

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Nathan R. Hovekamp for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education presented on August 30, 2005.

Title: Community College and University Faculty: A Comparison of Perceptions about Professional Role

Abstract approved:

Redacted for Privacy

Betty Duvall

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about similarities and differences in their professional roles. The research design included a qualitative ethnographic case study methodology with faculty participants purposively selected from two public colleges in the Pacific Northwest: a community college and a co-located university branch campus. Face-to-face interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed then subjected to analytic induction to provide for the emergence of themes. The community college faculty perceived their own professional role as focused on teaching, whereas they perceived university faculty as more focused on research. The community college faculty also described a perceived academic hierarchy with themselves lower than university faculty. The university faculty perceived their own professional role as combining teaching and research in a complementary way, whereas they perceived community college faculty as burdened by heavy teaching loads. The university faculty also contended that the demands of research and publication placed upon them are not fully understood by others. Faculty from both institutions made comments about the utility of a broader, more comprehensive concept of scholarship as well as the notion

of institutional pluralism including a place for both community colleges and universities. Finally, both faculties described the benefits from and barriers to community college and university faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation as well as mechanisms to improve them.

©Copyright by Nathan R. Hovekamp

August 30, 2005

All Rights Reserved

Community College and University Faculty:
A Comparison of Perceptions about Professional Role

by
Nathan R. Hovekamp

A DISSERTATION

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Presented August 30, 2005

Commencement June 2006

Doctor of Philosophy dissertation of Nathan R. Hovekamp
presented on August 30, 2005

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Major Professor, representing Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the College of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my dissertation will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my dissertation to any reader upon request.

Redacted for Privacy

Nathan R. Hovekamp, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the excellent faculty in the School of Education at Oregon State University for the learning experiences in the doctoral program of which this dissertation is the culmination. I particularly appreciate the support and encouragement of my major professor, Dr. Betty Duvall. The comradery among my cohort in the doctoral program is an indelible memory. I would also like to thank my parents and siblings for fostering in me the drive to succeed academically. Finally, the patience and understanding of my wife and sons all along the way have made the endeavor of this doctoral program and dissertation possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Focus and Research Questions	3
Significance	4
Chapter 2: Literature Review	8
Teaching and Other Dimensions of Faculty Professional Role	9
Self-perceptions and Cross-perceptions of Faculty Professional Role ...	14
Mechanisms for and Benefits of Improved Faculty Relations	20
Summary of Related Literature	25
Chapter 3: Research Design	27
Methodology and Rationale	27
Data Needed	29
Study Site and Participants	29
Data Collection Procedures	30
Data Analysis Procedures	32
Strategies to Ensure Soundness of Findings	33
Strategies for Protection of Human Subjects	34
Personal Disclosure	35
Summary of Research Design	36
Chapter 4: Results	37
Attention to Individual Students, Quality of Students, and the Burden Of Grading	39
Greater Schedule Freedom at the University versus Heavier Teaching Load at the Community College	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Relative Importance of Research at the University versus Teaching at the Community College	45
Scholarship in Place of Simply Research, and Teaching Breadth versus Depth	52
Graduate School and Cross-over Work Experience Inform Cross-perceptions	55
Perceptions of an Academic Hierarchy	60
Other Dimensions of Faculty Work, in Addition to Teaching and Research	63
Differing Missions and Matching the Right Person to the Right Job	67
Faculty Collaboration and Inter-institutional Cooperation: Benefits, Barriers, and Improvements	71
Advantages and Disadvantages of Co-location or Merger	78
 Chapter 5: Conclusion	 81
 Bibliography	 98
 Appendices	 102
Appendix A: Informed Consent Document	103
Appendix B: Interview Protocol – Community College Faculty	106
Appendix C: Interview Protocol – University Faculty	107

Community College and University Faculty: A Comparison of Perceptions about Professional Role

Chapter 1: Introduction

Together within American higher education, community colleges and universities are challenged by many issues that revolve around inter-institutional relations. Program articulation, student transfer, course equivalency, common calendars, and common course numbering are just a few examples of more specific issues requiring agreements between the two types of institutions (Barry & Barry, 1992; Ignash, 1992; Richardson, 1993; Rifkin, 2000). However, even broader areas have come to increasingly involve community college and university interaction, including intensifying debates over state-wide systems of educational governance, increased competition in resource allocation, greater scrutiny of accountability and assessment measures, and critical re-examination of institutional mission and orientation (Cooper, 1991; Prather & Carlson, 1993; Prather & Carlson, 1994). Indeed it is apparent that, as the different types of institutions in higher education struggle with these and other challenges of identity, a picture of them as isolated silos over a broad landscape inevitably gives way to a picture of a relatively smaller academic world with actively cooperating or competing institutions. The interaction between the community college and the university is complex, especially within a dynamic demographic, economic, political, and technological context.

Historical factors have undoubtedly shaped the distinction between community college and university cultures. In the early part of the 20th century, an increasing demand for broader access to higher education on the one hand combined with an effort to elevate the status of American universities by diverting that demand on the other hand led to the appearance of the junior college. Most of the early junior colleges took the form of either high schools that extended upward to include the freshman and sophomore college curriculum or small four-year colleges from which the last two years of the curriculum were eliminated. The GI Bill, enacted in 1944, and the recommendations of the Truman Commission on Higher Education, issued in

1947, along with a continued increase in demand for access to higher education following World War II, accelerated the transformation of the junior college, with its narrower focus on the first two years of the traditional liberal arts curriculum, to the community college, with its characteristically comprehensive mission (Witt et al, 1994). The latter half of the 20th century was a period of both marked expansion in the number of community colleges and the further development of their academic offerings into occupational, developmental, and continuing education in addition to the transfer curriculum (Gleazer, 1994). In the meantime, American universities too expanded, adding and diversifying programs and opening branch campuses. At the close of the 20th and the opening of the 21st century though, community colleges and universities are increasingly challenged to come full circle from their divergent historical paths to their convergent common interests.

Misconception, prejudice, bias, and other inaccuracies in the view community colleges and universities have of each other interfere with a more productive inter-institutional association (Barry & Barry, 1992; Fincher, 2002; Ignash, 1992; Kinney, 1976; Seidman, 1985; Steinberg, 1999; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000). In the interest of promoting positive interaction between these two types of institutions, a clarified shared understanding of the differences and similarities in the nature of their respective faculty is essential. Of particular importance in enhancing this understanding are their self-perceptions, how community college or university faculty view themselves, and their cross-perceptions, how they view each other, in regard to professional role.

This investigation examined the perceptions that community college and university faculty hold about their own and each other's professional roles. The professional role of a faculty member can be conceptualized generally as including *what* one does and *how* one does it, the essence of one's work. Shared values and characteristic behavior patterns are key in defining role (Corbin, 1998). The notion of faculty professional role is explored further in the literature review, and the

definition also took more specific shape as it emerged from the data, typical of qualitative research (Creswell, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Focus and Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about similarities and differences in their professional roles. This exploration revolved around four central research questions:

1. How do community college and university faculty perceive their own professional roles, particularly relative to each other's? This first question involves the exploration of faculty self-perceptions in regard to professional role, including those aspects that they see as either shared characteristics or ones distinguishing their role from that of their counterparts at the other type of institution, community college or university.

