues as processes within the academic department such as formal professional development planning and mentorship and informal experiences including peer support and modeling (Weidman & Stein, 2003; Tierney & Rhoades, 1994). Analysis of the data for the composite informant group indicated that primary and secondary sources of socialization differentiated the faculty sub-cultures.

The non-therapist sub-culture conformed to the pattern established in the traditional disciplines, i.e. pursued doctoral training to become socialized to the expectations of the academic role, and then consolidated their professional identities within the academic departments in which they have worked. In contrast, socialization to

the academic role for the mid-to-late career informant sub-culture occurred first in the academic department within which they were hired as new faculty members. Only many years later did they continue their socialization as they pursued doctoral training. The comments from one mid-late career informant from Eminence about her decision to return for a doctorate after teaching for many years, reflects the influence of the university context in which she found herself, as well as the external influence of the academic culture and the professional culture:

I really think that at this university, research is heavily valued.... By the 1990's it was definitely that we needed to be a more research focused faculty here.... as well as professionally, I think there was that push also. And as we were all moving toward master's level entry even back then, there was the importance you know, if you wanted to continue in an academic position the expectation was going to be to have a degree higher than the level that you're teaching. And I did value the research, I think again that's something that I've...and I've been around for so long, and it was a slow process.

A mid-late career faculty member from Determination College discussed her entry into academia and into an unaccredited professional program. In the following comments, she alludes to the value that she places on early mentoring despite the fact that her academic mentors were outside of the profession:

I would say certainly when I first came here I was like in awe.... I mean I could not believe that I had this job as a college professor. What am I doing here? Me? Little old me? So I would say that my mentor that I had here, immediately, because the department was trying to get accredited, and I didn't have anything in my background that was teaching I mean it was straight OT all the way through. I actually had two mentors...both of them had a very big influence...both of them were outside the OT department, one was in the education department and one was in the rehabilitation department.... I did feel like I was at a crossroads in my career just wanting something more, but wasn't quite sure what it was. So when I heard about taking this position, I thought, well great that will give me the avenue that I needed to really pursue something, of doing something new and innovative, which is what I always enjoyed doing.

And then I had a very hard time trying to figure out what I wanted to pursue for my doctoral work.

One of the purposes of this study was to explicate the sensemaking process used by occupational therapy faculty members in academic departments to achieve a scholarly fit (Harris, 1994; Weick, 2001). The beliefs and values about faculty work that are manifested in normative practices and informal interactions with disciplinary peers represent the final stage of socialization as part of academic training (Clark & Corcoran, 1986). The faculty informants in this case study identified the values and norms of the academic department as being instrumental in shaping their views of faculty work and what is considered scholarly.

Faculty narratives across settings coalesced around the department as the place where the needs of the professional culture for practitioners is met, where contributions to the professional community are made, and where professional knowledge is defined and developed by disciplinary scholars (Sieg, 1986). The data analysis revealed formal structures such as faculty appointments, departmental goals, and annual faculty performance evaluations as influential in the development of work priorities. Further, informal processes such as discussions at lunch with a peer, e-mail communications with a mentor, and casual interactions with the program director have also contributed to their scholarly identity as faculty members. Because the department is the place where faculty priorities for scholarship are institutionalized, it was important to analyze how each department directs role development relative to responsibility for sustaining practitioner growth versus commitment to developing knowledge for disciplinary advancement.

Primary socialization for the mid-late career informants occurred as on the job training in academic departments, and the majority of these faculty members have only

worked in one institution. Thus, the one departmental culture in which they have been socialized is viewed as having a formative influence on shaping a professional identity for these faculty members. In the case of Eminence University, the strongest influences on the development of faculty roles were reported to be peer support, modeling and mentorship, and the leadership of the program director in supporting the institutional mission. As for Determination College, faculty roles were shaped by professional accreditation, clinical training, mentoring, and modeling by the program director.

Consequently, the departmental processes experienced by faculty members as they learned their roles and responsibilities have provided a foundation for the development of faculty careers. That is, the guidance and expectations of the program director for building disciplinary scholars, combined with peer support for skills in grant writing, clinical research, and publication in addition to teaching, has made adjustment to the researcher role easier for the faculty informants from Eminence. On the other hand, departmental expectations for student recruitment and retention, curriculum development, and service learning, has made adjustment to teaching as the primary faculty role most comfortable for the faculty informants from Determination College. How departmental cultures harness the personal goals of individual faculty members into a commitment to a common responsibility for shared disciplinary goals, was also analyzed.

Individual faculty differences on the enactment of research activities as part of the faculty role were found to be linked to departmental setting in this study. At Determination College for instance, barriers to conducting research and publishing included age, family commitments, and a reluctance to accept the trade-offs in reduced time for service activities and teaching preparation that would be required. In contrast,

although age and raising a family were also identified as limitations to a research career at Eminence, the desire for challenges, the need to prove oneself and achieve academic success, and the pursuit of personal fulfillment in conducting research and publishing, were factors cited for overcoming the barriers. However, these views need to be interpreted in light of the level of support for research activities at the two institutions.

In the case of Determination College, the informants have achieved academic success by being promoted and earning tenure without becoming researchers. In addition, there is no tradition of building research careers in the professional programs at the college. Thus, there is little personal or peer incentive to develop the researcher role. Furthermore, although an institutional infrastructure to support research activities is being launched, it remains limited. Consequently, because personal preferences for faculty development are being accommodated, individual faculty members are at liberty to define scholarship on their own terms:

I think also the whole concept of scholarship... when I decided that I wasn't going to go toward a doctoral degree, I knew that I needed to have a very clear contribution. It may not take the form of a Ph.D., but I needed to demonstrate that I had a contribution, not only to the department here but to the whole profession.

Moreover, the data from this study suggests that adding faculty research to the existing norms of the teaching and service mission is far from imminent. Rather, the institutionalized structures and the departmental socialization processes that are driven by the realities of limited time for research given high teaching loads and excessive student advising roles, run counter to providing opportunities such as post-doctoral training for faculty members to further shape research careers.

Eminence University, on the other hand, has a reputation for research excellence within the higher education system, and provides clear expectations for academic scholarship and institutional support for promoting research careers. The level of status and reward afforded to research scholars within Eminence University provides an explanation for why the faculty informants hold a positive outlook on the need for personal compromises. Further, faculty at Eminence benefit from external acknowledgement associated with being in a respected academic department in a high status institution. This heightened opportunity however, is associated with the responsibility for conforming to the same institutional standards for faculty research and publications as other, more powerful professional groups, e.g. medical doctors. These conditions provide a context for understanding why fewer of the Eminence informants, as compared to their Determination College counterparts, have senior faculty status or are tenured. Illustrating the perceived difficulties of being an emerging practice discipline in a medical school environment, one of early career faculty informants remarked:

I think sometimes we're a little bit...not really a lost soul, but misunderstood across all the other programs. And so we're trying even harder to show that we're doing all these great things here because I don't think people always get it, like "oh, that's a science too?" But there is definitely a very high standard at this university for scholarly work and research work, and I think we're right there. And [program director] pushes.....

An additional measure of how successfully the departmental culture is shaping a professional identity is by analyzing how faculty members view the prioritization of faculty work.

Faculty Priorities

It is the accepted norm within the academic culture that faculty roles and rewards are predicated on academic performance in the areas of teaching, research and service. However, because departmental goals differ based upon distinct institutional missions, the prioritization of faculty roles and work functions in the three performance areas would be expected to differ accordingly. Moreover, the standing of each institution within the hierarchy of higher education would also be expected to influence how individual faculty members perceive their faculty responsibilities. For example, the remarks of one of the early career informants indicate how the status of Eminence University has impacted her identity:

Especially in this community, it's funny the words [Eminence] carry a lot of weight around here..... But, I think, definitely having [Eminence] program in OT under my name automatically gives me, I don't know what, a little more recognition, maybe, so....

In addition, one mid-late career faculty informant from Eminence cleverly portrayed the domains of faculty work and provided a glimpse of departmental priorities in this way:

Well, I think I heard people talk about Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston looking for triple threat. Teaching, research and service. And we want people who are in the trenches, and also teaching about the trenches, and doing research to make better trenches or to build the trenches or whatever. And I guess I see it more as triple opportunity. And I don't think I would want to be working in a place that had only service, I don't think I'd want to be working in a place that had only teaching, and I wouldn't want to be working in a place that was only research. I'm glad that we have all three. And I think that there's emphasis on really integrating the three. At least that's the interpretation that I have. And depending on who you talk to you may get different angles.

Also supportive of the view that the departmental focus on faculty work at Eminence is a balanced one, another mid-late career faculty member whose appointment distinguishes her primary role as researcher put forward this view:

Everybody teaches, some people do teaching and research, some people teach and do clinical work and some people do teaching, research and clinical work. They're all viewed as important. It is an intertwined relationship, and it is viewed as such here.

The above views notwithstanding, the majority of faculty members from Eminence reported that the institution and the department prioritizes faculty work as research, followed by teaching, with little emphasis on service. Characterizing the need to prioritize research based on faculty appointment and the institutional demand for departments to be self-supporting, another faculty informant at Eminence remarked:

Well, I mean you have to pay for yourself. You have to find a way to pay for yourself, and your benefits. I teach more than anybody I think here, at 50%. I don't think that any faculty teaches more than me. So, I don't think that it's possible to teach more than 50% here.And so for me the teaching and the research seem to be pretty even. You have other faculty that are 100% research. And so the research is where it's at. And so if I was going to say what the priority is here, I would have to say it was research. Just because out of the whole faculty, there are people that that's all they do. And there's no one here who just teaches. I would have to say that research is the number one and teaching is the number two.... But to me, clinical practice is on the bottom of our list here, as far as faculty members go. Not that it's not important, but we use our clinical practice to support our research and our teaching....but it's definitely the bottom on the priority.

The prioritization of faculty work in the academic department at Eminence appears to be a good fit for some of the faculty informants, and more of a struggle for others. For example, the faculty informant's from this institution who place the highest value on research activities also happen to be the most experienced researchers who completed their doctorates at least 15 years ago, and are also the most successful academics, i.e. are tenured, and/or hold the rank of associate or assistant professor. Conversely, those faculty informants who entered academia to teach and who became instructors with little or no research training or doctoral socialization to guide them, have

been slower to put aside personal priorities and fulfillment associated with teaching to embrace the researcher role. Moreover, some informants who entered doctoral education as mid or late-career faculty in response to the realities of changing academic and professional expectations are finding the priorities of Eminence to be challenging.

Consequently, in those situations where there has been congruity between personal goals, socialization to the academic norms of research training in doctoral education, and continued departmental socialization on knowledge building to advance the discipline and the institution, the coinciding influences have contributed to informants from Eminence who highly value the researcher role. In contrast to the ordering of faculty priorities at Eminence University, the teaching mission of Determination College sets the stage for a focus on practitioner training in this master's institution.

There was consensus in the faculty group from Determination College that the departmental emphasis for faculty work is ordered as teaching, service and then research. Illustrating the point that priority one is teaching and students advising, one of the faculty members from Determination described her multi-faceted work activities and what she values in this way:

Um, because part...a good chunk of my job is running the undergraduate programs I do alot of administrative types of work. What else?
...depending upon the courses that I teach, there are different levels of research that I need to do to keep up with them. Um...I like in my classes to have alot of Level I experiences [fieldwork], although many of them are not long term, so that it requires alot of organization to send students out to one visit here and one visit there...as well as students knocking at the door.....I don't want to say I'm too busy....certainly the door is open most of the time. Advising them... the undergrads have a slew of courses that they need to fit in.... I think I counted 60 appointments the last registration... And its lots of problem solving you know...I like all parts of my job. I don't think there's any part that I don't like.

The need to socialize students in clinical sites and the role that faculty members play in acquiring sites and training clinical supervisors adds a dimension to the faculty role in occupational therapy that is unique to practice disciplines. Alluding to the role of clinical socialization in the teaching process, a faculty member from Determination discussed the work activities that she values the most:

...the ones that I value the most are the success of seeing a student go from being a student to a clinician, and that happens during Level II Fieldwork. Um, and we bring them back after the end of Level II Fieldwork, and we have a seminar, and at the end of that, so we really see a lot of progress. Um, so, that's the thing that I value the highest. Probably the next thing that I value is the advisement that I do with students and then the teaching that I do. And then, probably what I value the lowest is the administration. You know, it's just a fact of life, it has to be done, and it has to be done well.

Another faculty member from Determination College focused on an issue that is most relevant to mid-level institutions that rely on a steady supply of students for financial viability, i.e. the impact of the student profile on teaching:

.....originally we started with older students, and more uh experienced students. And then as the job market changed, then we were reverting more to, to more undergraduate students coming up through the ranks who were certainly not as mature, who were certainly not as versed in the world. Um.. some of them were very good students, a lot of them weren't I mean they still needed to grow up and learn how to be OT's, both. So certainly that has affected our teaching and the way we provide information now and our expectations, because of what the student can legitimately accomplish in the amount of time.....I mean like you know they do not have the life experience to be able to grasp some of the concepts that we're talking about.

These faculty narratives have supported the role that departmental socialization processes play in how faculty members develop their work roles. However, to understand whether faculty work priorities have been institutionalized, it is also important to assess faculty scholarship outcomes.

Faculty Scholarship Outcomes

According to Boyer (1990), it is important that faculty members develop as scholars regardless of their institutional setting. Further, Boyer established the premise that diverse institutional contexts and missions required varied expectations and priorities for faculty work. Toward this end, an expanded definition of scholarship that includes faculty outcomes in teaching, discovery, integration and application was developed. The expanded view of scholarship prescribed that faculty from different types of institutions would pursue the domains of scholarship that most easily fit the norms of their institutional type and departmental culture. Thus, although the areas of scholarship are not mutually exclusive, faculty in research institutions would be expected to publish in the domain of discovery, while faculty in teaching institutions would be more likely to publish in the domain of teaching.

Braxton, Luckey & Helland (2002), extended Boyer's work on the parameters of scholarship by developing an inventory to study how faculty work is being carried out across the United States. The inventory of scholarship documents a broader range of what constitutes scholarship than previous research in occupational therapy, thereby permitting a more inclusive profile of faculty work to be considered (Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Paul, Liu and Ottenbacher, 2002) (See Appendix D). Inventory data was analyzed to determine if the occupational therapy faculty members in this study are meeting Boyer's prescriptives for successful faculty scholarship. The inventory of scholarship data is also helpful for isolating the type of scholarly activities in which the informant groups have been involved. See Table 3 for the analysis of the inventory data from the informant group from Determination College.

Table 3: Departmental analysis of scholarship inventory data from Determination College

	Teaching	Application	Integration	Discovery	Totals
Publications	1	3	1	0	5
Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes	29	13	7	2	51
Scholarly Activities	39	21			59

Inventory data on publications indicates that the faculty membership at Determination reported a total of 5 publications. 2 of the 5 faculty members published at least one article, and the program director published 3. The articles that were categorized in the domain of application included one that focused on bridging theory and practice, and the others that reported the findings of research designed to solve practical problems. The teaching publication was on the use of a new instructional method. The program director is viewed by her faculty peers as the most scholarly member of the faculty group. The program director intends to pursue further research activities because of an interest in promotion to full professor.

Consistent with the mission of Determination, the highest number of scholarly activities and unpublished scholarly outcomes were conducted within the domain of teaching. The type of scholarly activities included: developing new courses and preparing new syllabi; reading the current literature and using it to prepare lectures; designing and revising laboratory assignments; face to face mentoring and advising of students; supervising students at clinical sites; and directing student research projects. The unpublished scholarly outcomes in the area of teaching included: conference or seminar presentation on a new instructional technique to colleagues; developing a collection of resource materials in one's area of clinical expertise; experimenting with

innovative teaching or class management problems; or developing case-based scenarios to assist students with learning difficult concepts.

The data analysis reveals that faculty members at Determination are producing scholarly activities and outcomes in teaching that is indicative of a well developed clinician-teacher role. Thus, if indicators of successful scholarship are extended to unpublished performance outcomes then the faculty informants at Determination College can be viewed as functioning at a much higher level of scholarly engagement, than if publications alone are considered. Yet, the lack of publications, especially in the domain area of teaching, suggests less success in the development of a researcher role. As a teaching institution, research and publications in the domain of teaching would seem to be a reasonable platform from which to earn promotion and to establish themselves as disciplinary scholars.

As an applied discipline that is strongly driven by the socio-medical environment and service to society, it is not surprising that the faculty members from Determination recorded the second highest number of unpublished outcomes and scholarly activities in the domain of application. The unpublished scholarship outcomes that the faculty members at Determination are enacting include: educational seminars conducted for the community on an area related to health, wellness or rehabilitation; development of a new process for approaching a clinical practice problem; and conducting studies for local professional organizations to increase disability awareness or understanding of occupational therapy services. Thus, the data revealed that the Determination faculty group is producing documented outcomes that are acknowledged by the academic culture, despite the fact that they are not published. The application activities reported

include departmental service on college-wide committees, involvement in producing a self-study for the department or college-wide accreditation reviews, or studies to formulate institutional or departmental policy.

A total of 9 unpublished scholarly outcomes were reported in the domain of integration (7), and discovery (2). Unpublished outcomes related to knowledge integration included lectures on an occupational therapy area of practice for a local community college, business organization, professional association, or college alumni group. The discovery outcomes that remain unpublished included a presentation of research findings designed to gain new knowledge, and a report on research findings to a granting agency.

See Table 4 for an analysis of the inventory data from the faculty informants from Eminence University. The analysis revealed a total of 63 publications. Every faculty informant reported at least one publication, and the Eminence informant group as a whole averaged just over 6 publications per faculty member. The largest number of publications had to do with research that was applied to practical problems (31). The publications in the domain of application include articles that: reported findings of research; described new knowledge; applied new knowledge; or proposed an approach to bridging theory and practice.

Table 4: Departmental analysis of the scholarship inventory data from Eminence University

	Teaching	Application	Integration	Discovery	Totals
Publications	3	31	17	12	63
Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes	42	25	13	16	96
Scholarly Activities	81	38			119

Publications were also reported in the areas of integration (17) and discovery (12). Integration publications included a book chapter on the application of a theory borrowed from an academic discipline outside of occupational therapy; and articles that crosses subject matter lines. The discovery publications included articles that outline a new research problem or describe a new theory developed by the author. The domain of discovery also includes a book or refereed journal article reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge, and a report on research findings to a granting agency.

The high level of scholarly activities (81) and unpublished outcomes (42) related to teaching reinforces the views expressed by the informants from Eminence, that teaching is valued and consumes a large amount of faculty time. Given that such a high level of research productivity is reported for the informant group as a whole, the small number of publications related to teaching appears to suggest that teaching scholarship is not a highly valued research area.

Peer support and modeling by the program directors from both settings emerged as a salient influence on professional identity in occupational therapy faculty members in this study. Both program directors produced the most publications in their respective informant groups, and while one of them has earned full professor status and tenure, the other is tenured, and plans to earn promotion to full professor in the future. Thus, the role of leadership in guiding faculty professional development has implications for the development of future faculty in occupational therapy.

The Role of Leadership

Alpert (1991) suggests that understanding the beliefs of program directors about what is important in faculty work is the first step toward changing faculty rewards that favor disciplinary research over teaching. However, even program administrators who espouse the value of teaching are discovering that acting as a counterweight to an academic culture that narrowly rewards research as a single norm for faculty work, remains a problem in search of a solution (Fairweather, 1993). Because the largest sub-cultural group of faculty members in this study, i.e. mid-late career sub-culture favors the teaching role, these occupational therapy informants are characterized as a professional group that runs counter to the norms of the traditional disciplines. Thus, the findings of this study suggest that program directors in occupational therapy may need to modulate faculty interests away from the clinician-teaching role towards a more comprehensive identity that includes research.

Given the importance of departmental leaders in shaping faculty scholarship, this study analyzed the views of the program directors about their roles and faculty member's perceptions about their leaders. The data analysis from this study revealed differences based upon institutional setting in how program directors view faculty responsibilities relative to a commitment to educating practitioners and contributing knowledge to the applied discipline. Incongruities with respect to what each program director views as his/her role within each institutional context emerged from the data. The director's role at Determination College is more circumscribed in its scope, and highlighted by a focus on building a regional reputation as an educational program, and a commitment to excellence in training practitioners. Whereas, the program director's responsibilities at

Eminence require more breadth of responsibility that is highlighted by a focus on shaping disciplinary scholars, in addition to maintaining a national reputation for the educational opportunities that its program provides.

Revealing the values and norms of a teaching institution, the program director from Determination College suggested that what she values most about her position is her ability to be student-focused:

Because some people question how you can stand being the chair. But there are a lot of things I really love about being chair. One of the things I love the most is that I have just that much more authority that I can use to help a student who is having a problem. Because of the relationships we've built up with the registrar and other offices, I can make a phone call and help a student out of a fix.

Further implicating the influence of the more accommodating institutional culture at Determination College on leadership roles, the following rationale was provided by the program director regarding the view that standards for faculty rewards should differ by discipline:

Well, let's see, there have been some faculty committees that review curriculum and faculty status.....promotion and tenure. Some of these decisions are now being made on the school level...and the reason for that, um.....different expectations for different disciplines might be what should count for tenure. Those are faculty committees established by our faculty governance process across all of the schools. Those are only recommendations, and then it goes to the Dean....and the Chief Academic Officer, and a certain amount of that is driven by budget...So, if the expectations are different for biology than they are for OT it's because we're in different schools. I think that the value of that is recognizing that scholarship is different depending upon the discipline

Also contributing to beliefs about differing standards for faculty promotion and tenure by discipline, is the dilemma that is facing occupational therapy departments of growing faculty with doctorates in situ. The program director from Determination acknowledged the challenges to individual faculty members when she noted:

And so you start and carry out and finish a doctorate while you're working full-time, is that conducive to levels of scholarly productivity? Not according to many academic institutions. But the last 10 years there are more people going back and earning doctoral degrees.

In contrast to the influence of a "striving college" on the leadership of occupational therapy programs, the institutional mission of Eminence University demands that program directors concern themselves with different issues including university recognition, financial self-sufficiency with external funding, and developing disciplinary scholars. For example, in the following comments from the program director at Eminence University regarding the role of the administrator, the value of "fitting in" is illustrated:

Because as a program director you are a mentor of a faculty, you have to build a faculty. You don't have people, you have to build it..... And so another thing you have to be as a program director when there isn't a fit, or isn't an understanding, you have to be kind, but bold..... And I think we've been able to do things here because we've worked hard to fit in..[to the institution?] ...yeah, and its culture.

Likewise, self-reflecting on the strategies that have been necessary to lead a department in this research university context, the program director from Eminence remarked:

Sometimes I have to be pretty firm with some things that need to be done.. that they [faculty] might not have thought through as well as I wish they had. But everybody's really busy...I mean everybody is. I mean this is not an easy environment. Because they have so many responsibilities.[It's not a place for the light of heart, huh?] No, or somebody who wants a job. I mean you'd die, and you'd probably kill me if you just wanted a job. It just doesn't work that way, because everybody has to be striving for excellence. Because that's what we get recognized for.

In a further reference to a pragmatic mind set that governs thinking about administrative responsibilities at Eminence University, the program director reflected:

Well, one of the things you have to ask and this goes back to your person environment fit is do you have the infrastructure within your university to be able to submit and manage grants?..... We're about to put in a half-time

grants administrator because we now have more grants. So, you know, it's a business. And you've got to be in a position to have a business supporting your passion or it doesn't work. And I think that there's a lot of faculty here who have a lot of passion for what they're doing, and, so we have to support everybody.

Finally, using a pragmatic approach to leadership born of the necessity of the competitive environment at Eminence University, the program director noted:

Not only do we control our own budget, but we control our own income that generates the money for the budget. [And so without generating that income, there wouldn't be a program here?] That is true. And that is proven by the way the [type of school] school was closed, and most recently the [type of school] school was closed. [Type of school] had settled into just training students, they weren't building a discipline, and they didn't have external funds, and they didn't have promotable faculty. It's a very demanding and difficult environment, so it has to attract people who want to take on multiple roles.

Departmental leadership has an important part to play in maintaining the status quo or in creating change relative to faculty work roles and faculty department planning (Fairweather, 1993). The data analysis from this study underscores distinctions in philosophical outlook as conveyed by the program directors, and in leadership style and approach as conveyed by the faculty members about their departmental leaders. For example, the program director from Eminence described an interaction that took place with the Chancellor over 15 years ago. During this meeting, she developed a goal for the occupational therapy program to meet the established standards of the university, and not to request special or differential treatment. In recalling this meeting with the Chancellor, the program director provides a glimpse into an emerging leadership role:

And as he left the room, I walked down the hallway with him and I said, you know, I'm really thrilled that you came, we really want to know you. But there's something that I have to say, and I don't exactly know how this is going to happen, but it's going to be really important for us for you understand that we're building an academic discipline and that the

excellence that you demand out of every program at this university.....
that we will have here. And he said you show me. Now.....there is.

Offering a different vantage, the following comments from the program director from Determination College encapsulate how structural change within the institution, i.e. situating a lower status professional program within a disciplinary school, prior to creating a school for professional programs, shaped departmental leadership:

The other thing that happened was that our department had been part of the School of Arts, Sciences and Professional Studies. And academic affairs organized so that we had a separate school for OT, PT, PA and Rehabilitation and Emergency Medical Services Management. We'd now have our own Dean. And he was somebody that I went to [name of university] with, although he was in the PT program. It's been wonderful to have someone who knows and understand what we do and advocating for us. I've been thinking about this, but I feel valued by him in a way that other bosses have not. I think that's the single most important thing about making me feel good about being here.

The data analysis from this study illustrates how the role of program director diverges by institutional type on the issue of faculty development. Whereas the program director from Eminence University views it as a responsibility to develop faculty members as disciplinary scholars, the program director from Determination College appears less duty-bound to develop faculty scholars. The role of the institutional mission in shaping a view of leadership responsibility is evident in the narratives of the program directors. For instance, the program director from Eminence understands the importance of the basic sciences to the mission of the institution. Thus, to establish a power niche for the program and the faculty in this environment requires specific leadership functions. In the following discussion, the program director acknowledged relationship building within the campus community as a responsibility and a valued role that is necessary for faculty development:

And I think what continues to be a surprise to me, is how rational and reasonable people are about the importance of what we do, but how easy it is to be lost to people who are biomedical scientists and you just have to keep it in front of their face all of the time. And in order to get my people promoted I have had to form incredible relationships with people from the executive faculty, so that they even begin to understand what people over here do so that they can get promoted. Because the procedure for promotion can't come from the department it has to go through the executive faculty of medicine, and so I have to construct committees of people who understand what we're trying to do and I have to keep those relationships all the time.... And it takes a lot of work, it does.

The faculty informants from Eminence University uniformly agree that the program director's leadership and vision has provided the impetus for the program's success within the institutional environment, and for its recognition within the national professional community. Furthermore, the program director has served as a "role model" for their developing identity as disciplinary scholars. In an example of the program director's commitment to supporting the faculty researcher role, an external research consultant was hired to provide a presentation to the faculty members at Eminence. The departmental culture at Eminence was exemplified in the following comments by the program director regarding faculty responsibility for placing the needs of the department over personal priorities:

And we had this two hour meeting that was really phenomenal, in which [external consultant] didn't let people get away without getting a sense that they were building their careers, but they're also building the strength of this program.

The narratives from the faculty informants from Eminence University provided clear perceptions of exemplary leadership by the program director. For example, one informant illustrated how the program director successfully integrated the needs of the institution and the emerging discipline in the following comments:

[Program director] became director here in [the late 1980's], and when she/he became director, we always were asked for a five year plan of when we were going to get our doctorate degrees. Because she/he recognized... she's/he's always been a forward looking person, and she/he knew that in the School of Medicine we would need that. And along with several other faculty members I applied for and was accepted to a doctoral program.

Further, the effectiveness of the strategies utilized by the program director from Eminence to develop academic scholars who could be successful in the research university environment, were described by another informant from Eminence in this way:

I think, again recognizing the situation that we're in, with the values of the university and the mission of the university, [program director] protected us for a long time. So even after I got my Ph.D., I was an instructor until... it will be two years in June. So for a few years I was still at the instructor level, and [program director] didn't want to promote us too quickly because he/she was worried about the tenure track gap. And then if we weren't publishing and weren't getting grants...so it was more like we always had a start doing some of that before we even got put on the clinical track. And I think [program director] put those of us who were promoted as OT's who have Ph.D.'s now, were all put on the clinical track.

Encapsulating the department's impact on her faculty development one informant from Eminence described her transformation in this way:

Huge, huge [Because this is really the only place you've been, the only institution and department you've been in?] Yeah, just huge. I mean it's made me ask questions, and find answers and want to ask more questions. And question why our profession is where it is. Just huge. It completely took me, and flipped me over and beat me up and flipped me back. And I'm someone different now.

In a similar fashion, another faculty member from Eminence described the influence of the department by describing how the program director and her research peers have guided and encouraged her professional development:

I feel like [program director] is a real engine here. So... the guidance and general inspiration that I get from the director. I feel that the other faculty here have been very inspirational. Certainly [faculty member] and her development of a lab. And I've seen her from when she was pre-doctoral

through her doctoral work and out. [Faculty member] who has built a lab here, and is not an OT but has integrated his work with occupational therapy work to come up with some unique and probably valuable kinds of studies. [Faculty member] and her work on integrative curriculum.....

In contrast to the tenor of leadership from Eminence University that emerged from the data, Determination College offers a different vantage for understanding the role of program directors in master's institutions. The institutional culture of Determination College set a tone by promoting and providing tenure to occupational therapy faculty members without research publications. This tone has shaped the program director's perspective of faculty development. Moreover, judging from the narratives of the faculty informants from Determination College, departmental responsibility for building disciplinary scholars has been diluted. Regarding the influence of the program director on her scholarly outcomes, one informant from Determination portrayed it in this way:

Well, I suppose if the department chair pushed it more, I would feel compelled to have to do it. But because she... I mean she does encourage it. I feel like I'm able to choose my own path. Um.....and its...I don't at all feel like I don't do plenty of work. But I suppose I could put less effort into my classes and more effort into what is probably traditionally felt to be scholarly activity. Um...but I don't choose to do that, and it seems to be accepted um.....fine. You know, and I did get promoted. I think I influence myself more than or at least evenly with maybe [program director] and our new Dean. I mean we're not getting told that we have to make any changes.

Commenting upon whether the department values the same things that she values in her faculty work, the remarks of one informant from Determination speak to her perceptions about the barriers to the program director's role:

[Program director] is always under the weight of trying to manage the program....I know that [program director] is under enormous pressure to have the numbers of students, and count the beans correctly. So that even if she believes in it [what I value in my work], I feel like she's not in a position to pay attention to anything else.

Yet another faculty member from this master's institution characterized the departmental culture and how it influenced her faculty career in this way:

I think... I am the most recent faculty member. I've been here 13 years... So, I think that initially there was a lot of mentoring and it had a clear....influence. I think that over the years it's not been quite so clear.

Finally, one faculty member alluded to the cultural limitations to developing the researcher role at Determination College as she made these comments regarding what surprised her about scholarship in the department:

I don't know if I was surprised. I think I knew what I was getting into a little bit. I think I'm disappointed. I think we [department] keep talking about wanting it [research] to be important and then we just seem not to be able to go down that road. I'm more disappointed I think.

Summary

This section described the institutional settings of Eminence University and Determination College, as a context for understanding how academic departments impact the development of a professional identity in occupational therapy faculty members. Further, demographic and scholarship data on individual faculty informants was analyzed to provide a background for the broader analysis of two occupational therapy academic departments. Thematic explanations that emerged from interview and focus group narratives provided one snapshot of how diverse departmental cultures socialize faculty members to the expectations of the academic role, and institutionalize faculty priorities in occupational therapy faculty members. What remains is to develop a framework for visualizing the interpretive analysis described.

The Matrix Model

As colleges and universities have come to be viewed as complex open systems with multiple layers of interacting influence, the need for descriptive models that stress the relationships between key constituencies developed. A matrix model was developed by Alpert (1991) as an alternative to narrowly viewing faculty work from the perspective of institutional and disciplinary hierarchies. What makes the matrix model unique is that by visually representing the interdependence of institutions, departments and individual faculty members, it identifies important relationships within a college or university context (Menges, 1999). Furthermore, by also acknowledging sources external to colleges and universities that play a role in institutional performance it is possible to address an issue such as faculty performance by focusing on the department as the unit of analysis. By redirecting interest toward the role of academic departments and departmental leadership in rebalancing faculty priorities, it is possible for less prestigious practice disciplines like occupational therapy, and non-traditional faculty functions such as clinical supervision to receive the attention that is warranted. Thus, the matrix model was selected as an interpretive framework for this study.

The matrix model is based upon the realities of a research institution like Eminence University. However, due to the pressures within the academic culture to conform to the values of the research mission, this framework can also be usefully applied to a striving master's institution such as Determination College. The framework assumes that is more useful to situate Eminence University and Determination College within the context of the higher education environment in which they function, and to position the occupational therapy departments within their formal institutional structures,

rather than to view these institutions and departments in isolation. To be effective in capturing the reality of faculty scholarship for professional faculty members in diverse institutional settings however, also requires an accounting of the forces that exist external to colleges and universities. See Figure 2 for a matrix model depicting research universities and master's colleges.

The descriptive model positions Eminence University as a high level institution and Determination College as a mid-level institution in the hierarchy of higher education. Further, the model depicts each institution as being influenced by forces from the academic culture, the arts and sciences disciplinary culture, and the culture of the professions. Moreover, the model also portrays external relationships that act as supports or constraints to the academic role and its functions within occupational therapy academic departments, including the healthcare system, accrediting bodies, and federal funding agencies.

The matrix model organizes the associations between the structural units of each setting including the institution, the school, and the department. The relationships amongst schools and departments, clinical practice and clinician-teachers, and professional and disciplinary cultures is also framed by the model. Finally, by depicting the dynamic interplay between personal priorities, faculty roles, scholarship outcomes and academic careers that is situated in occupational therapy academic departments, an interpretive framework emerges.