2. How do community college and university faculty perceive each other's professional roles, particularly relative to their own? This second question involves the exploration of faculty cross-perceptions in regard to professional role, how they view the role of their counterparts and what they believe distinguishes their counterparts from themselves.

3. How do community college and university faculty say their own professional roles are perceived by the other? This third question involves the exploration of beliefs faculty hold in regard to the cross-perceptions of their counterparts; how they believe that they themselves are perceived by the other type of faculty. When these beliefs are compared to the actual cross-perceptions in question two above, the effect is to confirm or contradict the way in which faculty believe they are viewed by their counterparts. When these beliefs are compared to

the self-perceptions in question one above, the effect is to determine whether the way faculty see themselves matches how they believe they are seen by their counterparts.

4. What do community college and university faculty see as barriers to inter-institutional cooperation, and what measures do they suggest might enhance collaboration between the two faculties or cooperation between the two institutions?

This fourth question extends and refines the exploration of perceptions about professional role by asking faculty how they see these roles intersecting most productively.

Significance

The case for the significance of the proposed study rests on three legs. First, previous research at the interface of the community college and the university specifically calls for the exploration undertaken here; the present research extends this scholarly knowledge. Second, this study has important implications for educational policy and practice, with potential benefits to faculty themselves as well as administrators, students, and other stakeholders in higher education. Third, the topic of this research holds significance from my personal perspective as it explores an area central to my own professional work history and career interests.

Previous research into the fascinating and often contentious interface of community college and university faculty includes clear and specific direction for further exploration along the lines of this study. Townsend and LaPaglia (2000) surveyed community college faculty in regard to their perceptions of how four-year and university faculty view them, as well as to their self-perception as a consequence. Though most of the surveyed community college faculty agreed that they were viewed as “marginal” within the higher academic world, they did not see themselves that way. The authors called for more detailed examination of the forces that drive negative perceptions as well as structures and mechanisms for improving communication and cooperation between community college and university faculty.

Seidman (1985), in his report of intensive interviews with faculty, described the benefit of research into perceptions of role as providing a “deeper and richer understanding of their own experience” to otherwise often isolated faculty (p. xii). Austin (1994) suggested that central questions for institutional researchers and administrators planning assessment include how faculty perceive their role and what the degree of consensus is concerning the extent to which teaching versus research should be valued and rewarded. Fugate and Amey (2000) interviewed community college faculty in regard to the self-perceptions of their professional role as well as other factors. They suggested that academic conversations, about articulation and other areas, more balanced between community college and university faculty would help break down the pervasive adversarial mentality between the two and provide for both a more unified professional identity and enhanced faculty recruitment and retention. These authors too concluded by explicitly calling for further research into faculty beliefs about their role. A more detailed discussion of this research follows in the literature review.

In addition to the justification for significance based upon directions suggested by other researchers, the results of this research have critical significance for educational policy and practice in higher education. For faculty at community colleges and universities working with their counterparts at different “levels” of higher educational institutions, the themes that emerged from this research provide a clearer picture of how their colleagues at other levels view them and their institution. Openly airing these views helps to dispel some currently held apprehensions or, where the perceptions are negative in tone, is at least preferable to allowing them to perpetually simmer just below the surface. Negative perceptions need to be addressed, and positive perceptions reinforced in order to open new avenues for enhanced collaboration and communication as well as opportunities for faculty professional development. Administrators working on issues involving interaction or cooperation between the two institutional types have access through this study to the perspectives or attitudes of the two respective faculties, facilitating existing program

articulation and new cross-institutional program development. Ultimately, students transferring between the community college and the university would benefit from a smoother and more seamless association of the two with clearer pathways between them. Healthier inter-institutional relationships, including faculties that better communicate with and respect each other, would result in greater student success. Though these levels of significance apply broadly to community colleges and universities across the nation, they are perhaps most crucial to instances where these institutions are co-located, as in this case study. Also, this research has significance for a wider audience of other educational researchers, policy-makers, and practitioners interested in a better understanding of community college versus university faculty perspectives and a more productive association of the two. This enhanced inter-institutional interaction might be manifested in maximizing enrollment, avoiding undesirable program duplication, sharing facilities in instances of co-location, and other benefits with economic implications. Ultimately, this type of research collectively contributes to the encouragement of innovative and mutually beneficial cooperative agreements between the community college and the university.

Finally, this research holds significance from my own personal perspective. I have held faculty positions at the main campuses of two universities, a university branch campus, a university center on the campus of a community college, a four-year college, and three community colleges. As a student, all of my post-secondary education has been at universities, while as a professional, the majority of my work experience has been at community colleges. The university and community college faculty I have known seem anecdotally to hold ingrained beliefs about each other as well as convictions in regard to how they are viewed by their counterparts, though the legitimacy and justification of these attitudes is not often addressed openly. This study is intended in part to help me gain a deeper understanding of what these attitudes are, as I continue the pursuit of my professional interests in higher education.

Thus the significance of this research includes the extension of previous research, the importance to educational policy and practice, and the relation to my personal work history and career interests. The literature review, which follows, is directed by the research questions delineated earlier and further reinforces the case for the significance of this study while providing context for the findings to be reported.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Though there is not an extensive body of literature on the narrow topic of community college and university faculty perceptions of their own and each other's professional roles, there is a considerable amount of published material on the broader topic of inter-institutional relations and comparisons. Within this broader topic, three areas of research provide a foundation for the narrower purpose of this study. First, there is the attention to the differing character of faculty professional roles in regard to the emphasis on teaching, research, and other dimensions of the work. From an examination of this research, the intent is to further clarify what is meant by professional role and to consider some of the particular issues that may be the grounds for faculty self- and cross-perceptions. Second, there is research directly related to the focus of this study which examines how faculty perceive their own professional role, or self-perception, and the professional role of faculty at different types of institutions of higher education, or cross-perception. The utility of reviewing this literature is to provide a foundation by which to gauge the perceptions explored in this particular case study relative to the understanding of perceived distinctions between different types of faculty in the broader academic world: are the results reported here typical or exceptional? Third, a selective examination of the research literature discussing the mechanisms for and benefits of improved faculty relations across different sectors of higher education is applicable to this study as an extension of the consequences of better understanding faculty attitudes. In other words, since it could be anticipated that a firmer grasp on their respective faculty's self- and cross-perceptions would facilitate a more informed and effective inter-institutional association, an exploration of some of the literature on the topic of inter-institutional cooperation and competition is warranted. Finally, in reviewing all three of these areas, implications will be drawn for the design of the present research and interpretation of the data.

Teaching and Other Dimensions of Faculty Professional Role

In this section of the review of research, the nature of faculty professional roles at different types of institutions in regard to the emphasis on teaching, research, and other dimensions of the work is explored. The intent is to clarify what is meant by professional role and to consider some of the issues upon which faculty self- and cross-perceptions may be based.