Figure 2. Matrix Model in Research Universities and Master's Colleges

Manifestation of the Matrix: Determination College

Determination College is a master's institution that is positioned at mid-level in the institutional hierarchy. As a "striving college", the institutional mission, as well as faculty development goals are a reflection of competing needs to provide professionals for society, and to strive for academic legitimacy relative to their mid-position in the academic hierarchy (Clark, 1987; Boyer, 1990). Because Determination College competes for status with other similarly positioned institutions, recognition at the national and regional level is desired. Given that the college has been cited by the Carnegie Foundation for its community service record, and that it has earned a top tier ranking in its category as one of "American's Best Colleges" in a national review, suggests that it is competing well against other institutions at its level. The Occupational Therapy Program is situated in the School of Health Sciences and Rehabilitation Studies (SHRS), which is one of 5 schools at the College. In addition to occupational therapy the SHRS offers 7 other professional programs. The occupational therapy program is an entry-level master's degree program with undergraduate and graduate points of entry.

The departmental culture of Determination College exerts a socializing influence on faculty beliefs and values regarding a professional identity by structuring and supporting faculty roles and functions. The developing professional identity revealed in the findings from Determination College is a dynamic interplay of individual demographics and faculty roles that are enacted in the occupational therapy department. For example, personal priorities having to do with family responsibilities as well as age and career stage are factors that have shaped faculty careers at this college. See Figure 3 for a visual representation of faculty professional identity at Determination College. A

professional identity has been further molded by a well developed clinician identity that was based upon extensive clinical experience prior to coming to academia, and subsequently supported institution by the development of primary clinician-teacher roles for these mid-late career informants. Moreover, an underdeveloped researcher identity associated with delayed doctoral training and socialization to the academic role, and subsequent limited opportunities to further develop research skills and scholarly roles, has also contributed to the professional identity that has emerged.

There is consensus amongst the Determination College informants that faculty responsibilities are rank ordered within the department as teaching, service and research. This prioritization is representative of the institutional culture at the college in that it embodies the institution's commitment to undergraduate education, the college's teaching mission, the faculty's values, and the administration's goals for institutional success. The number of graduate programs on the campus also suggests that Determination College is being responsive to the need for graduate level professionals whose preparation requires teaching. Consequently, the high teaching loads, a faculty reward system that provides promotion and tenure without the pressure for faculty to conduct research, and the department's reliance on student recruitment for its financial survival, are norms that represent institutionalized priorities for faculty work.




Figure 3. Manifestation of the Matrix Model: Professional Identity in Occupational Therapy Faculty at Determination College

The professional roles reported as primary by the faculty from Determination College are teacher, mentor and advisor. The faculty activities associated with these roles, i.e. reading in preparation for teaching, designing classroom and laboratory activities, and providing clinical supervision, also represent the type of work behaviors that are most valued by the group as a whole. Given Determination College's teaching mission, it follows that the faculty members uniformly view students as the number one priority. Although the informant's professional identities are shaped by the roles that they perform on a day to day basis, their views of faculty scholarship are not limited to the teaching and service roles that are prioritized by the college's institutional culture and enacted in the department.

The matrix model points to the fact that no institution is independent of others, and this inter-connectedness helps to explain the similarity of aspirations across institutional types and disciplines. Suggesting the influence of the academic culture as well as the emerging disciplinary culture of occupational therapy, the informants not only acknowledged that research and publishing are the gold standard for faculty scholarship in higher education, but also identified research as a valued role for contributing to the profession. The majority of the faculty members from Determination do not view themselves as scholars, although they view their program director as being scholarly. Moreover, the faculty members from Determination largely agree that they would like to increase their research skills, and would welcome the support of the college for expanding the researcher role for faculty. Professional value and personal interest notwithstanding, the faculty membership concurs that research as a professional goal has

multiple constraints that are directly linked to Determination College's historical mission as a teaching institution.

The constraints include a belief amongst the faculty membership that while there is some administrative interest in campus recognition for research productivity, that there is limited evidence of the type of institutional planning needed to enlarge the mission to include research. There is evidence that as striving colleges like Determination make efforts to mirror the scholarship model of higher-tiered research institutions, the traditional teaching and service missions is challenged (Braxton, 1999). As an example that a mission-crisis may be forming at Determination College, the informants cited the fact that one of the more prestigious academic departments on campus was provided with a new building, and was charged with hiring faculty that will be expected to design and conduct research studies and publish their findings.

The Determination College informants expressed concern that emerging expectations for enhancing departmental status through faculty research, without institution-wide support for adding the researcher role to the existing teaching role, could lead to imbalances across academic departments. Braxton (1999) found that as master's institutions increase the amount of time that faculty members spend on research, there is a concomitant decrease in advising time, but not necessarily a decrease in teaching time. Thus, continued expectations for high teaching and student advising loads, and the fact that release time from teaching responsibilities is unpaid, exemplifies the limited institutional commitment to the research function at Determination.

Because the institutional culture of Determination College rewards teaching and service activities, the faculty informants expressed concern that academic departments

lacked the preparation to integrate research activities within current work roles, even if faculty members might value those activities. Furthermore, the informants believe that the occupational therapy department is constrained by financial pressures to maintain high student numbers, pressures from accreditors to maintain high pass rates on the certification examination, and by workload expectations that exceed faculty resources. The informants revealed that until the researcher role is institutionalized and faculty are rewarded for getting grants, conducting research, and publishing, there is little incentive on the part of academic departments and individual faculty to change.

Despite the fact that at least some of the faculty informants would welcome a revised institutional mission that includes research, there is consensus that the day to day expectations of teaching erode individual faculty ambitions to pursue research as a goal. As an example of the trade-offs in professional identity that have already been made in response to high teaching and mentoring loads, and service activities, the majority of the faculty at Determination revealed that they have all but given up their clinical activities. Thus, while the majority of the members of this faculty group view some involvement in research and publishing as part of their professional identity, they do not see themselves fulfilling that goal at Determination College.

Manifestation of the Matrix: Eminence University

Eminence University is classified as a research institution with very high research activity (www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/). The School of Medicine (SOM) at Eminence consists of 21 Academic Departments, 11 Programs & Divisions, and 9 Specialized Centers for Research and Education. Occupational Therapy at Eminence

University is one of the programs in the SOM. Medical schools represent a unique higher education context, although they conform to the three primary scholarship domains of teaching, research and service (Lowenstein & Harvan, 2005). Eminence strives for external standing in the institutional hierarchy of research institutions by having nationally respected, self-supporting departments and programs that are committed to research excellence. Likewise, academic programs in the SOM strive to meet the mission of the medical school by obtaining external funding and having faculty publish in high impact professional journals. Similar to other medical schools, the mission to educate the next generation of clinicians and medical scientists places teaching as a priority at Eminence. In practice however, the research mission trumps the teaching mission in terms of higher weighting in faculty promotion and tenure decisions, and indicators of departmental success.

There is consensus amongst the Eminence faculty informant group that the mission of the university and the medical school drives the departmental culture. Therefore, faculty perceptions of scholarship are shaped from within by institutional culture. Furthermore, faculty beliefs and values regarding faculty work are formally and informally shaped from by departmental socialization as guided by the program director. Finally, also contributing to an informant's professional identity are personal priorities, doctoral and post-doctoral training, and external forces from the healthcare system and the national professional community, i.e. the professional culture of clinicians, and the disciplinary culture of academics. See Figure 4 for a visual representation of faculty professional identity at Eminence University. Identifying how faculty appointments are

made in occupational therapy provides one window into how faculty priorities are shaped at this research institution.

Administrators at Eminence University utilize a common practice in medical education referred to as tracking to appoint entering faculty to positions in the university. Faculty members are appointed to investigator, clinician or research tracks when they are hired. The investigator track is based primarily on independent research contributions, while appointment and promotion to the clinician track is based primarily on clinical contributions, and the research track is designed for non-teaching faculty members that support the research of other faculty. As a highly respected research institution, Eminence's disciplinary and practitioner-scientists are seen as core to the mission and prestige of the university.

Research in higher education suggests that the practice of tracking perpetuates the view of scholarship as limited to hypothesis-driven research, by affording enhanced status to faculty on the investigator track and consigning second-class status to those in other tracks (O'Meara & Rice, 2005). This narrow view of scholarship is exemplified at Eminence by the fact that only faculty members in the investigator track may be granted tenure. It is noted however, that appointments to the clinical track provide for five-year rolling contracts that afford long-term security. Of the ten faculty members in the informant group, three are on the investigator track and another will be added shortly, while the remaining six are on the clinical track. Commenting upon the realities of faculty work at Eminence, one informant suggested that while there are "100% investigators there are no 100% teachers." Because faculty scholarship at Eminence is considered synonymous with tenured faculty members, even the clinical track faculty




Figure 4. Manifestation of the Matrix Model: Professional Identity in Occupational Therapy Faculty at Eminence University

members who teach and mentor as much as 50%, are required to devote some time to research activities.

Consistent with the traditional disciplinary hierarchy within higher education, the institutional culture in the SOM at Eminence sustains a bias toward basic versus applied disciplines. This bias has resulted in the health science programs such as occupational and physical therapy being relegated to the lower portion of the medical school status hierarchy. A shift in institutional expectations over the last two decades was confirmed by informant references to the recent closing of one of the applied programs due to lack of funding and research. Thus, at Eminence the external pressure from insurers and the professional community for research evidence to guide clinical practice has been consolidated with the institutional pressure to contribute to the status of the university by obtaining external funding and increasing the level of research commitment of the faculty within the academic department. With the institutionally based drive for research excellence at Eminence, it is concluded that having more faculty with research training, publication histories, and well funded grants would increase the program's status, and contribute to more successful faculty careers as defined by senior faculty status and tenure (Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998; AOTA, 2006).

This combination of forces provided the incentive for the program director at Eminence to establish departmental goals to develop and hire faculty with doctoral training, research experience, and research lines that are supported by grant funding. Therefore, to be aligned with the institutional mission and to survive according to the formal policies and informal norms of the SOM, the departmental culture prioritizes faculty work roles that are congruent with its context. Thus, it is not surprising that the

faculty informants at Eminence unanimously rank ordered faculty responsibilities in the department as research, teaching and service. Furthermore, faculty members are socialized to the understanding that tenure isn't possible without research productivity, and that no tenure means that the program suffers. According to the program director from Eminence, adapting to the culture of the institution will be the factor that differentiates the occupational therapy programs in research institutions who survive, from those that don't survive.

Although there is some evidence that the performance gap is narrowing for women in some academic disciplines, the reality of gender has not favored women in terms of opportunities and rewards in higher education (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1986). While it is common knowledge that medical schools are environments where the gender imbalance favors males, two of the female faculty informants identified the need to overcome gender bias as an additional impediment to a successful faculty career at Eminence. The following reference to gender was made by a faculty member describing what has surprised her about scholarship Eminence University:

Um, how slow the old boy's network was to change. [Program director] really, to get her tenure had to push a lot of people out of bench science, to look toward women. Even now at the [name of a hospital] to get a woman faculty tenured there is next to impossible because of the old boys.... I think that even things like offering day care. They finally have offered that if you're on tenure track, you can have interruptions. It's not a seven year do or die. [Oh, so if you have a child they will pause it?] They will pause it now. Huge concession to pause. So I think that it's...that's been really disappointing to see how slow they've been to respond to [women in] academia.

Research institutions in the United States are characterized as having autonomous academic departments that focus on research and graduate training and are self-

supporting with external grant funding (Boyer, 1990). The occupational therapy program has achieved success at Eminence by becoming financially self-sufficient, building a core faculty to teach the next generation of practitioners, and recruiting a graduate faculty to develop the research evidence to support occupational therapy practice. By earning national recognition as a highly ranked occupational therapy program in the United States the program at Eminence is meeting its responsibility to contribute to the reputation of the university, and to elevate its standing amongst other departments and programs in the medical school (U.S. News and World Report, 2008).

What constitutes faculty work and which activities are considered scholarly, provides a vantage for understanding how occupational therapy faculty informants at Eminence view themselves. The faculty informant group as a whole described their daily faculty activities as finding and writing grants, preparing for courses, conducting research studies, teaching courses, presenting papers at conference, mentoring graduate students on projects, committee work, publishing papers in peer-reviewed journals, curriculum design, data management and analysis, and student activities/recruitment. One of the faculty informants commented that maintaining clinical practice is at the bottom of the list of priorities in the department. There was agreement across the sub-cultural informant groups at Eminence that both research and teaching activities are considered scholarly, and that faculty members aspire to quality teaching. However, strongly contributing to how the professional identity is shaped is whether faculty values are contested or supported based upon faculty work priorities.

The matrix model utilized in this study (See Figure 2) also permitted competing interests within departments to be identified, i.e. differences in faculty role preferences

between graduate and non-graduate faculty members, or differences between experienced and new faculty members on the need for clinical experience as faculty members. For example, the data analysis revealed evidence of a contested identity for some of the faculty informants from Eminence University on the issue of faculty roles. One informant who is content having research activities as the top priority exposed the challenge by suggesting that while teaching is important and allegiance to students is strong, that “there is a point of diminishing returns” that is the norm for the teaching role. The dilemma for these faculty informants is how to balance departmental goals for external funding and research to build important research evidence for the field, with personal goals for excellence in teaching, and other aspects of faculty work such as curriculum design and student activities. One informant portrayed the complexity of dividing time between teaching and research by commenting that student “faces” appearing at the office door are difficult to ignore, and further suggesting that “we need to put a face on research.” Given the pressure from insurers to demonstrate treatment efficacy through research, as well as the lack of formal faculty rewards associated with high quality teaching, and the diminished informal status for teaching scholars, it seems inevitable that the balance at Eminence will favor research.

The strength of the clinician-teacher identity in occupational therapy faculty members however, is reinforced by the requirements for faculty to involve students in clinical fieldwork experiences as part of their professional training, and for faculty members to acquire and retain clinical expertise as part of their academic preparation and development. Thus, the current professional trend for individuals earning entry-level clinical doctorates in occupational therapy (OTD) to become hired as faculty members

prior to gaining experience in an area of existing clinical practice, is another inter-departmental issue that was exposed at Eminence. This issue was differentiated by views that conformed to sub-cultural faculty groups.

The mid-late career informants tended to portray clinical work experience as essential for confirming what is being taught. In this view, the faculty role as teachers is conceptualized as an end in itself, i.e. conveying specialized experience and current practice to new therapists. A mid-late career faculty informant from Determination College reflecting on this issue established her position in this way:

Um, I think about here we have faculty who have years of experience um...before they became faculty, continue to have years of experience after becoming faculty. If we had an OT teach here who didn't have any experience, how would that look different, how would that be different? I think the fact that we have experience in the clinic that we continue to have experience in the clinic not only adds validity to what we're teaching to our students, but it also allows us to take the theory, take the science and make it relevant to the clinic.

However, one early career faculty member who recently graduated with an OTD discussed the emphasis that the professional culture places on clinical expertise as being a good news/bad news scenario. Having recently had a role on a national committee that is looking at the viability of requiring clinical expertise in a practice area for faculty members, she/he approached this issue from a different vantage:

And so what happens is we lose a generation [of potential academics].... maybe it's just my perspective from this program, but it's always been you know, you have to have so many years of experience before you can do academics. Well, why is that? Ultimately, I'm coming here to investigate a new area of practice, and so if I worked for 20 years in a skilled nursing facility and came back to do research in [new area of practice], how will that really have prepared me a whole lot more than what I've done to this point. And what did I lose? I lost 20 years..... in a way it helps....I mean coming in to a clinical faculty role, I mean absolutely, without a doubt that's going to be something that's going to help you. But coming in with the expectation of heading up a line of

research or heading up a new lab, I don't understand how that helps. And really, other fields don't take that perspective. I mean if you look at medicine...if you go into academics you get the training before you hit the clinic, and when you hit the clinic you're already involved in research, there is no wait 15 years and then come back and do it.

Another informant from Eminence commented on the dilemma that the discipline currently faces regarding the role of individuals with clinical doctorates in occupational therapy in academic departments:

I think that... it's Ph.D. versus OTD. I think that Ph.D. is research based, statistics based, I mean you're just immersed in that stuff for however many years. Regardless of what you're studying, it's scholarship and scholarly pursuit of knowledge and research. The OTD is a clinical degree, and so we're training clinicians. And it's going to be really tough for them to step into a research. Really tough. So, it's the dilemma I think in OT right now is that we're needing more faculty, and the OTD might fulfill a role for filling faculty positions. But what's the expectations of the institutions in these faculty positions, and can they meet those expectations?

Summary

A premise of this study is that how the academic role is defined and how occupational therapy faculty members organize their work behavior is a function of how faculty scholarship is institutionalized in colleges and universities (Boyer, 1990; O'Meara & Rice, 2005). Faculty perceptions about work roles and scholarly activities were collected during faculty interviews and corroborated in follow-up focus groups in two diverse academic environments. Data from individual faculty members within each setting were reduced and analyzed in a process of narrative coding and categorization. Further analysis revealed patterns in the data regarding how faculty work is prioritized that was differentiated by institutional type. Moreover, synthesis of the composite data found similarities in the informant's responses relating to clinical training, career stage,

and socialization to the researcher role that crossed institutional boundaries. Thus, the beliefs and views of individual faculty members and identified sub-cultures were integrated into a broader analysis of the sites where scholarship is institutionalized (Yin, 1994). Finally, common themes that emerged from the data analysis process frame understandings of scholarship in occupational therapy faculty members.

Since a desire to contribute to the profession was identified as a key value for faculty members in this study, the tensions apparent in a clinical profession that is emerging as an applied discipline was the first theme that came to light. Further, due to the strong influence of the institutional culture on views of faculty responsibilities, scholarship and context surfaced as the second theme. Moreover, given that the departmental culture was revealed to be a critical source of academic socialization for the faculty informants in this study, the department as nexus evolved as the final theme. A thematic analysis regarding how faculty members in occupational therapy come to develop as scholars requires a framework within which interpretative conclusions can be drawn. Thus, the matrix model was adopted as an interpretive framework for this study (Alpert, 1991).

The matrix model of professional identity in occupational therapy faculty was developed to visualize the interplay of the academic culture, institutions of higher education, disciplinary and professional culture, academic departments, and individual faculty aspirations. This framework exposes how individual colleges and universities function as members of high status and lower status institutional groups defined by mission, rather than as independent entities within the academic culture. The fact that the academic culture provides an overriding pressure to view discovery research as the

standard for the development of disciplinary knowledge provides an explanation for why institutions with dissimilar missions have surprisingly similar aspirations, if not functions. According to the model, the pressure for institutional prestige regardless of position within the hierarchy, places demands on disciplinary cultures to produce scholars to increase the reputations of academic departments.

In addition to conforming to pressures from within the academic culture, colleges and universities must also acknowledge constituencies external to the boundaries of the educational institution. As matrix organizations, Eminence University and Determination College are compelled to remain responsive to the external forces that influence their ability to fulfill their educational missions such as accrediting bodies, grant funding agencies, and practice communities. In this study, the occupational therapy academic department is conceptualized as the focal point for balancing competing interests. The leadership of academic departments is expected to meet expectations from the academic and institutional cultures for contributing to institutional status and building program reputation. Further, departmental practices must address the professional culture of occupational therapy. The overarching values and norms of the national organization and the professional program accreditation process, as well as the impetus from the clinical community for excellence in practitioner training, shape the goals of academic departments. Finally, it is also important that occupational therapy departments address faculty development within the context of an emerging disciplinary culture. It is through socialization processes within diverse departmental cultures that faculty priorities for teaching, research and service are institutionalized into practice.

The data from this study supports the literature on the impact of institutional type and mission on distinctions in the departmental cultures at Eminence University and Determination College (Braxton & Berger, 1999). The perceptions of the faculty informants revealed that the value of faculty roles and activities differed on a number of factors specific to the department's context and values, e.g. internal verses external sources of funding, type of faculty appointment, commitment to training practitioners, and responsibility for developing disciplinary scholars. Thus, this data analysis provides support for viewing the beliefs, values, norms of the departmental culture as guided by the program director as salient in supporting or constraining faculty priorities, and as serving as an agent of change in expanding the parameters of faculty scholarship.

Consequently, professional identity in occupational therapy faculty is a dynamic process that begins in professional training and further develops as a result of clinical experiences, doctoral training for the academic role, and socialization in academic departments. The implications of these findings for occupational therapy academic professionals are discussed in the next section.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This section will examine the purpose for which this study was designed and revisit the research questions that were posed in the first chapter. The concepts around which this study was organized will also be reviewed. In addition, the literature driven assumptions that guided this study will be discussed in light of the findings. This section will also revisit a matrix model that evolved from an interpretive analysis of the data in chapter four, and that depicts the development of a professional identity in occupational therapy faculty members. Furthermore, this section will discuss the implications of the findings for the development of future faculty careers in occupational therapy. Finally, the chapter will close by reviewing the limitations of the case study and by explaining the conclusions that were reached.

Synthesis of the Study

The status of current academic careers and the development of future academics in occupational therapy is at the heart of the recent interest in faculty scholarship within the national organization (AOTA, 2009, 2006; Baum, professional correspondence, 2005). Of relevance to the discussions of faculty development in occupational therapy are the concurrent debates within higher education regarding the parameters for defining, measuring and rewarding faculty scholarship (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Braxton, Luckey & Holland, 2002; O'Meara & Rice, 2005). Unfortunately, faculty

in the health professions have received less attention in studies on the effects of culture on faculty performance. Thus, this study contributes to the literature by using existing theoretical frameworks regarding the role of the academic culture, institutional culture and departmental culture in faculty development, to explore the emerging practice discipline of occupational therapy (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Kezar, 2005).

The purpose of this study was to develop an in-depth understanding of faculty scholarship in occupational therapy by asking faculty members in academic departments to describe their roles and how they prioritize work behaviors. A secondary rationale was to expand upon the literature on faculty socialization in the health professions (Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998). Because of the saliency of the clinical role and the need for direct relationships with clinical environments as part of the curriculum, faculty members in the health professions add complexity to current understandings of faculty work behavior.

A conceptual framework that acknowledges the historical challenges of health professional programs in academia and yet is guided by research on the differing lives and worlds of faculty members by institutional type, discipline, and academic department, guided the inquiry (Braxton & Berger, 1999; Stark, 1998; Becher, 1989; Tierney, 1988; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1987; Clark, 1987). A theoretically grounded case study inquiry permitted this researcher to utilize an “insider’s view” of faculty life in occupational therapy departments and to find answers for the following research questions: 1) how are occupational therapy faculty members in academic departments in research universities and master's institutions prioritizing faculty roles and developing as disciplinary scholars?; and 2) how do these faculty members make sense of the personal,

professional, academic and institutional influences that impact the development of a professional identity?

Further, the case study design provided faculty members from diverse institutional environments with the opportunity to provide rich descriptive data on their daily working lives, thus revealing the assumptions, values and beliefs underlying their developing professional identities. In-depth narrative responses from faculty members also provided insights regarding the following questions: how has the personal background of these faculty members influenced the course of their academic careers; how have institutional contexts accentuated or diluted clinical or academic influences on how these faculty members function in their faculty roles; and how has the departmental culture impacted how these faculty view themselves as scholars? To insure accuracy, the interpretive framework that was revealed in Chapter Four will be discussed in light of the assumptions that guided this study.

Key Analytic Findings

By paying close attention to the meanings that occupational therapy faculty subcultures ascribed to their work as teachers, researchers and providers of community service, and how they communicate that to others, it was possible to build a description for how professional identity develops in this practice disciplinary group. Likewise, it was possible to identify the salient features of the process that should be encouraged and supported in the development of future faculty.

Describing the factors that influence faculty perceptions about scholarship in occupational therapy faculty members was not unlike tracing the network of nerves in the

human body. The organization of the data into descriptive and conceptual categories yielded themes that drew upon the relevant literature, and captured the layers of meaning through which faculty members come to understand their roles, and what they value in faculty work. The following are the three themes that came to light during the process of data analysis: the clinical profession as an emerging discipline; scholarship and context; and department as nexus. However, just as nerves are comprised of sub-branches, the sub-themes of time as a barrier, researcher role, and the function of leadership also provide understandings of the inter-connectedness of the forces that shape professional identity.

The clinical profession as an emerging discipline reflects the fact that the study was conceptually grounded in cultural perspectives of how clinical professions and academic disciplines socialize members and impact faculty work (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Becher, 1989; Stoecker, 1993). Further, the theme of scholarship as context signals the work of Boyer (1990) on the impact of institutional type on faculty priorities in colleges and universities (Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002; O'Meara & Rice, 2005). Finally, the theme of department as nexus echoes researchers who have turned to cultural perspectives to uncover the values and boundaries that determine power and status amongst disciplinary and professional groups, and to expose normative influences on faculty priorities within academic departments (Stark, 1998; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Stoecker, 1993; Alpert, 1991; Becher, 1989; Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

Given the diversity in institutional types, and disciplinary cultures within the system of higher education, some researchers studying the academic profession have found it useful to view colleges and universities and disciplinary groups in isolation

(Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989). In contrast, the data from this study supports that a more useful purpose for understanding institutional cultures is served by not decoupling Eminence University and Determination College from their positions within the system of higher education. By acknowledging the distinct pressures from the academic culture on occupational therapy programs in research institutions and master's colleges, an appreciation of the scope of faculty work was revealed.

Understanding scholarship in occupational therapy faculty requires a model that situates an emerging practice discipline within a framework of influence that includes the academic culture in higher education, acculturation in professional education and clinical work environments, socialization to the discipline and faculty role, and personal values and preferences (Braxton, Luckey & Holland, 2002; Menges, 1999; Stark, 1998; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Alpert, 1991; Boyer, 1990; Dinham & Stritter, 1986). Furthermore, given that the findings from this study suggest an important role for academic departments in determining faculty priorities it is constructive to view faculty socialization processes from the departmental contexts in which they occur.

The matrix model was selected as the framework for this study because it permits less prestigious practice disciplines such as occupational therapy to become recognized for their contributions to the institution, since it places the responsibility for faculty scholarship within academic departments. By conceptualizing the occupational therapy departments at Determination College and Eminence University as the point of convergence for institutional pressures and external pressures from the profession and clinical community, the breadth of leadership responsibility at the departmental level is

exposed. In order to displace research missions that fail to acknowledge teaching scholarship and applied research, and that fail to recognize and reward the non-traditional faculty functions required of clinician-teachers, a new framework for developing a professional identity in occupational therapy is needed.

Situating Findings in Existing Literature

A synthesis of the relevant literature provided context for understanding the complex relationship between educational training, socialization processes, evolving roles, and mission-driven functions in the development a professional identity in occupational therapy faculty members.

Personal Preferences and Clinical Training

The findings from this study support the premise that personal values and clinical socialization experiences have impacted the development of faculty careers in occupational therapy (Stark, 1998; Dickerson & Whittman, 1997; Stoecker, 1993; Yerxa, 1991; Jaffe, 1985; Clark, Sharrot, Hill & Campbell, 1985). The combined impact of individual preferences, professional training and clinical experience on faculty roles was evident in the faculty members from the mid-late career sub-culture. This group of faculty came to academia to contribute to the profession by teaching students the skills and providing the insights that they learned after many years in clinical practice. These findings are consistent with previous literature depicting occupational therapy faculty as having a strong interest in teaching (Dickerson & Whitman, 1999; Vasantachart & Rice, 1997). Furthermore, similar to other applied, professional fields such as nursing,

extensive clinical training and experience was associated with faculty members who value teaching over research.

Career goals differentiated the three faculty sub-cultures that were identified in this study. Many of the faculty members in the mid-late career sub-culture reported no inclination toward doctoral training or becoming researchers as new faculty members. In contrast, the two faculty members in the non-clinician sub-culture pursued a direct path of graduate training leading to an academic research career. Further, the members of the early-career sub-culture came to the university for the graduate training that Eminence afforded and quickly became socialized to the idea of developing research careers. For these faculty members that have less experience as practicing clinicians, teaching is viewed as important, but only as one of many academic roles that includes research. Thus, it is concluded that the combination of less recent professional training, clinical careers and limited academic socialization have contributed to a preference for teaching, and a reticence to develop a researcher role in the mid-late career sub-culture. However, the data on the influence of gender on faculty role development was mixed.

Regarding the influence of social roles, family was discussed as a barrier to developing a research career by the faculty members at Determination College. However, at Eminence University family commitments did not appear to limit the overriding desire for faculty to succeed as academics in a research environment. Furthermore, faculty members at Determination did not raise gender as an issue with respect to faculty roles and rewards. At Eminence University however, two of the faculty members commented upon the perception that the institutional culture favored male over female faculty members in terms of career success.

Culture: Professional and Institutional

This study was also guided by suppositions regarding the historical realities of an occupational therapy practitioner culture, and the practical realities of faculty work in diverse college and university contexts. For example, it was assumed that a highly developed clinical identity in occupational therapy faculty members influences their ways of knowing and may conflict with the norms of the traditional academic culture that favors knowledge development in faculty work, research missions over teaching missions, and traditional disciplines over professions (Paul, Liu & Ottenbacher, 2002; Dickerson & Whitman, 1999; Vasantachart & Rice, 1997; Stark, 1998; Clark, 1997; Stoecker, 1993; Rozier, Gilkerson & Hamilton, 1991; Boyer, 1990; Parham, 1985a, 1985b; Jaffe, 1985; Johnson, 1978; Jantzen, 1974). Further, given that professional accreditation standards have historically supported institutional prerogative in occupational therapy faculty preparation and development, the institutional culture of colleges and universities is expected to exert a strong influence on faculty work priorities (O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Braxton & Berger, 1999; AOTA, 1991, 1998).

The results of a study by Parham (1985a, 1985b) that was previously discussed in Chapter Four provides a historical context from which to interpret the current perceptions of the faculty members from this study, many of whom entered academia in the late 1980's and early 1990's. Parham's study documented that publication trends for occupational therapy faculty members varied by type of institution similar to faculty from other professions and disciplines throughout higher education. However, an additional finding that may have been overlooked for its future implications was the existence of a differential faculty reward system for occupational therapy faculty members that was

necessitated by a lack of research training. Given that the overwhelming majority of faculty lacked doctoral training and socialization to the researcher role, institutions developed reward systems based upon outstanding teaching, and distinguished service to the institution and the profession, rather than on the publication of research findings. While permitting institutional prerogative to determine faculty credentials and roles was judicious for the profession in the short run, the current study suggests that the long term implications of a divergent reward system that strongly emphasized teaching and minimized the role of research may have been self-limiting for the development of occupational therapy academic careers.

The data from this case study implies that occupational therapy's history of autonomy from the norms of the academic culture with respect to faculty scholarship has produced both intentional outcomes and unintended consequences. Intended results have included an increase in the number of occupational therapy educational programs and program expansion into master's colleges and research institutions (Heater, 1987). Had the institutions required new occupational therapy faculty members to have doctoral training, fewer programs would have been started and higher education would have missed an opportunity to meet a pressing social need for practitioners. The findings of this study further indicate however, that the unintended consequences of differential treatment may include the delayed development of the researcher role, an undermining of student interest in faculty research careers, and the delayed evolution of a collective disciplinary culture whose goal it is to support the development of disciplinary scholars.

Similar to the faculty members in the Parham (1985a, 1985b) study, the demographic profiles of the occupational therapy faculty in this study also failed to

conform to the norms of doctoral training for an academic career. The fact that almost three-quarters of the composite informant group entered academia without doctoral socialization to the academic role provides one explanation for a preference for the clinician-teacher role. These findings also provide a context for understanding why there is a limited body of knowledge to support this practice discipline. Because scholarship is linked to disciplinary identity, occupational therapy faculty feel less responsibility to develop themselves as disciplinary scholars, regardless of institutional context.

Research in higher education suggests that the practice of assigning faculty to - tracks, e.g. clinical or investigator promotes a narrow view of faculty scholarship (O'Meara & Rice, 2005). By affording enhanced status to faculty on the investigator track and consigning second-class status to those in other tracks perpetuates the short-sighted view that scholarship is limited to hypothesis-driven research. This perspective of scholarship is exemplified at Eminence by the fact that only faculty members in the investigator track may be granted tenure. At Eminence University, promotion from a clinical track position to an investigator track appointment is an important benchmark for a successful faculty career that is directly linked to obtaining external grant funding and research productivity. Three of the four faculty informants on the investigator track include the program director, both of the non-clinician faculty members, and one addition member of the mid-late career sub-culture. The remaining eight faculty informants are on the clinical track.

To appreciate this faculty development profile, it is important to understand if a pattern of differential treatment has existed for occupational therapy faculty members at Eminence University. The data from this study indicates that the mid-late career faculty

sub-culture was permitted to retain faculty positions within the department through renewable clinical track appointments, and to earn doctorates on a part-time basis (12 years on average). These accommodations permitted the department the prerogative to retain faculty as clinician-teachers to develop the professional program, while permitting them to gradually earn doctorates in situ. Although this process of growing potential disciplinary scholars from within was practical given the limited pool of occupational therapists with doctorates from which to choose, it was inefficient for advancing disciplinary knowledge.

At Eminence University, the publication data from the faculty as well as supportive narrative data provided evidence that the departmental culture is overcoming the disadvantages of delayed socialization to the researcher role. This has been driven to some extent by the fact that the differential treatment from within the institution is dissolving. The data indicates that programs whose faculty members are not developing as research scholars are being closed. Furthermore, as a practice discipline that is strongly governed by external forces such as updated accreditation standards for student competencies in research, and the expectations of the professional community to develop research evidence for practice, demands for well prepared faculty from outside of the institution have also increased (Stark, 1998; Stoecker, 1993). As these forces have escalated, inevitable departmental strains have resulted. Data from this study suggests that past differential treatment may be the source of the dynamic tension between the mid-late career faculty sub-culture and departmental leadership. As a result, individual members of this sub-culture who remain inclined to pursue personal priorities as clinician-teachers have found themselves at odds with the program director who is

responsible for developing scholars to build knowledge for the field, as well as training practitioners.

Two faculty members from Eminence in particular, alluded to a contested identity despite having overcome the disadvantages characteristic of the mid-late career faculty sub-culture. One faculty member commented upon knowing the expectations of the department as a new faculty member and yet struggling with the necessity for earning a doctorate and becoming published. However, despite achieving the milestones expected in this research environment, she questioned the ultimate value for her career, as she doesn't view herself as a research scientist. The second faculty member describes a very gradual progression toward an academic profile beyond the clinician-teacher role. This faculty informant noted that although her original commitment was toward teaching, she now enthusiastically embraces a research focus and the goals of tenure and becoming an applied scientist. Consequently, the conclusion drawn from these findings is that departmental cultures can reverse faculty work preferences that do not include research skills and researcher roles. However, to the extent that departmental socialization is supported or constrained by the expectations of the institutional mission, will determine how successful departments are likely to be in the development of faculty scholars.