Previous research on the perceived differences between the faculty at different types of higher educational institutions creates an impression of distinctly divergent character. An article in *Change*, the magazine of the American Association for Higher Education, reported the results of a survey of faculty attitudes, especially on differences between those at two-year institutions versus four-year colleges and universities (Community Colleges, 1990). A prominent finding was that community college faculty had the clearest sense of purpose, *teaching*, and consequently a relatively greater job satisfaction. Community college faculty were also found to be more positive about their institution and its administrators and mission. The dual expectations of four-year college and university faculty in teaching and research were a source of stress for them, resulting in lower job satisfaction and less positive attitude toward their institution. Faculty across all types of colleges were found to share similar values about curriculum, agreeing on the importance of both common core and breadth requirements in mathematics, science, history, social science, literature, and the arts. The article concluded by expressing hope that the lack of research activity on the part of community college faculty did not imply a lack of scholarly commitment and with the suggestion that the broader definition of scholarship propounded by Ernest Boyer and others is perhaps more appropriate, including the discovery of knowledge, the integration of knowledge, the application of knowledge, and the transmission of knowledge (Community Colleges, 1990). A potential criticism of this article might be the perception of bias favoring community colleges in the interpretation of the survey results into broader conclusions about relative degree of job satisfaction. A strength of the article is the presentation of the

focus on teaching as the seemingly central purpose defining community college faculty, drawing a bright line distinguishing them from university faculty. This distinction again appears in the present research exploring the perceptions of faculty roles at the community college versus the university.

Much of the distinction between community college and university faculty roles centers around this issue of their different degree of focus on actual teaching. Richardson (1993), in talking with faculty during site visits, found at community colleges a common pride in the focus on teaching and no desire to be working at four-year institutions. The faculty at four-year colleges, on the other hand, cared about their disciplines and about teaching but again experienced pressure from multiple demands, including the emphasis on publishing and a competitive system of tenure and promotion. Austin (1994) suggested that university faculty may derive professional identity more from their disciplinary affiliation and research orientation, whereas community college faculty may derive professional identity more from their particular institution and teaching orientation. However, it is acknowledged that within a category of institutional type there are differences from college to college, and even within a particular college there are differences in how faculty derive identity based on discipline and full-time or part-time status. Kinney (1976) pointed to the luxury of the greater amount of time that university faculty typically have for thought and reflection, whereas community college faculty with their heavy teaching loads were depicted as in crisis or survival mode. He acknowledged the thinly veiled feelings of superiority that the "elitist" university faculty feel but also, from the community college faculty, "the brawling worker's sense of superiority over the effete man of culture" (Kinney, 1976, p. 35). The contention was that the root of some of these feelings lies back in the graduate school culture from which future faculty members emerge; there those individuals that go off to teach in community colleges are seen as straying from "the sacred calling" (Kinney, 1976, p. 36). Callan (1997) found that 81% of community college faculty felt that teaching is their principle activity, and furthermore, where 92% of community college faculty felt that

teaching should be the primary criterion for promotion, only 22% of research university faculty agreed.

A key distinction, then, that consistently and prominently arises between the community college faculty role versus the university faculty role is the relative weight of teaching versus research. Leslie (2002) found that while there was a common commitment to teaching as the principle value of the academic profession, there were differences in attitude based on institutional type and teaching discipline toward the primacy of teaching versus research as criteria for awarding promotion and tenure. Research university faculty felt that research is rewarded more than teaching and should be the most important criterion for promotion; community college faculty disagreed. However, among research university faculty, there was a discipline-based distinction, with those in fine arts putting the highest value on teaching as a promotion criterion and those in natural sciences the lowest. Faculty in institutions other than research universities placed a higher value on teaching as a promotion criterion across all disciplines, and the indication was that the effect of institutional type was more important than teaching discipline in determining relative weight of teaching versus research. The suggestion was, though, that most faculty placed great value on teaching and the intrinsic satisfaction it carries, even though research and publication might result in some institutions in greater extrinsic incentives, such as money and status. Leslie (2002) stated that, "this disconnect between the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards poses problems for policy and practice" (p. 70). The implication for college leaders is perhaps either a re-examination of the appropriateness of faculty incentives given the type of institution or else careful attention to matching criteria used in faculty recruitment to the nature of the college mission. In the present research, a better understanding of faculty role was revealed by assessing self-perceptions and comparing them to cross-perceptions among community college and university faculty. Also, study participants were included across different academic disciplines.

The contention that community college culture and the abilities of community college faculty are centered around instruction is often advanced but perhaps less often critically examined. Steinberg (1999) referred to a study in which it was found that only about 5% of research on higher education focused on community colleges. Furthermore, much of the research on community colleges was conducted by university scholars and was largely biased by a negative tone with community colleges being viewed as marginal or second-rate. It was suggested that the effect of this elitism is to cause community college practitioners to ignore much of this research, an unfortunate development, as there may be some useful suggestions in between the condescension. One of these suggestions was the critical examination of the contention that the defining characteristic of community colleges is the concentration on teaching. While community college faculty recruitment and retention may not depend on their record of research and publication, it might not necessarily then always depend on their record of teaching either. The largely unaddressed questions concerning level of preparation in pedagogy and ongoing evaluation of effectiveness in teaching practices constitute a paucity of evidence for the characterization of community colleges' teaching orientation. Other potential sources of threats to the academic standards and teaching effectiveness at community colleges include heavy instructional load, the isolation of instructors from their disciplinary cultures, insufficient opportunities or funds for professional development, and the open access of the institutions (Steinberg, 1999). The implication for leadership is the importance of continuing to address these threats, and the relevance of that endeavor to supporting the veracity of the contention that community colleges are teaching oriented. This study examined community college and university faculty beliefs in regard to the prominence of teaching versus other components of their work, from their own and their counterparts' perspectives.

Finally, another parameter of professional role is illuminated by research into job satisfaction, where there are examples of both common concerns and differentiating issues among community college and university faculty. In reporting

the results of a faculty survey, Baltimore (1991) discovered that both community college and university faculty listed time pressures and “too many things to do” as a prominent source of job dissatisfaction and stress. However, the most frequently listed sources of job satisfaction among university faculty were research and teaching whereas among community college faculty they were students and teaching. The implications for faculty recruitment and retention, of reducing stress and increasing satisfaction, were clearly indicated (Baltimore, 1991). Clark (1987) found in the results of a 1984 Carnegie Foundation survey much similarity across institutional types in answers to a number of questions about job satisfaction. Both community college and university faculty disagreed with the statements, “If I had to do it over again, I’d not become a college teacher” and “I feel trapped in a profession with limited opportunities for advancement” (pp. 218-219). Both community college and university faculty felt their respective institutions were “a very good place” for them and that “education offers the best hope for the improvement of the human condition” (pp. 220, 223). The author proposed that the often relatively limited extrinsic rewards in faculty work of salary or job security were more than offset by the prominent intrinsic rewards of teaching. Despite these shared impressions, Clark (1987) acknowledged a paradox in the distinction between the community college and the university:

The extensive differentiation of American higher education plays an important role in promoting satisfaction even though it leads to the unhappiness induced by the invidious distinctions of the institutional hierarchy. The differentiation provides a variety of settings in which individual academics can play to their preferences and strengths... [however] the fit of individuals to settings is highly imperfect, leaving many in unwanted locations. (p. 231)

So, though on a broad level community college and university faculty share common views about job satisfaction, perhaps ultimately the key to job satisfaction is the match between an individual’s interest and ability and the demands of the particular professional role.