In contrast to the internal pressures being experienced by the faculty informants from Eminence University to prioritize their research activities, the faculty members from Determination College have yet to feel institutional pressure to develop as researchers. Although the study provided some indication that "institutional drift" is beginning to occur at Determination College, there is no real evidence of institutionalized change (Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000). Thus, to the disadvantage of the discipline, the mid-late

career faculty members at this institution find themselves with limited research experience and mentorship beyond their doctoral preparation. Although a positive relationship has been documented between doctoral preparation and research that leads to publications, the lack of institutional support may help to explain why this effect is not yet apparent for the informant group from Determination College (Parham, 1985a, 1985b).

The prominent influence of the institutional culture that favors and rewards teaching at Determination College, combined with departmental socialization processes that are driven by the realities of limited time, high teaching loads and excessive student advising roles, align to favor the status quo over a transformation of faculty work. Consequently, there is a decreased likelihood of creating a change in faculty roles in this institutional environment. Moreover, because faculty members have been promoted and have earned tenure without conducting research and publishing, it is possible that the department does not view the development of disciplinary scholars as one of its roles. Finally, although faculty research and publication are institutionalized at the structural level, i.e. required to be promoted to full professor, they are clearly not part of the regular work load. Furthermore, despite the predicted practical linkage between master's institutions and the scholarship of teaching, application and integration this study revealed that although espoused values support research activities, the occupational therapy faculty members at Determination College are not publishing their scholarly outcomes (Boyer, 1990; Braxton, Luckey & Holland, 2002).

Academic Socialization

A final assumption that guided this study was that given occupational therapy's status as a low-consensus, rural, applied practice discipline whose faculty members have entered academia in mid-career without doctoral socialization, a heavy reliance on the departmental culture to shape faculty scholarship through socialization processes would be expected (Wulff & Austin, 2004; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Baldwin, 1996; Becher, 1989). Although no disciplinary groups are immune to the expectations of institutional missions, occupational therapy's status as an immature practice discipline heightens the susceptibility of its faculty to the influence of the institutional context in which they work (Braxton & Berger, 1999). Thus, regardless of a history of clinical acculturation and variable academic training, a professional identity is likely to be framed in large part by the socializing influences at work within academic departments, e.g. normative practices, peer influences, and program leadership.

Socialization is viewed as a developmental process that includes individual choice in the first stage, doctoral mentorship that facilitates anticipation of the emerging identity in the second stage, and full internalization of the role functions leading to a successful faculty career in stage three (Clark & Corcoran, 1986). Stage three socialization is the process through which institutional missions and faculty role priorities are conveyed to faculty members in academic departments. Thus, the second research question that this study posed was how do faculty members make sense of themselves as scholars as they sort out competing interests in diverse institutional environments?

Sensemaking refers to an ongoing cognitive process experienced by faculty members in academic departments as they attempt to: comprehend their standing within an academic hierarchy that considers hard knowledge domains as more prestigious than soft ones; explain their experiences given that pure disciplines are considered more intellectually engaged than applied ones; or rationalize their outcomes when mature disciplines with well established paradigms and convergent knowledge communities are valued over practice disciplines whose paradigm has yet to crystallize (Weick, 2001; Harris, 1994; Becher, 1989).

At Determination College, the faculty members portrayed a limited view of themselves as scholars. In addition, although the informants uniformly view the program director as scholarly, she does not describe herself as a successful scholar, nor does she view the faculty membership as a whole as scholars. In contrast, all of the faculty informants including the program director at Eminence view themselves as academic scholars or emerging scholars. For example, some of the faculty informants describe one of their jobs as building the research evidence to support occupational therapy practice. Other faculty informants from Eminence see themselves as developing researchers who don't believe that they've *arrived yet*. One informant commented that "I'm tangentially scholarly and that's important." The instrumental role of leadership in how faculty members make sense of faculty work and how scholarly roles are defined is a critical aspect of the departmental socialization process that emerged from the data.

This case study suggests that the program leadership in occupational therapy departments are differentially guiding and supporting the pace and scope of faculty development, based upon institutional prerogative for successful scholarship. Further,

this study revealed that the pressures on program directors are different depending upon the institutional expectations placed upon academic departments.

The data analysis from this study supports prior research that concludes that an institution's ranking in the hierarchy of higher education systems does have an impact on the research productivity of occupational therapy faculty (Braxton & Berger, 1999; Dey, Milem & Berger, 1997; Bentley & Blackburn, 1990). In the case of Eminence University for example, because the institution is listed in the top 100 of the world's best universities, and is ranked in the top 50 universities nationally, the pressure for faculty research productivity is salient. Thus, the research culture at Eminence University provided the impetus for the program director to consider the negative ramifications for the department and for individual faculty careers of failing to develop research scholars. The comments of the program director from Eminence also indicated a concern that the emerging discipline would be disadvantaged relative to the development of knowledge if faculty researchers were not groomed. Consequently, the program director at this research institution assumed the responsibility for developing disciplinary scholars, while also meeting the needs of the professional culture for maintaining a well respected professional education program and graduating competent practitioners.

Similarly, influenced by the teaching and service missions of the institution, the program director from Determination College placed more emphasis on developing clinician-teachers that focus on curriculum design, clinical education, and implementing a high quality professional program. Thus, while the departmental leadership at Determination College has encouraged and supported doctoral training for the faculty membership, research training beyond the doctorate has not been emphasized. Because

the institutional culture neither requires or supports faculty research, the day to day priorities of this faculty group do not include the publication of scholarly outcomes to benefit the emerging discipline.

The literature suggests that departmental leadership in the traditional disciplines must assume responsibility for countering an imbalance that favors disciplinary research, with efforts to upgrade the importance of the teaching role (Alpert, 1991). In contrast, the data analysis from this study seems to indicate that an imbalance that favors teaching functions over researcher activities is the scenario that is occurring in the occupational therapy academic departments at Eminence University and Determination College. This finding has implications for the role of the program director in future faculty development, regardless of the institutional setting.

Viewing the departmental culture as a change agent for the development of disciplinary scholars implicates the leadership of the program director in fostering the values and norms of faculty scholarship as well as excellence in teaching. Thru the mechanism of faculty development planning and assessment, program directors are in a position to model a balanced view of faculty work that includes the clinician-teacher role and the role of disciplinary scholar. Furthermore, because program directors understand the needs of the practice discipline for non-traditional faculty functions, and for applied research to investigate the merits of assessments and interventions, they are in a good position to work with deans and promotion/tenure committees to advocate for an expanded definition of faculty scholarship. While an appropriate model for a practice discipline may include hypotheses-driven discovery research, research on the scholarship of teaching, and research that answers applied clinical questions or integrates the theory

of other disciplines with occupational therapy practice frameworks, must also become institutionalized (Braxton, Luckey & Holland, 2002; Boyer, 1990).

Implications

This study has several implications for faculty leaders who are interested in how departmental culture influences and is influenced by reforms in faculty scholarship. The faculty informants in this study have been paradoxically advantaged by differential treatment in gaining access to academia and establishing themselves in academic departments, and yet disadvantaged relative to developing faculty research careers (Johnson, 1978; Tanguay, 1985; Broski, 1986, 1987; Becher, 1989). This contradiction has resulted in a contested identity, especially for mid-late career faculty members for whom the development of a researcher role remains a challenge. How each faculty informant in this study came to make sense of his/her professional identity was due in large part to how the departmental culture interpreted the pressures that were external to the institution, managed the meaning of the teaching, research and service missions of the college or university, and established faculty priorities to meet a full range of departmental goals that includes practitioner training and the development of disciplinary scholars.

Achieving high national rankings, sustaining program longevity in an institution, maintaining specialized accreditation status, and retaining core faculty with doctorates who are productive as scholars and sustain scholarly reputations, are indicators of success for professional education programs. Considering these markers, the occupational therapy departments at Eminence University and Determination College are succeeding within

the system of higher education. Further, the data from this study reveals that both Determination College (80%) and Eminence University (90%) have a higher percentage of faculty members with doctorates than the national average for occupational therapy core faculty (67%) (AOTA, 2009). However, given the variability in faculty rank, tenure, and publication histories observed across settings, it is less clear that the faculty informant group as a whole is yet achieving disciplinary success that is defined by the academic culture as knowledge production by nationally recognized faculty scholars.

The paradox of past differential treatment has produced mixed results in the occupational therapy faculty careers that were described in this study. While the departmental norms of Eminence University permitted the mid-late career faculty informants to partially overcome past disadvantages as evidenced by the number of publications and unpublished scholarly outcomes, they continue to experience limited success as measured by their lack of promotion and tenure despite years of service to the institution. Likewise, a comparative disadvantage in the development of a researcher role remains for the faculty members at Determination College. Although the faculty members at this master's institution are all tenured and three have been promoted to associate professor, they report limited engagement in research activities and have few publications even in the area of teaching scholarship and applied scholarly outcomes. However, a strikingly higher level of engagement in scholarship emerges for the faculty members at Determination College when unpublished scholarly outcomes in teaching and application are used as an indicator of successful performance. Understanding how current faculty members in occupational therapy have navigated largely uncharted waters

in pursuit of an academic career provides insights on how to avoid the mistakes of the past and maximize opportunities for the future.

Policy and Practice

This study suggests that new ways of thinking about the recruitment, preparation, socialization, and career support of future occupational therapy faculty is necessary for this disciplinary group to survive and thrive in diverse higher education contexts.

Transforming a professional identity in occupational therapy will require the work of deans, program directors, and engaged faculty members. Agents of change within occupational therapy must recognize the role of academic departments in transforming thinking about disciplinary scholarship and the prioritization of faculty roles. The following measures are recommended if the work of developing future scholars in occupational therapy is to be most effective.

First, to ensure the continued development of the practice discipline and the clinical profession, students must be encouraged to consider the academic career as a viable option during their professional training. Also, because students are the faculty members of tomorrow, it is imperative that occupational therapy students are introduced to scholarly ways of knowing as well as clinical ways of knowing during professional socialization. Therefore, occupational therapy students must be socialized by faculty who are trained at the doctoral level and who are actively involved in scholarship. Well prepared occupational therapy faculty members who are both clinician-teachers and disciplinary scholars will best serve individual careers, and will best benefit the

discipline's need for professional role models and academics who can succeed in diverse institutional contexts.

Second, new occupational therapy faculty members need to be socialized in academic departments to the values, beliefs and norms of the emerging disciplinary culture regardless of the type of institution that employs them. Further, individual faculty members must aspire to a complete professional identity that includes the clinician-teacher role, but also includes the role of disciplinary scholar. Moreover, post-doctoral training and research experience must become the norm for new faculty members who are interested in research careers. To meet the emerging discipline's need for knowledge to support practice, faculty members need to take responsibility for conducting research, publishing scholarly outcomes and becoming recognized scholars that can advance the standing of academic departments and institutions.

Third, because work priorities, roles and practices for faculty members in research institutions like Eminence University and master's institutions like Determination College are dissimilar, program directors are responsible for finding models for faculty development that are responsive to institutional missions, and yet meet the needs of an emerging practice discipline for faculty scholarship.

For example, as Eminence University ramps up the requirements for faculty research in the health professions, academic departments might benefit from the model that was developed in 1997 at the School of Medicine at the University of Colorado. This model recognizes and rewards the non-traditional faculty functions required of clinician-teachers and provides more parity to teaching (Lowenstein & Harvan, 2005). Similar to the institutional environment of Eminence University, the University of Colorado

functions by focusing on the *bottom line*, where an emphasis on revenue streams, resource management and accountability, prevails. Acknowledging the disconnect between what clinician-teachers do for work, and what is expected for career advancement in a business context, was the first step toward identifying the value of alternative forms of scholarship that are unique to practice disciplines. By doing away with separate tracks that diminished the value of clinical track faculty, and creating a single tenure-eligible track system that incorporates Boyer's (1990) broad perspective of scholarship into the rules for promotion and tenure, this model recognizes translational, interpretive and interdisciplinary scholarship along with hypothesis-driven research.

Likewise, Determination College might garner an advantage by reflecting on the experiences of faculty members from Madonna University (Bozyk, 2005). In 1998, at the initiation of the administration, a faculty task force was formed to redefine the culture of scholarship at this master's institution. Also informed by Boyer's (1990) perspective on scholarship, the task force operationally defined scholarship as teaching, application, integration and discovery. The faculty informants at Madonna University bear a striking resemblance to the occupational therapy faculty at Determination College in that they are strongly committed to the teaching mission, and yet personally and professionally extol the value of faculty scholarship. Further, similar to the slowly emerging institutional drift toward adding research to the expectations for faculty work at Determination College, the faculty at Madonna ultimately referred to their campus situation as being a "soft revolution" (p. 110) in progress. Although more questions than answers ultimately evolved from the efforts of the task force, the groundwork was set for institutionalizing scholarship at the structural and procedural levels. In addition to legitimizing faculty

practices beyond discovery scholarship, the experience at Madonna provides support for beginning the process of building a “community of scholarship” (p. 111).

Fourth, occupational therapy program directors in research universities and in mid-level, striving colleges have an important role to play in managing the obvious or subtle insurgencies in faculty scholarship that are occurring on their campuses. Notwithstanding the requirement that all faculty members should be required to participate in scholarship as broadly defined, program directors must creatively meet the continued need for experienced clinicians, quality clinician-teachers, research scholars, and career scientists within their faculty membership. Departmental leaders will require different approaches depending upon institutional distinctions in structure and function, but each should have the combined goal of developing occupational therapy disciplinary scholars that are aligned with the mission of the university.

Program directors at research institutions like Eminence University, will need to support individual faculty members whose scholarship products will consist largely of randomized-control intervention studies and multi-site designs. However, these departmental leaders should also strive to legitimize the work of faculty scholars with mixed portfolios that include: receiving training grants for establishing fieldwork education sites in an emerging practice area, e.g. homeless shelters (scholarship of teaching); book chapters on theory derived from other disciplines, e.g. interdisciplinary studies on the use of cognitive theory in the treatment of executive dysfunction in brain-injured patients (scholarship of integration); and leadership roles in state or national organizations to advance rehabilitation and habilitation policy by linking theory to practice (scholarship of application). Maintaining the quality of professional education

for future generations of practitioners will require that academic departments in master's colleges as well as in research institutions develop the ability to grow, retain and recruit disciplinary scholars.

Departmental leadership in master's institutions similar to Determination College, must redefine the mission and goals of the academic program to include faculty scholarship. Program directors will need to transform faculty work by balancing the demands on faculty time for teaching related activities, with time for scholarship functions that include research. Further, program directors must advocate for the establishment of reward structures to reward faculty members who produce unpublished outcomes that meet Shulman and Hutchings (1998) criteria for scholarship, i.e. publicly observable, suitable for critical peer review, and in a format that permits other members of the occupational therapy community to use and respond to the information (as cited in Braxton, Luckey & Holland, 2002). However, departmental socialization must also focus on the value of publications.

Program directors at mid-level institutions will need to advocate for changes to professional development planning and faculty contracting that includes expectations for some faculty members to engage in post-doctoral research training and mentorship. In addition, because the infrastructure at master's institutions are less likely to support access to federal funding for research projects training grants from state or local organizations may be easier to acquire and manage, e.g. council on aging, or Autism Speaks. To be effective however, program directors will need to support faculty development within the areas of scholarship that are most consistent with the college's mission, i.e. teaching, applied community service, or interdisciplinary collaboration.

These outcomes may involve: research on the appropriateness of fieldwork settings for meeting curriculum goals (scholarship of teaching); literature reviews on an interdisciplinary topic relevant to occupational therapy (scholarship of integration); and designing and implementing disability advocacy projects or policies that are designed to increase access to occupational therapy services in rural or intercity areas (scholarship of application).

Future Research

The study yielded findings from occupational therapy faculty members in a private research institution and a private master's college to support Boyer's (1990) contention that faculty engagement in the four domains of scholarship should match the domain emphasis that is defined by institutional missions and goals. Moving forward, the study implicates the need for additional case studies in other types of institutions to build upon this evolving knowledge, e.g. public colleges and universities, and community colleges. Expanding upon these emergent findings to include occupational therapy academic departments whose faculty members entered academia earlier in their careers, program directors that vary in gender and age and part-time faculty members, will broaden understandings of faculty work. In addition, to gain further insight into scholarship in occupational therapy, it is important to describe and explore faculty performance that may differentiate a practice discipline from other disciplines.

Recommendations for future studies also include survey research to expand the Braxton, Luckey & Holland (2002) inventory of scholarship to include professional behaviors that most accurately characterize occupational therapy faculty performance.

This would entail developing an instrument that identifies the daily work of occupational therapy faculty in diverse institutional environments and categorizes them as published and unpublished scholarly outcomes and activities within Boyer's four domain areas. Developing an instrument that is directly linked to faculty practice would permit a national study of scholarship in occupational therapy faculty to be conducted, and a comparison within and across institutions to be made. Further, quasi-experimental designs could be conducted across academic departments using the scholarship instrument as an outcome measure, to determine the impact of faculty development training in a particular domain of scholarship on subsequent faculty performance in that domain area.

Limitations of the Study

Although the case study methodology utilized in this study addressed the identified research purpose and is grounded in supported theoretical perspectives, there are inherent limitations to the inquiry. For example, limited time, financial resources and the involvement of an individual researcher contributed to the decision to conduct a case study design that is intended to stand alone (Yin, 1994). Given that the case study involved two academic departments, the evidence will be less compelling than other research methodologies, e.g. multiple case study design. In addition, given that the researcher is a program director of an occupational therapy academic department it is important to consider whether a critical distance that allowed for a level of scholarly skepticism was possible. To achieve the level of objective authority to which the researcher in the proposed study aspires, every effort was made to insure that the

scholarly conclusions represent the informant's perspective rather than the researcher's point of view, and that alternative explanations have been given equal consideration (Yin, 1994).

This decision to conduct a single case study does not detract from the fact that the findings provide important descriptive information about the development of professional identity in faculty members in two diverse institutional environments. Further, methodological strategies were utilized to increase the probability that results may be applicable to other similar occupational therapy academic departments, or have relevance for faculty in other health professions. There are 147 occupational therapy academic programs in colleges and universities across the United States (<http://www.aota.org/Educate/EdRes/OTEdData.42026.42027.aspx>). Strategies that were utilized in this study included selecting cases that were typical in terms of: a) geographic location in the United States; and b) type of academic institution (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>). For instance, both settings are located in regions of the country that have high percentages of occupational therapy programs. Moreover, approximately 34% of occupational therapy programs are in research universities or in doctoral/research institutions, and 43% are in master's colleges and universities (AOTA, 2009). Thus, by selecting programs in a research university and a master's college the selection criterion was met for contexts where typical faculty perspectives could be obtained. Further, the personal, professional, and academic backgrounds of the occupational therapy faculty in this study demonstrated congruity with faculty in similar health professions and practice disciplines, i.e. nursing, physical therapy and social work.

For example, demographic data revealed the faculty informants were characterized by a significantly higher percentage of women (87%) than men (13%). Also similar to faculty in the professions who tend to enter academic life after gaining experience in their professional fields, a high percentage of the faculty members in this study entered academia in mid-career (73%). One characteristic that differentiated the occupational therapy faculty informants in this study from the norms of the academic culture is that they averaged over 12 years in academia prior to earning doctorates, with the majority of doctorates being conferred within the last 6-7 years. This stands in contrast to the two non-clinician faculty informants who entered academia with doctorates and research training as early career faculty.

The informants in this study were not viewed as a sample, and thus, there is no intent to infer that the findings discussed will generalize to the broader population of occupational therapy faculty in other research universities or master's colleges. The applicability of the findings to other occupational therapy faculty members in similar institutional contexts however, is left to individual readers to interpret. Thus, if other occupational therapy faculty members perceive a similarity of circumstances with the informants in this case study then the rich, descriptive data provided might prove to be useful information.

Conclusions

This study was designed to explore scholarship in occupational therapy faculty by examining the role of departmental culture in providing academic socialization processes that guide the development of a professional identity. The importance of personal

preferences, clinical training, and institutional culture on the prioritization of faculty roles and the development of academic careers was identified. Further, the findings from this case study suggest that professional identity in occupational therapy is not a fixed state, but rather involves a dynamic interplay of cultural forces that exist within colleges and universities and external to those institutions. This implies the critical role that academic departments play in modulating the competing influences and shaping faculty priorities. It is concluded that socialization processes in occupational therapy academic departments need to shape a national disciplinary culture of occupational therapy. The development of a common culture to which all faculty members feel connected, regardless of institutional context will permit the emerging discipline to develop scholars who can grow the knowledge base and build the research data needed to effect rehabilitation policy at the state and federal levels.

A common disciplinary culture requires a unified perspective on faculty scholarship. Recent interest in higher education for redefining scholarship may have prompted the release of a document that addressed scholarship in occupational therapy (AOTA, 2003). In the recently revised document, a broad perspective on scholarship that includes teaching, discovery, application and integration is conceptualized as critical to the needs of an emerging practice discipline (AOTA, 2009; Boyer, 1990). How academic departments operationalize occupational therapy's concept of faculty scholarship will impact the development of a professional identity in future faculty.

In this study, similarities in faculty narratives regarding scholarship were observed across the two settings indicating that some commonalities are present despite diverse institutional missions. For example, the informants collectively placed a high

value on their role as teachers and mentors, and collectively espoused conducting research and disseminating knowledge through publications as the gold standard for faculty scholarship. However, in terms of a collective disciplinary focus on faculty scholarship clear distinctions identified the faculty sub-cultures.

It is concluded that professional identity is contested or not contested based upon the degree of congruity between faculty experiences and personal preferences and the values of the departmental culture that supports faculty roles and work functions.

Therefore, if both the researcher role and the teaching role are valued by faculty members and prioritized as faculty work in academic departments, there is congruity with the mission of research institutions. This alignment of values was observed in the non-clinician and the early-career informant sub-cultures at Eminence University. Contested identities occur however, when a limited interest in developing as a research scholar conflicts with the institutional culture that highly rewards research and assigns a secondary role to teaching. This incongruity was observed in some members the mid-late faculty sub-culture whose limited research contributions failed to earn them promotion and tenure despite years of service to the institution.

Likewise, if faculty members like those from Determination College are content with teaching and service roles and spend little time in research activities, there is congruity with the mission of master's institutions. However, there is some indication that the identity of the informants from Determination is contested by the reality that a tepid inducement toward scholarly development has left these individuals wanting more. It is concluded that successful adjustment to faculty roles in the context of master's institution is insufficient if occupational therapy is going to develop disciplinary scholars

who will develop knowledge for practice and for education. Program directors and faculty members must be willing to surpass the expectations of teaching institutions and establish departmental requirements for developing the researcher role.

The profession of occupational therapy has recently standardized doctoral training for the academic role as the norm for faculty in professional education programs (AOTA, 2006). Thus, anticipatory socialization to the role of researcher that occurs during graduate training will now be the standard for occupational therapy faculty members. However, given that the faculty members in this study who entered doctoral training and faculty roles at mid-career were revealed to be at a disadvantage for developing careers as research scholars, future faculty members should seek academic training at an earlier stage of life (Baldwin, 1996). It is further concluded that clinicians who are interested in pursuing an academic career should limit the amount of clinical experience they acquire before returning for doctoral training.

It is anticipated that the insights drawn from this study may alter perceptions about the work that faculty do in research institutions and master's colleges. Furthermore, it is hoped that the interpretive model developed in this study will provide the basis for further research to uncover how to optimize the socialization processes that are occurring in academic departments to enhance the habits of mind and action that are required of disciplinary scholars. Of further interest is how occupational therapy faculty are developing as scholars using the domains of teaching, application and integration, in addition to discovery, and how publications and unpublished scholarly outcomes are being institutionalized in faculty promotion and tenure decisions.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

Project Purpose

The purpose of the proposed study is to develop an understanding of faculty scholarship in occupational therapy that is grounded in the profession's history and current theoretical perspectives, and yet permits the aspects of academic life that are unique to this health profession to be appreciated (Tierney & Rhoades, 1994; Boyer, 1990; Stark, 1998). The study will be organized around the concepts of socialization to the academic role, scholarly identity, and work behaviors in occupational therapy academic professionals.

A conceptual framework that is consistent with research on the differing lives and worlds of academics by discipline, profession and institutional type will guide the inquiry (Clark, 1987; Becher, 1989; Tierney, 1988; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1987; Braxton & Berger, 1999). A theoretically grounded case study inquiry will allow a rich understanding of the values, beliefs and norms of a professional occupational therapy department, as well as individual faculty perceptions regarding the day to day experiences of academic life in colleges and universities (Yin, 1994). The proposed study will extend current understandings of faculty socialization in the health professions beyond nursing, to include faculty in the rehabilitation profession of occupational therapy (Stoecker, 1993; Stark, 1998).

Informant Responsibilities

You are being asked to participate as an informant in a doctoral research project that is scheduled to be conducted at your college/university during the week of November ?? - ??, 2007. If you become a participant, you will agree to: 1) complete a demographic survey; 2) permit the investigator to conduct two interviews with you at your college/university; 3) take part in a focus group consisting of the occupational therapy faculty in your academic department; and 4) complete an inventory of scholarship.

The interviews are expected to occur in a comfortable setting that will be pre-arranged with the Program Director. Each interview is designed to be completed in 1.5 to 2 hours. The first interview will be directed by an interview protocol and will be audio-taped for later transcription. The follow-up interview will permit each informant to review the transcribed interview for clarification and validation of the findings.

The focus group will occur following the completion of the interviews at a pre-arranged time when all faculty informants can be present. The focus group will also be audiotaped for later transcription. At the completion of the focus group, the informants will complete an inventory. The focus group is designed to be completed in 1.5 to 2 hours.

Confidentiality of Data

Your identity will remain confidential. To ensure confidentiality, your name will not be used to identify the survey and interview data collected from you. Rather, you will be assigned a number at the beginning of the project and the data collected from you in written and audio format will be recorded under the assigned number. All data will be securely stored and remain accessible only to the investigator.

If you agree to participate in the project, you can discontinue your participation at any time.

To verify your qualifications to participate in this research study, you must include:

- 1) your NBCOT certification number
_____;
- 2) the year of your initial professional certification
_____;
- 3) the highest degree earned_____.

Your signature below indicates your acknowledgement of the project description and purpose, data collection methods to be used, projected timetable for the project, and that you agree to participate:

I (print faculty member name), _____
understand the information provided in this informed consent document and my signature below indicates my willingness to participate in this dissertation project.

Faculty Signature

APPENDIX B

FACULTY INFORMANT DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Informant Number _____

I. Demographic Data

1. Age:..... _____
2. Gender:.....Male _____ Female _____
3. Racial/Ethnic Group:
 - a. Caucasian..... _____
 - b. Black/Afr.American..... _____
 - c. Hispanic..... _____
 - d. Asian..... _____
 - e. Pacific Islander..... _____
 - f. Other..... _____
4. Personal Status:
 - a. Married..... _____
 - b. Single..... _____
 - c. Partnered.... _____
 - d. Separated... _____
 - e. Divorced... _____
 - d. Widowed... _____
 - e. Total Number of Children _____
 - f. Number of Children in each age group:
 - i. 0-5..... _____
 - ii. 6-10... _____
 - iii. 11-15.. _____
 - iv. 16-21.. _____
 - v. >21.... _____
5. Complete all that apply regarding earned academic degrees:
 - a. BS or BA _____ Field of Study _____
Year _____
 - b. Entry MSOT or MOT Occupational Therapy _____
Year _____
 - c. MA or MS _____ Field of Study _____
Year _____ Thesis Requirement Yes _____ No _____
 - d. Ph.D or Ed.D or Sci.D. _____ Field of study _____
Year _____
 - e. Clinical Doctorate _____ Field of Study _____
Year _____ Dissertation Requirement Yes _____ No _____
 - f. Honors Earned in Academic Career (e.g. Distinguished Teaching Award): _____

Academic Career

- 6. Number of years as a faculty member in all institutions:.....___Yrs.
- 7. Number of academic institutions in which you have worked as a faculty member:..... _____
- 8. Original academic appointment:
 - a. Instructor..... _____
 - b. Clinical Instructor.. _____
 - c. Assistant Professor. _____
 - d. Associate Professor _____
 - e. Full Professor..... _____
 - f. Did you have academic mentoring from a senior faculty member:
 - in your department?.....Yes ___ No ___
 - in another academic department? Yes ___ No ___
 - g. Did you earn tenure?.....Yes ___ No ___
- 9. Current academic appointment:
 - a. Instructor _____
 - b. Clinical Instructor _____
 - c. Assistant Professor _____
 - d. Associate Professor _____
 - e. Full Professor _____
 - f. Did you have academic mentoring from a senior faculty member:
 - in your department? Yes ___ No ___
 - in another academic department? Yes ___ No ___
 - g. Are you currently tenured?.....Yes ___ No ___

Clinical Career

- 11. Total number of years employed as a clinician: _____
- 12. Number of years employed in each setting:
 - a. In-Patient Hospital Unit..... _____
 - b. Outpatient Hospital Unit..... _____
 - c. Post-Acute Rehabilitation..... _____
 - d. Specialty Hospital/Center (Burns/Spinal Cord/Hand)..... _____
 - e. Outpatient Mental Health..... _____
 - e. School Systems..... _____
 - f. Early Intervention..... _____
 - g. Private Practice..... _____Area of Private Practice: _____

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Research Question #1

How are occupational therapy faculty members in academic departments in research universities and master's institutions prioritizing faculty roles and developing as disciplinary scholars?

Interview Questions to Faculty

1. How did you decide to become an academic?
Probe: What needs do you believe that you were fulfilling in going into academia?
Probe: Have there been any unexpected results of becoming a faculty member?
Probe: Any second thoughts about selecting an academic career?
2. How would you describe what you do in your current working life?
Probe: What work roles do you participate in on a regular basis?
Probe: Describe the types of activities that you spend most of your day performing.
Probe: How do you prioritize your professional activities?
3. Of the faculty activities that you regularly perform, which ones do you consider scholarly and why?
Probe: What or who has contributed most to this view?
Probe: Have you found that your view has changed since you began your academic career?
4. Tell me what being a successful scholar means to you and how did you come to that understanding?
Probe: Have your personal characteristics, e.g. age or gender, played a role in your beliefs?
Probe: Has the profession's viewpoint been instrumental in influencing your beliefs?
5. If I asked a randomly selected group of OT faculty to describe what value they ascribed to teaching, research, and service to the institution or practice community, would you expect the responses to be similar or dissimilar?
Probe: Do you believe that the type of graduate degree earned might differentiate them, e.g. OT or Rehabilitation Science vs. Higher Education or Psychology?
Probe: Would the type of employing college or university be a factor, e.g. a research university vs. a master's college?

6. What has surprised you the most about faculty scholarship at your institution?
Probe: Are the expectations for faculty to meet expectations for scholarship the same or different for faculty members in a hard science discipline, e.g. biology, and professional faculty in programs such as occupational therapy?
Probe: Compared with other faculty at your college/university, are OT faculty members viewed as scholars?

7. How much influence has the OT department in this college/university had in the formation of your faculty career, and why?
Probe: How would you characterize the emphasis placed on teaching, research, or service within the OT department/division?
Probe: How much of a factor have the ACOTE accreditation standards been on your development as a faculty scholar?

8. If you could write your academic epitaph, what would you like it to say?
Probe: What would you like to be remembered for as a faculty member?

Research Question #2

How do these faculty members make sense of the personal, professional, academic and institutional influences that impact the development of a professional identity?

Interview Questions to Faculty

1. How have you balanced working between the multiple identities of clinician and academician?
Probe: Have you retained an active clinical or practice role, how have you accomplished this, and how important has it been to you as a faculty member to do so?
Probe: In what ways is the professional status associated with clinical specialization a factor in your beliefs regarding your academic identity?

2. What frustrations have you experienced as an OT faculty member who needs to prepare practitioners and to contribute to the distinction of your academic department?
Probe: Have there been trade-offs and has your behavior favored one over the other?
Probe: Has coming from a practitioner culture in which theory and research evidence specific to OT practice is only decades old, contributed in any way?

3. What are the faculty activities that you value the most, and are those the same activities that the department values?
Probe: What is it about these activities that make them meaningful for you?

Probe: Do the other members of the OT department share these views?

4. How did you come to understand what was needed to be a successful faculty member in this institution?

Probe: Was there a new faculty orientation process?

Probe: Did the department provide faculty mentors?

Probe: Were linkages made between faculty success and development as a faculty scholar?

5. Did the notion of "scholarly fit", i.e. the level of congruity between what you value in faculty work and what is expected on the job, enter into your decision to become a faculty member in this department?

Probe: Was institutional prestige a factor in seeking a faculty position?

Probe: Was faculty and departmental status in the academic community a consideration?

Probe: Was the respect of your clinical peers a factor?

6. How do you intend to advance your academic career?

Probe: On what basis have you decided [or will you decide] that an academic doctorate or a clinical doctorate will best meet your needs for professional development?

Probe: How do you see your scholarly role evolving?

Probe: Is academic career mobility a value?

7. Do you anticipate that what you currently value as faculty scholarship will change over time?

Probe: Do you consider the beliefs about faculty work that you acquired since becoming a faculty member at this institution to be reasonably stable?

Probe: What can you imagine happening in your professional life that would alter your beliefs about how to be a successful faculty scholar?

8. If I asked you to name the top three occupational therapy programs in the U.S., which programs would you select and why?

Probe: Do you aspire to a faculty position in any of those institutions? Why or why not?