In summary, it appears that much of the distinction in professional role between community college and university faculty centers around teaching versus other activities. Community college faculty are often depicted as focused on teaching, to the point of being burdened by heavy teaching loads, though evidence for the contention that they are particularly accomplished at teaching remains inconclusive. University faculty are seen as dealing with, and somewhat stressed by, the multiple demands of teaching, research, and other activities. There are positive and negative ramifications of both a more focused and a more multidimensional professional role, and one key to job satisfaction among academics is matching qualifications and interests with job expectations and reward structure. Despite differences in professional role, community college and university faculty share many values, including a common commitment to quality instruction, recognition of the importance of curricular breadth, and many common views in regard to job satisfaction. There is also a repeated call for the value and necessity of a broader definition for scholarship. One of the goals of this research was to build upon and extend this compelling comparison of professional role among community college and university faculty. In particular it was interesting to see the study participants corroborate the descriptions of faculty professional role in the literature, and to see the distinctions, or lack of them, drawn between the demands of the community college and the university.

Self-perceptions and Cross-perceptions of Faculty Professional Role

With a consideration of the dimensions of professional role accomplished, this section of the review of research moves to an exploration of what is known about how community college and university faculty perceive their own and each other's professional roles. Directly related to the purpose of the present research, this exploration will provide implications for its design and a foundation of findings for comparison, confirmation, or contradiction relative to the findings of this research.

Barry and Barry (1992), in their advocacy for a greater community college role in driving articulation agreements with universities, described perceptions that the different types of faculty hold about each other. "Elitist" university faculty (Barry & Barry, 1992, p. 43) believe that community college courses lack a thorough examination of the subject matter, are less rigorous in their application of standards and expectations, and are "watered down" (p. 39) relative to university courses. They view themselves in a position of judging or arbitrating the quality of community college instruction when determining course equivalency. The authors further contended that university faculty of limited experience with community colleges assess transfer courses in a subjective, erratic, and inconsistent manner, whereas university faculty more knowledgeable about community colleges assume that course content is comparable. However, this view of the university faculty position as arbiter of community college curricular rigor is a contested one. The authors implied that the developmental transition of community colleges from their historical origin as junior colleges focusing on the first two years of the university curriculum to their broader missions today was accompanied by a transition in the community college faculty from seeking approval of their courses from their university peers to growing confidence in their own teaching mastery. Regardless of intent, the terms "junior" versus "senior" institution come with connotations for their respective faculties. Barry and Barry (1992) suggested that community college faculty think they do a better job of classroom instruction than is found in the universities, where lower division courses are often taught either by inexperienced teaching assistants or distracted faculty who prefer research and more specialized upper division courses. The community college faculty believe that their "small classes, individualized attention, and dedication to pedagogy qualify them as master teachers," and that "their courses are every bit as rigorous as comparable university courses" (Barry & Barry, 1992, pp. 39-40). The strengths of this article include an almost ruthless frankness in addressing what are usually covert attitudes and the repeated call for an end to the counterproductive elitism of universities toward community colleges,

particularly interesting given that the authors are listed as both hailing from a university. A potential limitation of this article is its paucity of citations documenting evidence of the authors' contentions. The intent of this research was to listen to both community college and university faculty to see whether these somewhat divisive views were substantiated.

Fugate and Amey (2000) took a qualitative approach utilizing interviews in their case study of new faculty at a large Midwestern suburban community college. The focus was on examining the factors leading individuals to employment at a community college, the self-perceptions of their role as faculty, and the impact of opportunities for professional development on their attachment to the work. Analysis of audio recordings and notes made during the interviews provided the means for emergent themes to surface. The majority of faculty interviewed did not deliberately set out to pursue a career in higher education, but evidently found themselves drawn to the community college by a number of characteristic factors. Avoidance of the tenure process at four-year institutions, pragmatic considerations of decent salaries for academic positions that did not require a doctoral degree, and the focus on teaching all attracted them to the community college, as well as in some cases positive memories of their own previous educational experiences as students at two-year colleges. The most prominent characteristic these early career faculty ascribed to their own professional role involved a comprehensive notion of teaching. Supplemental professional roles, such as service to the college and the community, were also viewed as important, particularly after the first year of full-time teaching. Research was seen as an "extra," rather than an integral part of their role, and mention was made of the necessity for considering multiple definitions of research and inquiry when looking at the community college faculty. Professional development opportunities had a large positive impact, perhaps particularly on faculty retention. The powerfully focused identification with teaching was seen as both a meritorious attribute of community college faculty and, paradoxically, a potential contributor to burnout (Fugate & Amey, 2000).

Strengths of this research of Fugate and Amey (2000) into the factors leading to employment as a member of the community college or university faculty and the self-perception of professional role include important implications for faculty recruitment and retention. The authors contended that while there have been many reports on the demographic characteristics of faculty, these findings are largely drawn from broad national surveys or discipline-specific studies. Less research has focused specifically on the overall development of faculty or beliefs about the professional role of faculty at different types of colleges. The advocacy for stronger ties between the community college faculty and the rest of the academy represents a positive effort to break down the barriers between postsecondary sectors, both for faculty and for students. As in Kinney's (1976) research, Fugate and Amey (2000) also suggested that the root of many of the negative attitudes about community colleges as employers lies back in the graduate school programs from which future faculty emerge. There, at best, community colleges as a career option are ignored, and, at worst, negative stereotypes about them are promulgated. Finally, this article concluded by calling for further research into faculty beliefs about their role. The present research attempts to answer that call.

Townsend and LaPaglia (2000) took a quantitative approach in reporting the results of a survey of the full-time faculty in the City Colleges of Chicago (CCC) system of seven community colleges in regard to their perceptions of how four-year and university faculty viewed them, as well as to their self-perception as a consequence. Community college faculty felt that university faculty viewed them within the larger higher academic community as somehow lesser, at the bottom of the hierarchy, contributing little to scholarship, vocational rather than academic, parochial, devalued, marginalized, and unequal to themselves, the university faculty. Though most of the surveyed two-year college faculty agreed that they were viewed as "marginal" by the four-year faculty, they did not see themselves that way. The authors speculated that this was due to their deep commitment to their work and the concept of the community college. A potential limitation is the reported survey

response rate of 44%, which might seem low in some contexts. The authors might have addressed the possibility of response bias more fully or followed up on non-respondents. This article is also applicable to the present study in that it explicitly invites further research into this issue, suggesting a look at perceptions from the other direction, those of the four-year faculty.