APPENDIX D

INVENTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP

Please check all activities in which you have participated in the last 3 years:

The Scholarship of Application

Scholarly Activities

- a. Service on a departmental program review committee _____
- b. Service on a departmental curriculum committee _____
- c. Service on a college-wide curriculum committee _____
- d. Self-study conducted for one's department _____
- e. Service on a committee engaged in institutional preparation for accreditation review _____
- f. Study conducted to help solve a departmental problem _____
- g. Study conducted to help formulate a departmental policy _____
- h. Study conducted to help formulate institutional policy _____
- i. Introduction of some result of scholarship in a consultation _____
- j. Provision of expert witness or testimony _____

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- k. Development of an innovative technology _____
- l. Seminars conducted for laypersons on current disciplinary topics _____
- m. Development of a new process for dealing with a practice problem _____
- n. Study conducted for a local organization _____
- o. Study conducted for a local nonacademic professional association _____
- p. Study conducted for a local government agency _____
- q. Study conducted to help solve a community problem _____
- r. Study conducted to help solve a county or state problem _____

Publications

- s. An article *that outlines a new research problem* identified through the application of knowledge and skill of one's academic discipline to a practical problem _____
- t. An article that *describes new knowledge* obtained through the application of the knowledge and skill of ones's academic discipline to a practical problem. _____
- u. An article that *applies new disciplinary knowledge* to a practical problem _____
- v. An article that proposes an approach to the bridging of theory and practice _____
- w. An article reporting findings of research designed to solve practical problems _____

The Scholarship of Discovery

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- x. A paper presented that describes a new theory developed by the author _____
- y. A paper presented that reports the findings of research designed to gain new knowledge. _____
- z. A report on research findings to a granting agency _____

Publications

- a1. A book chapter describing a new theory developed by the author _____
- b1. A refereed journal article reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge _____
- c1. A book reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge _____
- d1. A book describing a new theory developed by the author _____
- e1. A refereed journal article describing a new theory developed by the author _____

The Scholarship of Integration

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- f1. A talk on a current disciplinary topic given on a local radio station _____
- g1. A talk on a current disciplinary topic given on a local television station _____
- h1. A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local men's or women's service organization _____
- i1. A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local business organization _____
- j1. A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local nonacademic professional association _____
- k1. A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a group of college alumni _____
- l1. A lecture on a current disciplinary topic given for a local high school class _____
- m1. A lecture on a current disciplinary topic given for a local high school assembly _____
- n1. A lecture on a current disciplinary topic given for a local community college _____

Publications

- o1. A review of literature on a disciplinary topic _____
- p1. A review of literature on an interdisciplinary topic _____
- q1. A review essay of two or more books on similar topics _____
- r1. An article on the application of a research method borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own _____
- s1. A book chapter on the application of a research method borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own _____

- t1. An article on the application of a theory borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own _____
- u1. A book chapter on the application of a theory borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own _____
- v1. A critical book review published in an academic or professional journal _____
- w1. A critical book review published in a newsletter of a professional association _____
- x1. An article addressing a disciplinary/interdisciplinary topic published by the popular press _____
- y1. A book addressing a disciplinary/interdisciplinary topic published by the popular press _____
- z1. An article that crosses subject matter areas _____
- a2. A book that crosses subject matter areas _____
- b2. A critical book review published in the popular press _____
- c2. A book published with research findings to lay readers _____
- d2. A textbook published _____
- e2. An edited book published _____
- f2. An article on a current disciplinary topic published in a local newspaper _____
- g2. An article on a current disciplinary topic published in a college or university publication _____
- h2. An article on a current disciplinary topic published in a national magazine of a popular press _____

The Scholarship of Teaching

Scholarly Activities

- i2. Directed student research projects _____
- j2. Preparation of a new syllabus for a course _____
- k2. Development of exam questions requiring higher-order thinking skills _____
- l2. Development of a set of lectures, learning activities or class plans for a new course _____
- m2. Maintenance of a journal of day to day teaching activities _____
- n2. Study problems or questions emerging from one's own teaching _____
- o2. Construction of an annotated bibliography for course reference _____
- p2. A lecture on topics from current journal articles not covered in course readings _____
- q2. A lecture on topics from current scholarly books not covered in course readings _____
- r2. Development of a new course _____
- s2. Development of a new set of lectures for an existing course _____

- t2. Introduction of some result of one's scholarship in teaching _____
- Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
- u2. Presentation about new instructional techniques to colleagues _____
- v2. Development of a collection of resource materials for one's subject area _____
- w2. Construction of a novel examination or testing practice _____
- x2. Experimentation with new teaching methods or activities _____
- y2. Development of methods to make ungraded assessments of students' learning of course content _____
- z2. Trying a new instructional practice and altering it until it is successful _____
- a3. Development of examples, materials, class exercises, or assignments that help students to learn difficult concepts _____
- b3. Creation of an approach or strategy for dealing with class management problems faced in teaching a particular type of course _____
- c3. Creation of an approach or strategy to help students to think critically about course concepts _____
- Publications
- d3. Publication listing resource materials for a course _____
- e3. Publication on the use of a new instructional method _____
- f3. Publication reporting a new teaching approach developed by the author _____
- g3. Publication of a method to make ungraded assessments of students' learning of course content _____
- h3. Publication on the use of a new instructional practice and the alterations made to make it successful _____
- i3. Publication on examples, materials, class exercises, or assignments that help students to learn difficult course concepts _____
- j3. Publication on an approach or strategy for dealing with class management problems faced in teaching a particular type of course _____
- k3. Publication on an approach or strategy to help students to think critically about course concepts _____

Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W. & Holland, P. (2002). Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 29(2). San Francisco, CA: Wiley Subscription Services. P. 141-146.

APPENDIX E

DATA CODING: MID-LATE CAREER STAGE SUB-CULTURE

OPEN CODING	ANALYTICAL CODING	AXIAL CODING
Interview Question #1	Academic Career	How and Why?
I did a lot of workshop teaching..I thought I might eventually end up teaching..I got married and wanted the summers off	Teaching Career (DC) Academic training secondary	Primary Goal Passive Pursuit
It was an outgrowth of over 20 years of experience as a clinician....I wanted new challenges and to have a different kind of effect on the profession	New work/Teaching (DC) Academic training secondary	Secondary Goal Passive Pursuit
I figured I'd always get back into teaching...it was one of my goals and the area needed a professional program...a doctorate was never contemplated	Teaching Career (DC) Academic training secondary out of necessity	Primary Goal Passive Pursuit
I was burnt out on clinical work and needed a change...I was miffed about having to get a doctorate	New work/Teaching (DC) Academic training secondary out of necessity	Secondary Goal Passive Pursuit
My father was a professor...I didn't want to spend all of my time in a clinic...I saw teaching as a way to be a huge change agent	Teaching Career (DC) Academic training/career by preference	Primary Goal Active Pursuit
I came to run the clinical program and teach....I fell in love with the university and became involved in research...I came to a point where I had to have a doctorate	Teaching Career (EU) Academic training secondary out of necessity	Primary Goal Passive Pursuit
It wasn't something that was well thought out...I needed a change of pace because I was at the top of my clinical game...it had nothing to do with research	New work/Teaching (EU) Academic training secondary out of necessity	Secondary Goal Passive Pursuit
I was interested in teaching and student activities...always interested in reading, learning and thinking....now getting an OTD	Teaching Career (EU) Academic training secondary out of necessity	Primary Goal Passive Pursuit
I was teaching employers as part of clinical work and I liked teaching....needed to move on to a new challenge..didn't anticipate getting a doctorate it just evolved by being in the environment.	Teaching Career (EU) Academic training secondary out of necessity	Primary Goal Passive Pursuit
I was interested in an area of practice and I had clinical questions and so I ended up getting my Ph.D.	Research Career (EU) Academic training/career by preference	Primary Goal Active Pursuit
Code: DC = Determination College EU = Eminence University		

APPENDIX F

DATA CODING: NON-THERAPIST AND EARLY CAREER SUB-CULTURES

OPEN CODING	INDEX CODING	ANALYTICAL CODING
Interview Question #1	Academic Career	How and Why?
I got an MS in Kinesiology and wanted to know more about biomechanics.....so I trained as an academic and followed the money to medicine	Research Career (EUb)	Primary Goal Active Pursuit
In 7 th grade I decided to become a scientist...I wanted to apply neuroscience to some clinical questions	Research Career (EUb)	Primary Goal Active Pursuit
Didn't plan on it.....got into this environment in graduate school...field needed academics with research agendas	Research Career (EUc)	Secondary Goal Active Pursuit
It just kind of happened ...coordinated research grants as a teaching assistant...in the process of looking for a Ph.D. program	Research Career (EUc)	Secondary Goal Active Pursuit

EU = Eminence University

b = Non-Clinician

c = Early Career

APPENDIX G

MATRIX ANALYSIS
 WHAT NEEDS WERE MET IN ACADEMIA? ANY SURPRISES? ANY
 UNEXPECTED RESULTS/REGRETS?

HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM & INSTITUTIONAL EXPECTATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Knowledge production top priority ✓ Hierarchy with soft applied sciences departments having lower status ✓ Teaching as primary goal – 6/10 ✓ Teaching valued but differently than research ✓ Non-tenured faculty not viewed as scholars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Faculty with master's degrees ✓ Teaching/students top priority ✓ Professional Program hierarchy with history & mission driving status Teaching as a primary goal – 3/5 ✓ Tenure achieved without research, but those who don't do research are not viewed as scholars
ACADEMIC CULTURE: GRADUATE TRAINING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Passive pursuit of research training -5/10 ✓ Active pursuit of academic career/research training -3/10 ✓ Trained as an academic and pursued the money to medicine ✓ Opportunity and desire to make research a career ✓ <i>Unplanned but was motivated by the environment of the university</i> ✓ <u>Fell in love with the opportunities at university</u> ✓ <u>Could provide answers to clinical questions</u> ✓ Surprise - tremendous university need for external funding ✓ Surprise - students are not the most important thing ✓ <i>Discovered how few OT researchers there were and wanted to support the profession</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A doctorate was never contemplated ✓ Passive pursuit of research training - 5/5 ✓ <u>Wasn't sure about the quality of the institution but came to respect the caliber of the faculty</u>
DEPARTMENTAL SOCIALIZATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Surprise - OT transforming into an academic discipline</u> ✓ More money elsewhere but less fulfillment ✓ Even clinical track faculty value research as primary function because 50%-75% of time is research, and teaching is integrated with research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Wanted to accomplish something for the field ✓ Similar to clinical work in helping students to reach goals ✓ <u>Surprise - finding out that it was such a different world and more challenging</u>
PROFESSIONAL TRAINING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Loved the field and wanted to accomplish something for it</u> ✓ <u>National organization as instrumental in leadership</u> ✓ Would like time for clinical work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Wanted to have a different kind of effect on the profession ✓ Would like time for clinical work ✓ Desire for teaching in area of expertise
PERSONAL BACKGROUND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Satisfying my need to know and be in charge ✓ Needed a role change and a new challenge ✓ No regrets & no second thoughts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Wanted relationships with people being taught ✓ Needed a role change and a challenge ✓ No regrets and no second thoughts ✓ Faculty stay because of fit and personal values
	EMINENCE UNIVERSITY	DETERMINATION COLLEGE

Black = Mid-to-Late Career Sub-Group **Bold** = Non-Clinician Sub-Culture
Italics = *Early Career Sub-Culture* Underline = Program Director

APPENDIX H

DETERMINATION COLLEGE FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

a = Mid-Late Career Informants (5)

	DC#1a	DC#2a	DC#3a	DC#4a	DC#5a
AGE	55	56	58	57	52
GENDER	F	F	F	F	F
RACE	C	C	C	C	C
PERSONAL	M	M	M	M	M
CHILDREN	3	3	3	2	3
DEGREE YEAR FIELD	BA 1974 PSY.	BS 1973 OT	BS 1978 EDU.	BS 1971 OT	BA 1976 OT
DEGREE YEAR FIELD	MS 1976 OT	MBA 1988 BUS.	MS 1984 OT	MS 1981 OT	MS 1981 BUS.
DEGREE YEAR FIELD	PHD 2004 ED.PSY.		PHD 2002 FAM.DEV.	Ed.D 2004 ED.PSY.	OTD 2006 OT
YEARS AS FACULTY	16.5	13	19	17	19
#INSTIT.	1	1	1	1	3
ORIGINAL APPOINT.	ASSIST.	ASSIST.	ASSIST.	ASSIST.	ASSIST.
YRS. TO PROMOTION	13		19		16
CURRENT APPOINT.	ASSOC.	ASSIST.	ASSOC.	ASSIST.	ASSOC.
TENURE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
YEARS AS CLINICIAN	16	18	14	20	15

APPENDIX I

EMINENCE UNIVERSITY FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

	a = Mid-Late Career Informants (6)			b = Non-Therapist Informants (2)			c = Early Career Informants (2)			
	EU#1b	EU#2b	EU#3a	EU#4a	EU#5a	EU#6a	EU#7a	EU#8c	EU#9a	EU#10c
Age	57	44	56	54		48	41	27	65	33
Gender	M	F	F	F	F	F	F	M	F	F
Race	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Status	M	M	M	M	M	D	M	M	D	S
Degree Year Field	BS 1973 Math	BA 1986 Psy..	BS 1974 OT	BS 1976 OT	BS 1975 OT	BS 1980 OT	BS 1986 Hlth. Sci.	BS 2003 Hlth. Sci.	BS 1966 OT	BA 1996 Psy.
Degree Year Field	MS 1979 Kines.	MS 1990 Psy.	MAT 1987 Ed.	MS 1980 OT	MS 1981 Edu.	MHS 2000 Hlth.	MS 1992 OT	MS 2007 Clin. Invest.	MA 1979 Mgmt.	MS 1998 OT
Degree Year Field	PHD 1985 Bio- Mech.	PHD 1992 Psy.	PHD 2000 Soc. Wrk	PHD 1999 Soc. Wrk.	OTD 2009 OT	OTD 2008 OT	PHD 1998 Env. Sci.	OTD 2007 OT	PHD 1993 Soc. Wrk.	
Original Appt.	Instruct	Assist.	Instr.	Instr.	Instr.	Instr.	Instr.	Instr.	Instr.	Instr.
Current Appt.	Assoc.	Assist.	Instr.	Instr.	Instr.	Assist.	Assist.	Instr.	Full	Instr.
Tenure	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
#Instituti on	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Children	2	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	1	0
Years as OT Clinician			8	10	5	21	20	1	22	0
Years to Promotion	4		20				10		12	
Years as Faculty	23	10	25	20	15	7	16	1	32	6

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Academic programs 2007-2008 annual data report. Retrieved May 25, 2009, from <http://www.aota.org/Educate/EdRes/OTEdData.42026.42027.aspx>
- Academic programs 2004-2005 annual data sheets. Retrieved May 25, 2009, from <http://www.aota.org/Educate/EdRes/OTEdData/FacDeg/38364.aspx>
- Alpert, D. Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. (1991). In M.W. Peterson (Ed.). *Organization and governance in higher education. ASHE Reader Series* (pp.76-102). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Altbach, P. G. (1999). Harsh realities: The professoriate faces a new century. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumpert (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 271-297). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R. O. & Gumpert, P. J. (1999). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as the socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (1), 94-122.
- Bailey, D.M. (2001). *Research for the health professional: A practical guide*. Philadelphia, PA: F.A. Davis Company.
- Baird, L. (1991). Publication productivity in doctoral research departments: Interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 32, 303-318.
- Baldwin, R. G. (1996). Faculty career stages and implications for professional development. In D. Finnegan, D. Webster, and Z. Gamson. *Faculty and faculty issues in colleges and universities*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster.
- Barker Schwartz, K. (2003). The history of occupational therapy. In E.B. Crepeau, E.S. Cohn, & B. A. Boyt Schell. *Williard and Spackman's occupational therapy*. (pp. 5-13). Philadelphia, PA: Lippencott, Williams & Wilkens.
- Barris, R. & Kielhofner, G. (1985). Generating and using knowledge in occupational therapy: Implications for professional education. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 5, 113-124.

- Baum, C. M. (1987). Research: Its relationship to public policy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 41, 143-145.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories*. Bristol, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Bentley, R. & Blackburn, R. (1990). Changes in academic research performance over time: A study of institutional accumulative advantage. *Research in Higher Education*, 31 (4), 359-380.
- Berdahl, R. O. & McConnell, T. R. (1999). Autonomy and accountability: Who controls academe? In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumport (Eds.). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. (pp. 70-88). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton University Press. Princeton: New Jersey.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bozyk, D. (2005). Redefining the culture of scholarship: Madonna University. In K. O'Meara & R. E. Rice (Eds.). *Faculty priorities reconsidered : Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. (pp. 95-111). San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass.
- Braxton, J. M. & Berger, J. B. (1999). How disciplinary consensus affects faculty. In R. J. Menges and Associates (Eds.), *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established and building institutional support*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- 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: Wiley Subscription Services.
- Broski, D. C., Olson, R. E., & Savage, A. A. (1985). Increasing research productivity in university-based colleges of allied health. *Journal of Allied Health*, 14, 160-162.
- Broski, D. C. (1986). On increasing research productivity in university based occupational therapy programs. *Proceedings: Occupational therapy education: Target 2000*, 191-192. Rockville, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association.
- Broski, D. C. (1987). Commentary: 'Faculty perceptions of rewards in occupational therapy education: Implications for improving research productivity.' *The Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 7(4), 210-214.

- Bruhn, J. G. (1987). Commentary: The changing limits of professionalism in allied health. *Journal of Allied Health, 16*, 111-118.
- Buchanan, J. R. (1989). Resources and limitations of medical centers in the United States. *Academic Medicine, 64*, 513-526.
- Carnegie Foundation. (2009). Basic classification: Distribution of institutions and enrollments by classification category.. Retrieved May 26, 2009, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp>
- Christiansen, C. H. (1981). Editorial: Toward resolution of crisis: Research requisites in occupational therapy. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 1*, 115-124.
- Christiansen, C. H. (1986). Editorial: Research as reclamation. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 6*, 323-328.
- Christiansen, C. H. (1987). Research: Its relationship to higher education. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 41*, 77-80.
- Christiansen, C. H. & Baum, C. M. (1997). *Occupational therapy: Enabling and well-being*. Thorofare, NJ: Slack Incorporated.
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, B. R. (1997). Small worlds, different worlds: The uniquenesses and troubles of American academic professions. *Daedalus, 126* (4), 180-191.
- Clark, S. M. & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *The Journal of Higher Education, 57* (1), 20-43.
- Clark, F., Sharrot, G., Hill, D.J., & Cambell, S. (1985). A comparison of impact of undergraduate and graduate occupational therapy education on professional productivity. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 39* (3), 155-162.
- Clark, F., Azen, S., Zemke, R., Jackson, J., Carlson, M., Mandel, D., et al. (1997). Occupational therapy for independent-living older adults: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 278*, 1321-1326.
- Coleman, W (1990). The curriculum directors: Influencing occupational therapy education, 1948-1964. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 44* (4), 357-362.