In fact perhaps the primary limitation in the research of both Townsend and LaPaglia (2000) and Fugate and Amey (2000) was the focus on only community college faculty perceptions: how they felt university faculty viewed them as well as their self-perceptions. The present case study explored the questions from both perspectives: the perceptions of community college faculty and university faculty. The fact that this case study focused on an instance where a community college and a university branch campus are co-located brings these two sets of faculty into close contact and provides a useful laboratory for exploring perceptions of distinctions in professional role and institutional culture.

Seidman (1985) also looked at only one side of the equation by focusing exclusively on community college faculty, but did so thoroughly and critically by means of in depth interviews. He too alluded to “the higher education hierarchy” and, among community college faculty, the feeling of being at “the bottom of the higher education totem pole” (p. 11). This “nagging, pervasive sense” of inferiority persisted

despite the difficulty, complexity, and social significance of their multiple missions, despite the confrontation with what others in higher education have been able to evade because of the very existence of community colleges, despite many instances of true local pride, and finally despite salaries that compete with and sometimes outrun salaries in four-year institutions. (p. 11)

Seidman (1985) contended that regardless of the diverse responses to these feelings, they inevitably affect self-perception negatively.

Seidman (1985) also discussed the stereotypical dichotomy between instruction- and student-centered community college faculty on the one hand and

research- and subject-centered university faculty on the other. Again, the attribute of student-centeredness at the community college was at once a source of both pride and stress. It can, for instance, contribute to an overloaded work schedule, to attempts to over-individualize instruction, to feelings of responsibility or guilt over matters beyond one's control, and to a general blurring in the boundaries of the self-perception of professional role between that of instructor and that of counselor. The expectations of constant student access to community college instructors can restrict faculty opportunity to grade, read, plan, prepare, think, reflect, communicate with colleagues, and participate in professional development. Seidman (1985) proposed a reconsideration of excessive concern for student-centeredness, which can be "carried to the point of diminishing returns" and lead to "injurious consequences" (p. 273). The dichotomy between interest in subject matter as opposed to students was exposed as a false, meaningless, and ultimately destructive stereotype; interest in scholarship does not preclude, but enhances, instruction (Boyer, 1990; Seidman, 1985). A movement away from such a false dichotomy might go a long way toward promoting more professional connections between community college and university faculty.

In summary, it is evident that there are many provocative assertions about how faculty in different sectors of higher education see themselves and each other. In many instances, the relationship between community college and university faculty is depicted as a dissonant one between laboring generalists and elite specialists. Future college faculty often begin to form these attitudes while still in graduate school and select or end up on a pathway leading toward employment at one or the other type of institution based largely upon developing perceptions of divergent professional roles. A particularly intriguing question is whether what one believes to be the perceptions of the other sector about one's own professional role influences self-perception. For instance, many community college faculty believe that university faculty view them as marginal, but this may not detract from the community college faculty confident self-perception grounded in a strong

identification with teaching. An inversely oriented question, one which this study addressed, is the effect on university faculty self-perception of what they believe to be how the community college faculty view them. Also, the mantra of student-centeredness among especially community college faculty may have problematic consequences when carried to extreme; again, the notion arises of the advantages to a more balanced scholarly professional role. Finally, through interviews of community college and university faculty, some of the stereotypes that persist about how they perceive one another were substantiated, but some were revealed as unfounded. Through this kind of examination and clarification, the results of this study might be applied to inform faculty relations across sectors of higher education and enhance inter-institutional cooperation.

Mechanisms for and Benefits of Improved Faculty Relations

Now that the nature of faculty professional role as well as self- and cross-perceptions about professional roles at community colleges and universities have been explored, in this section of the literature review the implications for inter-institutional cooperation versus competition are considered. The presumption is that a better understanding of, or at least an open airing of attitudes about, the perceptions that the faculty have about one another in regard to professional role will accommodate a more informed, enhanced association between the community college and the university.

Addressing the perceptions that community college and university faculty hold in regard to each other's roles and institutions, and determining whether they have internalized those perceptions, are key to understanding and perhaps narrowing the gulf that apparently continues to separate them. Townsend and LaPaglia (2000) speculated that negative attitudes toward each other in the two types of institutions may ultimately have a significant impact on student transfer and retention. They called for more detailed examination of the forces that drive negative perceptions as well as structures and mechanisms for improving communication and cooperation

between community college and university faculty; the present research explores those areas. These authors suggested discipline-specific meetings of faculty from both camps, faculty exchanges, and facilitating better appreciation for each other's scholarly activity. Faculty wishing to better understand their colleagues at other types of institutions could use research reporting self- or cross-perceptions to, by building upon positive perceptions and working to allay negative ones, improve collegiality and provide a more unified, professional approach to their disciplines, across institutional type. Administrators, policy-makers, researchers, and other practitioners in higher education might be able to apply the results of these kinds of studies as they attempt to move toward the improved articulation, inter-institutional agreements, and cooperation that result in more efficient college pathways and better learning experiences for students.

While acknowledging differences between community college and university faculty, in some of this same research the interests both have in reaching a better understanding of one another are explored. The central importance of faculty involvement and cooperation from both types of institutions in the processes of transfer and articulation is apparent (Kintzer, Martorana, Sullins, & Wattenbarger, 1985-86; Rifkin, 2000). The incentive or structure to encourage this faculty collaboration in improving the fit of courses and programs across institutions, though, is presented as largely lacking. Richardson (1993), while also suggesting discipline-specific groupings to bring two-year and four-year faculty together, proposed through these arrangements an active fostering of faculty ownership of and responsibility for academic programs and not just their individual courses. Kinney (1976) stated that higher education "cannot much longer endure the drawing of class lines and disdain on either side, however well- or ill-masked" (p. 35). He suggested establishing departmental liaisons between the community college and the university and that, if the position were rotated among faculty given reduced load and mileage allotment to compensate, much would be gained in closing the gap in understanding between the two institutions. Inter-institutional liaisons could have a prominent role

in the design of effective and attractive in-service programs for faculty at both types of colleges. A potential benefit to community college instructors might be enhanced identification with their academic disciplines. A potential benefit to university instructors might be additional suggestions for creative application of pedagogical theory. This article, written by a university rather than a community college faculty member, concluded that “instead of seeing common interests, too often we seem to view each other through lenses that distort honest differences into cheap stereotypes” (Kinney, 1976, p. 37). The primary limitation of Richardson’s and Kinney’s papers for the purpose of their application here is that they are short on the raw data of a primary research report, instead offering insightful but fairly broad observations from more of a secondary perspective. The strength of both papers in relation to the present research is a clear-eyed, honest assessment of the contrasting views many community college and university faculty hold as well as the suggestion of a number of specific ways in which improvement in relations could be facilitated and result in mutual benefits.