- Coleman, W. (1992a). Maintaining autonomy: The struggle between occupational therapy and physical medicine. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46 (1), 63-70.
- Coleman, W. (1992b). Exploring educational boundaries: Occupational therapy and the multiple-entry-route system, 1970-1982. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46 (3), 260-266.
- Conine, T. A., Shilling, L. M., & Pierce, E. R. (1985). The relative importance of supportive data for promotion and tenure reviews. *Journal of Allied Health*, 14, 183-190.
- Cook, J. V. (Ed.). (2001). *Qualitative research in occupational therapy: Strategies and experiences*. Canada: Thomson Learning, Inc.
- Coppard, B. M. & Dickerson, A. (2005). *A descriptive review of occupational therapy education*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Coppard, B., Berthelette, M., Gaffney, D., Muir, S., Reitz, S. M. & Yarett Slater, D. (2009, March 9). Why continue 2 points of entry education for occupational therapists? *OT Practice*, 10-14.
- Covey, P. C., & Burke, J. E. (1987). Commentary: Research and the mission of schools of allied health. *Journal of Allied Health*, 16, 1-5.
- Crepeau, E. B., Cohen, E. S. & Boyt-Schell, B. A. (2003). *Williard and Spackman's occupational therapy*. (pp. 5-13). Philadelphia, PA: Lippencott, Williams & Wilkens.
- Danka, M.A. (1993). Differences in values and goals of occupational therapy students. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 47(5), 453-459.
- Dey, E. L., Milem, J. F. & Berger, J. B. (1997). Changing patterns of publication productivity: Accumulative disadvantage or institutional isomorphism? *Sociology of Education*, 70 (4), 308-323.
- Dickerson, A. E. & Whittman, P. P. (1999). Perceptions of occupational therapists regarding postprofessional education. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 53 (5), 454-457.
- Dillaway, H., Lysack, C. & Luborsky, M. R. (2006). Qualitative approaches to interpreting and reporting data. In G. Kielhofner (Ed.). *Research in occupational therapy: Methods of inquiry for enhancing practice*. (pp. 372-387). Philadelphia, PA: F.A.Davis Company.

- Dinham, S. & Stritter, F. (1986). Research on professional education. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp.952-965). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Ellwein, L. B. (1989). Evaluating journal publication across academic departments. *Academic Medicine*, 64, 319-325.
- Ethridge, D. A. & McSweeney, M. (1971). *Research in occupational therapy*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1993). Academic values and faculty rewards. *Review of Higher Education*, 17 (1), 43-68.
- Finnerty, A. (February 25, 2007). The way from San Jose. *The New York Times Book Review*. Section 7. Book Review on *The Golden Road: Notes on my gentrification* by Caille Millner.
- Fog, P. (2003, April 18). The gap that won't go away. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A14.
- Frank, G. (1992). Opening feminist histories of occupational therapy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46(11), 989-998.
- Gay, L. R. & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Golde, C.M. & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia, PA: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Grady, A. P. (1987). Nationally speaking: Research: Its role in enhancing professional image. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 41(6), 347-349.
- Haertlein, C. & Coppard, B. M. (2003). *Scholarship and occupational therapy*. (Addendum to the Reference Manual of the Official Documents of the American Occupational Therapy Association, Inc., pp. 1- 4). Bethesda, MD: The American Occupational Therapy Association, Inc.
- Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic and post-modern perspectives*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Heater, S. (1987). Developing an occupational therapy program at a small college. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 41(3), 179-183.
- Hoberman, S. & Mailick, S. (1994). (Eds.) *Professional education in the United States: Experiential learning, issues and prospects*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Holcomb, J. D., & Roush, R. E. (1977). Faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure policies in the allied health professions. *Journal of Allied Health, 6*, 24-27.
- Holcomb, J. D., & Roush, R. E. (1988). A study of the scholarly activities of Southern allied health faculty. *Journal of Allied Health, 17*, 277-293.
- Hooper, B. (2006). Epistemological transformation in occupational therapy: Educational implications and challenges. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research: Occupation, Participation and Health, 26*(1), 15-24.
- Hummer, L. A., Hunt, K. S., & Figuers, C. C. (1994). Predominant thought regarding entry-level doctor of physical therapy programs. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education, 8*, 60-66.
- Jaffe, E. (1985a). Transition in health care: Critical planning for the 1990's, part one. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 39*(7), 431-436.
- Jaffe, E. (1985b). Transition in health care: Critical planning for the 1990's, part two. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 39*(8), 499-503.
- Jantzen, A.C. (1974). Academic occupational therapy: A career specialty. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 28*(2).
- Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. New York, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Johnson, J. A. (1974). Delegate assembly address. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 28*(9), 521- 524.
- Johnson, J. A. (1978a). Representative assembly address. Sixty years of progress: Questions for the future. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 32*(4), 209-213.
- Johnson, J. A. (1978b). Nationally speaking: Issues in education. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 32*(6), 355-358.
- Johnson, J. A. & Yerxa, E. J. (Eds.). (1989). *Occupational science: The foundations for new models of practice*. New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.
- Jones, D., Blair, S. E., Hartery, T. & Jones, R. K. (1998). *Sociology and occupational therapy*. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.
- Kamp, L. (1994). *Constraints and enablers that delineate career paths of occupational therapists in doctoral education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

- Keefe, S. (2007, March 12). Reaching higher. *Advance for Occupational Therapy Practitioners*. 7-9.
- Kielhofner, G. & Burke, J. P. (1977). Occupational therapy after 60 years: An account of changing identity and knowledge. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 31, 657-689.
- Kielhofner, G. (2006). *Research in occupational therapy: Methods of inquiry for enhancing practice*. Philadelphia, PA: F.A. Davis Company.
- Kuh, G. D. & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Educational Report*, 17(1).
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd Ed.). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Labovitz, D. R. (1986). Faculty research: A pluralistic approach. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 40, 207-209.
- Ladd, E. C. (1979). The work experience of American college professors: Some data and an argument. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 2, 3-12.
- Laliberte-Rudman, D. & Moll, S. (2001). In-depth interviewing. In J.V. Cook (Ed.). *Qualitative research in occupational therapy: Strategies and experiences*. Canada: Thomson Learning, Inc.
- Larson, E., Wood, W. & Clark, F. (2003). Occupational science: Building the science and practice of occupation through an academic discipline. In E.B. Crepeau, E.S. Cohn, & B.A. Boyt Schell (Eds.), *Williard and Spackman's Occupational therapy* (pp.15-26). Philadelphia, PA: Lippencott, Williams & Willkins.
- Lindeman, C. (1989). Nursing education and practice. *Academic Medicine*, 64, 70-73.
- Litturst, T. A. (1992). Occupational therapy: The role of ideology in the development of a profession for women. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46 (1), 20-25.
- Lowenstein, S. R. & Harvan, R. A. (2005). Broadening the definition of scholarship : A strategy to recognize and reward clinician-teachers at the University of Colorado School of Medicine. In K. O'Meara & R. E. Rice (Eds.). *Faculty priorities reconsidered : Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. (pp. 230-251). San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass.

- Lysack, C., Luborsky, M.R. & Dillaway, H. Gathering qualitative data. (2006). In G. Kielhofner (Ed.). *Research in occupational therapy: Methods of inquiry for enhancing practice*. (pp. 372-387). Philadelphia, PA: F.A. Davis Company.
- Lucci, J. (1974). Basic Master Program. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 28 (5), 292-295.
- Masagatani, G.N. & Grant, H.K. (1986). Managing an academic career. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 40 (2), 83-88.
- Mathewson, M. (1975). Female and married: Damaging to the therapy profession? *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 29 (10), 601-605.
- Maxfield, M.F. (1975). The effectiveness of master's degree programs. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 29 (4), 213-217.
- Mayhew, L. B. & Ford, P. J. (1974). *Reform in graduate and professional education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Menges, R.(1999). *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Metaxas, V.A. (2000). Eleanor Clark Slagle and Susan E. Tracy: Personal and professional identity and the development of occupational therapy in progressive era America. *Nursing Historical Review*, 8, 39-70.
- Mettler, P. & Bork, C. E. (1985). Tenure and the allied health professions: Issues and alternatives. *Journal of Allied Health*, 14, 119-127.
- Middaugh, M. F. (2001). *Understanding faculty productivity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B. & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71 (4), 452-475.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mitcham, M. D., Lancaster, C. J. & Stone, B. M. (2002). Evaluating the effectiveness of occupational therapy faculty development workshops. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 56 (3), 335-339.
- Mitchell, M. M. (1985). Professional development: Clinician to academician. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 39, 363-368.

- Morse, J. M. & Field, P. A. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for health professionals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Kane, C.P. (1977). *An exploration of the status and future directions of graduate programs in occupational therapy in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- O'Meara, K. & Rice, R. E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco, CA: Josey- Bass.
- Ott, J.S. (1989). *The organizational culture perspective*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Pagliarulo, M. A. (1996). *Introduction to physical therapy*. St. Louis, MO: Mosby Publishing.
- Parham, D. (1985a). Academic reward structures and occupational therapy faculty Part I: Characteristics of faculty. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 5, 83-100.
- Parham, D. (1985b). Academic reward structures and occupational therapy faculty Part II: Predictors of rewards and scholarly productivity. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 5, 139-153.
- Patten, M.L. (2005). *Proposing empirical research: A guide to the fundamentals*. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA:Sage.
- Paul, S., Liu, Y. & Ottenbacher, K.J. (2002). Research productivity among occupational therapy faculty members in the United States. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 56(3), 331- 334.
- Pfiefle, W.G., Lacefield, W.E., & Cole, H.P. (1981, May). Motivational factors in the careers of health care educators. *Journal of Allied Health*, 73-90.
- Pierce, D., Jackson, J., Rogosky-Grassi, M., Thompson, M. E. & Menninger, B. (1987). The possible effects of a change to master's entry level in occupational therapy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 41, 658 - 666.
- Pierce, D. & Peyton, C. (1999). A historical cross-disciplinary perspective on the professional doctorate in occupational therapy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 53, 64-71.
- Posthuma, B. W. & Noh, S. (1991). Faculty recruitment: Where are the applicants? *The Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 58, 189-195.

- Pounds, L. A. (1989). The nursing–medicine relationship: Two views. *Academic Medicine*, 64, 67-69.
- Print, M. & Hattie, J. (1997). Measuring quality in universities: An approach to weighing research productivity. *Higher Education*, 33, 453-460.
- Provident, I. M. (2006). Outcomes of selected cases from the American Occupational Therapy Foundation's curriculum mentoring project. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 60 (5), 563-576.
- Punwar, A. J. & Peloquin, S. M. (2000). *Occupational therapy: Principles and practices*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins.
- Radonsky, V.E. (1980). Personality characteristics of the published and the nonpublished occupational therapist. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 34 (3), 208-212.
- Reilly, M. (1969). The educational process. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 23, 299-307.
- Rider, B. A. (1987). Faculty research: A reply to Deborah Labovitz. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 41, 55-56.
- Rider, B. A. (1989). A comparison of curriculum directors, aspiring curriculum directors, and faculty members in occupational therapy. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 9, 131-142.
- Rogers, J. C. (1980a). Design of the master's degree in occupational therapy, part 1: A logical approach. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 34(2), 113-118.
- Rogers, J. C. (1980b). Design of the master's degree in occupational therapy, part 2: A logical approach. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 34(3), 176-184.
- Rogers, J. C (1986). Mentoring for career achievement and advancement. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 40(2),79-82.
- Royeen, C. B., Zardetto-Smith, A. M. & Duncan, M. E. (1999). Preliminary study of learning through discussion in occupational therapy education. In P. Crist (Ed.). *Innovations in occupational therapy education 1999*. Bethesda, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association.
- Rozier, C. K., Gilkeson, G. E., & Hamilton, B. L. (1991). Job satisfaction of occupational therapy faculty. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*,45(2),160-165.

- Sabari, J. S. (1985). Professional socialization: Implications for occupational therapy education. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 39, 96-102.
- Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Schein, E. H. (1987). *The art of managing human resources*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schnebly, M. E. (1970). From clinician to educator. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, XXIV (5), 329-335.
- Schnebly, M. E. (1971). *Graduate study needs of occupational therapy educators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Sieg, K. W. (1986). Chairing the academic occupational therapy department: A job analysis. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 40 (2), 89-95.
- Siler, W. L. & Smith Randolph, D. (2006, July 21). A clinical look at clinical doctorates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved September 7, 2006, from <http://chronicle.com/free>.
- Spurr, S. H. (1970). *Academic degree structures: Innovative approaches*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stark, J. S. (1998). Classifying professional preparation programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69, 353-383.
- Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. & Hagerty, B. (1986). Faculty roles and role preferences in ten fields of professional study. *Research in Higher Education*, 25(1), 3-36.
- Steele, R. L. (1991). Attitudes about faculty practice, perceptions of role, and role strain. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 30, 15-22.
- Stemmler, E. J. (1989). The medical school – where does it go from here? *Academic Medicine*, 64, 182-185.
- Stoecker, J. L. (1993). The Biglan classification revisited. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(4), 451-464.
- Stone, D. (1997). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making*. New York. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

- Storm, W. (1990). The relationship of educational level to the development and dissemination of knowledge by occupational therapists. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 44 (1), 39-46.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, T. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory and strategies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (1963). *Occupational therapy curriculum study: Introduction to reports on the curriculum study*. New York: Author.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (1982). 1982 Member data survey final report. Rockville, MD: Author.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (1985). *A professional legacy: The Eleanor Clarke Slagle lectures in occupational therapy, 1955-1984*. (pp. 155-173). Rockville, MD: Author.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association. (1997). AOTA Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education Accreditation Manual. Rockville, MD: Author.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (2003). *Scholarship in occupational therapy*. Bethesda, MD: Author.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (2004). Academic Terminal Degree: Official documents the American Occupational Therapy Association, Inc. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 58 (6), 647.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (2006, 1998, 1995, 1991, 1983, 1973, 1965, 1949, 1943). Essentials/Standards for Educational Programs for Occupational Therapists. Rockville, MD: Author.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (2006). *Academic standards for a masters-degree-level educational program for the occupational therapist*. Retrieved October 26, 2009 at www.aota.org/Practitioners/Official/Accreditation/41085.aspx
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (2009). *Academic programs annual data report: Academic year 2008-2009*. Bethesda, MD: Author.
- The American Occupational Therapy Association (2009). *Scholarship in occupational therapy*. Retrieved October 26, 2009 at www.aota.org/Practitioners/Official/Concept/38356.aspx

- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59 (1), 2-21.
- Tierney, W. G. (1991). *Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Tierney, W. G. & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). *Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process*. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics (1993). *Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:93): Salary, promotion, and tenure status of minority and women faculty in U.S. colleges and universities*. Retrieved October 3, 2009 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/index.asp>.
- Van Maanen, J. (1977). *Organizational careers: Some new perspectives*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Maanen, J. & Barley, S. (1984). Occupational communities: Culture and control in organizations. In B. Straw & I. Cummings (Eds.). *Research in organizational behavior, Vol.1*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Vasantachart, D. S. M. & Rice, G. T. (1997). Academic integration of occupational therapy faculty: A survey. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 51 (7), 584 - 588.
- Walker, K. F. & Ludwid, F. M. (2004). *Perspectives on theory for the practice of occupational therapy*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed, Inc.
- Waller, K. V., Jordan, L., Gierhart, J., Brodnik, M. P., Schiller, M. R., Flanigan, K. S., Ballinger, P. W., Grant, H. K., Bennet, D., Can Son, L. G., & Testat, E. W. (1988). Research skills and the research environment: A needs assessment of allied health faculty. *Journal of Allied Health*, 17, 101-113.
- Wartman, S. A. & O'Sullivan, P. S. (1989). A call for a national center for health professions education research. *Academic Medicine*, 64, 295-299.
- Weick, K.E. (2001). *Making sense of the organization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Weidman, J. C. & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to academic norms. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(6), 641-654.

- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage? *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 28, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- West, W. L. (1958). The present status of graduate education in occupational therapy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 12, 291-297.
- West, W. L. (1992). Ten milestone issues in AOTA history. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46(12), 1066-1074.
- Whittman, P. P. (1990). The disparity between educational preparation and the expectations of practice. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 44(12), 1130-1131.
- Wilcox, A. A. (1998). *An occupational perspective of health*. Thorofare, NJ: Slack, Inc.
- Wulff, D. H. & Austin, A. E. (Ed.). (2004). *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Yerxa, E. J. (1967). Authentic occupational therapy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Vol. XXI, 155-173.
- Yerxa, E. J. (1975). Nationally speaking: On being a member of a "feminine" profession. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 29(10), 597-598.
- Yerxa, E. J. (1991). Occupational therapy: An endangered species or an academic discipline in the 21st century. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45(8), 680-685.
- Yerxa, E. J. (2005). A firm persuasion in our work: Learning to love the questions. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 59(1), 108-111.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Zaytoun, K. D. (2005). Identity and learning: The inextricable link. *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience*, 9 (6), 8-15.