Successful cooperative inter-institutional arrangements can be motivated by financial self-interest and often include a common set of characteristics. In an era of tight budgets and in the interest of maximizing enrollment, Prather and Carlson (1993) indicated that universities look increasingly to arrangements with community colleges as feeder schools, while community colleges look increasingly to arrangements with universities to enhance program prestige and opportunities, thus attractiveness to students. They suggested that such cooperative arrangements to be successful must be built on commitment, respect, trust, open and frequent communication, vested interest, and the potential for mutual benefit (see also Behm, 1983; Fincher, 2002). Drawbacks of cooperative arrangements include the potential of the university co-opting rather than complementing community college offerings. Also, in the instances where a branch campus of the university enters a cooperative arrangement with the community college, there is the danger of the “stepchild syndrome” wherein the perception emerges of the branch campus as inferior to the

main campus, with all its “trappings” of prestige, such as graduate programs, research activity, and athletic events (Prather & Carlson, 1994, p. 138). The speculations of these authors are again qualified as an outgrowth of a review of literature rather than a direct result of primary research, but they specifically point to the necessity of faculty involvement from both of the cooperating institutions. The present research sought in part to determine community college and university faculty insight into mechanisms for enhanced collaboration. Research of this nature that presents implications for the benefits of inter-institutional cooperation in meeting the needs of either institution as a win-win situation, “can do much to waylay the fears of both internal and external constituencies” (Prather & Carlson, 1993, p. 8).

Research supports the notion that a healthy balance of inter-institutional competition and cooperation sustains a vibrant landscape of institutional pluralism. Cooper (1991) proposed that universities and community colleges in the same region must necessarily more carefully tailor their curriculum, mission, and culture in ways that distinguish them. The university is challenged to “create an image of itself as a place at once friendly and accessible, yet learned and scholarly” (Cooper, 1991, p. 11). The community college is challenged to “strengthen and clarify the college’s pedagogical and philosophical value” (p. 17). Cooper (1991) depicted these challenges collectively as the institution’s struggle to clarify a distinct identity while simultaneously supporting other institutions and higher education generally. Over twenty years ago, Koltai (1981) implied that the struggle to avoid the appearance of program duplication was particularly imperative in light of increased legislative scrutiny and budget constraints. That issue remains. While inter-institutional competition, especially over enrollment, frequently causes the resurfacing of counterproductive prejudices about hierarchy and status, the stakes are too high to indulge those attitudes, and many problems are common to both community colleges and universities. Competition to the extent that it drives institutional responsiveness and adaptability contributes to vitality, but competition pushed to the extent that

faculty morale suffers or student transfer is impeded obviously becomes problematic. On the other hand, there are clear mutual benefits to cooperative measures such as sharing expensive equipment and facilities. By providing feedback on student success after transfer, universities provide valuable data to community colleges assessing programs and instruction. By providing profiles of their student body, community colleges offer vital information to universities seeking to improve recruitment (Koltai, 1981).

Ultimately, students derive benefits from improved collaboration between community college and university faculty and cooperation between the two types of institutions. Wolfson (1994) described a “balkanization” of higher education, including a separation of community colleges and universities by different standards and policies, that creates difficulty for students navigating across institutions. She called for a more “seamless flow” for students from one institution to another through elimination of barriers and greater cooperation. It was suggested that faculty in particular from both community colleges and universities must play a prominent role in discussions around articulation and transfer, and that a productive collegiality among them as opposed to a counterproductive hierarchical elitism is key to making these processes effective for students (Wolfson, 1994).

In summary, there exist several suggested mechanisms for improving relations between community college and university faculty as well as several benefits to be derived from such an improvement. Discipline-specific groupings of faculty across different types of institution have been especially advanced to improve inter-institutional relations, strengthen faculty identification with their academic field, and perhaps provide opportunities for professional development. There are clear implications of such measures for improving transfer and articulation and for informing or having a positive impact on not just faculty themselves, but also on transfer students and administrators, and on others working on issues in higher education that cut across institutional sectors. More informed or improved inter-institutional relationships carry the potential of mutual economic benefits as well as

enhanced prestige and attractiveness to students, though there are also potential drawbacks of which to be aware. Finally, a key to institutional health as well as diversity in educational opportunities may be a careful balance of competition and cooperation among the various components of higher education.

Summary of Related Literature

The exploration of differences between community college and university faculty characteristics includes some intriguing and fairly consistent distinctions, though it is clear that a better understanding of faculty perceptions about these differences is necessary. The literature for the most part supports a notion of teaching as the primary role in community college faculty self-perception, whereas university faculty see teaching as only one among other roles key to their identity. The implication is that while there may be a degree of similarity in the dimensions of perceived professional role by faculty at both types of institution, there is a distinction in the perceived priority of those dimensions. In both a more focused and a more multidimensional professional role, there appear to be for faculty both a sense of pride and a source of stress. The present research sought in part to examine further this fascinating paradox. Similarities in aspects of job satisfaction among community college and university faculty exist, and an effective match between the individual and the institution improves satisfaction. A broader definition for scholarship that more accurately and completely reflects the range of activities in which faculty engage is persistently suggested.

Stereotypes about the relative degree of academic rigor and standards at the two types of institutions abound, though they may well be based on lack of cross-over experience or knowledge of each other's sector. Graduate school is suggested as an initial source of negative attitudes toward, or at least ignorance of, the opportunity for community college faculty employment. An especially interesting question that arises and that was addressed by this study is the effect of faculty cross-perceptions on self-perceptions.

While exploring differences between them, the literature also discusses the many consistent similarities among community college and university faculty, such as the common value placed on quality instruction and the importance of both common core and breadth requirements in traditional academic subjects. The present research was just as interested in similarities as in differences that emerged between the perceptions of the two types of faculty.

Finally, there is a significant treatment of the potential gains that could be realized in many areas of institutional function from cooperation as well as specific mechanisms suggested to enhance collaboration and mutual understanding between community college and university faculty. This study sought in part to determine whether faculty interviewed surfaced some of those same suggestions. In particular it was expected that an exploration of the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about their own and each other's professional roles would build upon earlier research and provide important applications for enhanced cooperation. Particularly interesting are the implications of the balance between competition and cooperation for institutional pluralism and health. Lastly, this review of literature serves as a foundation for the research design as well as context for the themes that emerged from the data analysis.

Chapter 3: Research Design

The design of this study includes consideration of the methodology employed and the rationale for such decision, the data needed, the selection of study site and participants, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, the strategies to ensure soundness of findings, the strategies for the protection of human subjects, and a personal disclosure statement.

Methodology and Rationale

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about similarities and differences in their professional roles. A qualitative approach to the research is appropriate, as the aim here was to try to understand faculty self- and cross-perceptions: what they are, where they might come from, and why they exist. The purpose of this research was not to explain a relationship between variables nor to test specific pre-existing hypotheses, so a quantitative approach was not used (Creswell, 2002; Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1993, p. 100; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1987; Seidman, 1985, p. 15). This distinction has been framed as the “discovery” role or “generative” nature of qualitative research versus the “confirmatory” role or “verificative” nature of quantitative research (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 24; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, pp. 4-5). From particular comments gathered in interviews of participants themes emerged inductively and *a posteriori*, as is characteristic of qualitative research, rather than the researcher deductively deriving predictions from existing theory *a priori*, as is characteristic of quantitative research (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Neuman 2000; Patton, 1987; Seidman, 1985, p. 15). Also, the qualitative or interpretive perspective is that the researcher “does not know what he or she doesn’t know” and that the study participants have the “answers” to the research questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 209). Van Manen (1990) called for qualitative research results which are “oriented, strong, rich, and

deep” (p. 151). It was the intent of this research to develop themes of that sort from the perceptions, experiences, and words of the study participants.

Within the broad umbrella of qualitative inquiry, Creswell (1998) discussed the five research traditions of biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, and case study. He proposed that an ethnographic approach is appropriate where the object is to study, understand, and interpret a culture-sharing group and that a case study is appropriate where the object is to examine in depth a bounded system. In the present research, the focus is on community college and university faculty, arguably constituting a distinct cultural group or groups, thus suggesting ethnography. Though culture is variously defined, “it essentially refers to the beliefs, values, and attitudes that structure the behavior patterns of a specific group of people” (Merriam, 1998, p. 13). Austin (1994) outlined multiple levels of faculty culture, including that of the academy generally, the discipline, the institutional type, the particular institution, and the department. Ethnography as a word “literally means ‘writing about people’” and is both a product and a process involving the analytic description of the shared beliefs and behaviors of a group of people, often concentrated on a single research setting (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, pp. 2-3, 245). The present research is also clearly a bounded system in limiting the investigation to faculty at one particular community college and one particular co-located university branch campus, thus suggesting case study. Both ethnographies and case studies can and do frequently employ interviews and inductively develop themes from that data to answer research questions. It becomes apparent then that these two traditions are not mutually exclusive – indeed the ethnographic case study has been specifically indicated in literature discussing research methodology (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998). This research used a qualitative ethnographic case study methodology.

Data Needed

In order to answer the research questions, the relevant experiences, insights, and perspectives of community college and university faculty must be obtained. Specifically, interview questions need to elicit comments in regard to self-perception of professional role, cross-perception of professional role of academic counterparts at the other type of institution, beliefs about how those counterparts view their own role, and perspective or suggestions concerning potential mechanisms for and benefits of improved collaboration. Each question should be followed by probes asking for clarification, expansion, illustrative examples, or the basis upon which answers were given (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 271; Patton, 1987, pp. 125-126).

Study Site and Participants

This research was conducted at a community college in the Pacific Northwest referred to herein as Anonymous Community College (ACC) and at a co-located university branch campus herein referred to as Anonymous University (AU). Co-location and the frequent interaction of community college and university faculty carries the potential of both particularly intense faculty views in regard to each other's professional roles and particularly important implications for faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation.

A purposive strategy was employed to select full-time, permanent faculty members from both colleges as study participants. The advantage to a purposive selection over a random sample is the opportunity to include individuals both available and best prepared to provide the in-depth, vivid data most relevant to understanding the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2002, p. 193; Merriam, 1998, p. 61, Patton, 1987, pp. 51-52; Seidman, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) asserted that the goal of naturalistic sampling is "to maximize information, not facilitate generalization" (p. 202). Specifically, a combination of opportunistic, snowball, and convenience sampling was employed to identify appropriate participants (Creswell, 1998; Creswell, 2002; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton,

1987; Seidman, 1985). Opportunistic sampling was used by interviewing study participants who unexpectedly surfaced and who held the potential to yield useful data. Snowball sampling, also called network or chain sampling, was used by obtaining leads on other potentially useful participants from those interviewed earlier. Convenience sampling was used simply by interviewing those faculty available, willing to participate in the research, and with the potential to yield interesting and relevant data. Furthermore, an attempt was made to include faculty participants from across different academic disciplines in order to enrich the diversity of perspectives, as this has been repeatedly suggested by previous research (Leslie, 2002; Richardson, 1993; Seidman, 1985; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000). The number of participants selected in qualitative studies of this type ideally is driven by the practice of continuing to identify and interview participants until reaching saturation, when one is no longer hearing anything new. The intent was to interview four or five faculty from both ACC and AU, for a total of eight to ten participants; if this did not result in a feeling of saturation, more participants would have been selected for interview. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that the selection of study participants involves an emergent strategy, serial selection, continuous adjustment, and selection to the point of redundancy or information saturation (pp. 201-202). Patton (1990) discussed the "logic and value of purposeful sampling with small, but carefully selected, information-rich cases" (p. 486). Merriam (1998) stated, "In qualitative research, a single case or small nonrandom sample is selected precisely *because* the researcher wishes to understand the particular in depth, not to find out what is generally true of the many" (p. 208).

Data Collection Procedures

Data were gathered through individual face-to-face interviews of community college and university faculty. Austin (1994) suggested that where the focus of research is on assessing aspects of *objective* institutional climate, direct observations be made of patterns of communication, interaction, and decision-making. However,

where the focus of research is on assessing aspects of *perceived* climate, as was the case in this research, the “rich, extensive interpretations that a smaller number of faculty may have shared in individual interviews” are especially effective (pp. 55-56). Austin (1994) further mentioned that faculty interviewed should be informed as to the purpose of the research, the procedures to protect anonymity, and any potential risks to them as well as the potential benefits of the research (p. 57). The interviews for this research were structured only to the extent that a flexible interview protocol was used and the interview was scheduled to last approximately one hour. The interview protocol is simply a standardized form that includes a header with procedural reminders to ask participants to sign the informed consent form, to test the audio recording equipment, and to note the time, date, location, and name and position of the interviewee (Creswell, 2002, pp. 212-213; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 254-255). Also included in the protocol are the interview questions which were open-ended and followed up with probes intended to elicit responses which were oriented, strong, rich, and deep (Van Manen 1990). Written notes were taken during the interviews as a back up and supplement to the tape recording (Patton, 1987, p. 137). Seidman (1985) described audio tape recording of interviews with faculty as convenient in allowing “the interviewer to concentrate on what the participant is saying” (p. 21). He further stated that “the presence of the tape recorder proved to be a constant and appropriate reminder of the delicate tension between the private voice sought in the process and the public use of the interview material that was intended” (p. 21). Finally, though acknowledging the use of open-ended interviews, Van Manen (1990) cautioned that “the interview process needs to be disciplined by the fundamental question that prompted the need for the interview in the first place” (p. 66). Patton (1987) also advised researchers conducting interviews to keep centered on the purpose (p. 142). It was the intent of this study to stay oriented to the research questions during the data collection.

Data Analysis Procedures

Transcripts of the audio recording of interviews and written notes taken during the interviews were coded. Coding qualitative data involves segmenting and labeling text in the initial process of summarizing it and understanding its meaning. The next step was to compare codes across interviews and reduce their number due to overlap and redundancy, and to look for patterns and develop themes, which are fewer in number but broader in scope than the individual codes and which are also variously referred to as categories, dimensions, issues, or perspectives (Creswell, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1987). The most useful themes are the ones that are most consistently and fully supported by the data. This process of coding and thematic development is both inductive, in that it progresses from concrete details to abstract generalizations, and recursive, in that it is necessary to repeatedly return back to the codes and the data from which they were derived in order to check on the accuracy of themes (Creswell, 2002; Patton, 1987). Lincoln and Guba (1985) described this process as “unitizing and categorizing” while utilizing the “constant comparative method.” Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) referred to this emergence of themes or patterns from qualitative data as “analytic induction.”

Finally, it is important to note that in progressing from data collection to data analysis, in qualitative research this process is rarely absolutely sequential. Indeed, Merriam (1998) stated, “the right way to analyze data in a qualitative study is to do it simultaneously with data collection,” and slightly later, “Without ongoing analysis, the data can be unfocused, repetitious, and overwhelming in the sheer volume of material that needs to be processed. Data that have been analyzed while being collected are both parsimonious and illuminating” (p. 162). Patton (1987, p. 144) contended that the overlapping of data collection and data analysis in qualitative research improves the quality of both, and Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 242) specified that this facilitates emergent aspects of design, such as the further selection of study participants (see also Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1993, p. 111). Creswell (2002) depicted this as a repeated zigzag between data collection and data analysis in

refining, informing, and achieving saturation of categories (p. 450). In this study, coding the transcripts from the first interviews and initially developing themes occurred even while in the midst of conducting the later interviews.

Strategies to Ensure Soundness of Findings

Criteria for the soundness of quantitative research include the concepts of reliability, validity, and objectivity. It has been argued convincingly, though, that these criteria are not as meaningful in qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998). Instead, the assertion is that more applicable criteria of soundness are plausibility, authenticity, credibility, and relevance (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Two different qualitative studies of the same phenomenon or setting may yield different data and findings and yet neither may have a problem with reliability unless they are “contradictory or incompatible” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 36). Additionally, the preoccupation with objectivity in the quantitative approach is largely replaced in qualitative studies by acceptance of subjectivity (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). In fact Bogdan and Biklen (1998) depicted this concern as sometimes “immobilizing,” advise researchers to “lighten up,” and state that “the goal is to become more reflective and conscious of how who you are may shape and enrich what you do, not to eliminate it” (p. 34). Patton (1987, p. 167; 1990, pp. 475-476) questioned the usefulness of the dichotomy between objective and subjective, insisting instead that qualitative researchers focus on neutrality, impartiality, balance, fairness, and conscientiousness.

Creswell (1998) advocated the use of the term verification in qualitative research in place of validity, detailed eight verification procedures, and recommended that a qualitative study include at least two of the procedures (pp. 201-203). This qualitative study included three of those verification procedures: clarification of researcher bias, member checks, and thick description. Clarification of researcher bias was accomplished through the inclusion of a personal disclosure statement in the report of research. Member checks were conducted by taking the

transcripts from the interviews back to the participants in this study so that they could verify their accuracy. Thick description is included in reporting the results of the research so that readers may judge authenticity and transferability. Additionally, this research was repeatedly subject to criticism from doctoral student colleagues and professors at Oregon State University in the program for which this dissertation was prepared.

Finally, verification to ensure soundness of the research can be thought of in terms of external versus internal standards (Creswell, 1998, p. 215). Externally, the research is subject to scrutiny from the study participants, peer researchers, and the readers of the report. In fact Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003, p. 466) suggest that one “approach to the issue of generalizing case study findings is to place the responsibility for generalizing on the ‘consumers’ of the findings rather than on the researchers” (see also Boglan & Biklen, 1998, p. 33; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 298; Merriam, 1998, p. 211). It is, though, still the responsibility of the researcher to provide sufficient detail for readers to be able to make that determination. Internally, the research is subject to scrutiny from the researcher’s own sense of credibility or authenticity (Creswell, 1998). This study was subjected to rigorous standards of both external and internal verification. The goal, as Denzin (1997) suggested in addressing legitimation, is “verisimilitude,” or the feeling of truthfulness and consistency with reality (p. 10).

Strategies for Protection of Human Subjects

The conduct of this study was guided by the *Oregon State University Institutional Review Board Human Research Handbook* (2002). On May 28, 2003, I successfully completed the Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). It was required that the proposal for this research be subject to formal review by the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (OSU IRB), and approval was obtained prior to proceeding with the research. In all respects, the policies and practices

established by the OSU IRB for the protection of study participants was followed in this research. Participants interviewed at the two academic institutions examined in this case study are protected by anonymity in the report of research. Finally, prior to conducting interviews, each participant had explained to him or her the protections afforded by informed consent, including the freedom from negative consequences of deciding not to participate. Each participant in this study signed an informed consent form.

Personal Disclosure

The clarification of researcher bias through the inclusion of a personal disclosure statement is an important criterion providing for verification in interpretive research (Creswell, 1998). The experiences, values, and beliefs that I bring to this study as the researcher must be acknowledged, but they do not necessarily impair the importance or legitimacy of the findings of this research (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1993, p. 114). In fact Van Manen (1990) contended subjectivity in qualitative research means one can be “perceptive, insightful, and discerning” in providing rich, deep interpretations (p. 20). Rather than detracting from it, the research should be enhanced by my background and perspective.

Based upon my earlier and now continuing experience as a student myself as well as on my experience as an instructor of biology, I have a profound respect for and commitment to education and lifelong learning. My bias is that above and beyond its practical application, a formal education is an end in and of itself as well as one of the most valuable attainments to which one can aspire, much more intrinsically valuable, for instance, than our material possessions. The values I believe that are key in educational policy, practice, and leadership are wisdom, integrity, and compassion. Also, just as the dynamics of competition and cooperation in ecological communities fascinate the biologist in me, the same dynamics among educational institutions intrigue the educational researcher in me. As discussed earlier in the case for the significance of this research, my own education and

professional experience spans across the community college and the university, and provides the personal interest and impetus for this research. The perceived distinctions between community colleges and universities and the faculty that work in them represent a sensitive subject that I am interested in candidly, though carefully, exploring, mindful of the integrity and impartiality required of me as a researcher. Ultimately, this research furthered my own understanding as part of my continuing journey to find a fulfilling professional niche.

Summary of Research Design

The present research is a qualitative ethnographic case study. Interviews were conducted of purposively selected faculty at a particular community college and a co-located university branch campus with the intent of eliciting perceptions and cross-perceptions of professional role and suggestions for improved collaboration. Interview notes were coded in order to inductively develop emergent themes, and this analysis commenced overlapping data collection, in order to better inform the interviews. The soundness of the findings, in the sense of plausibility, authenticity, credibility, and relevance, was provided for by the use of verification procedures including clarification of researcher bias, member checks, and thick description. Human subjects were protected through adherence to OSU IRB guidelines, anonymity, and informed consent.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about similarities and differences in their professional roles. The research design proposed a qualitative ethnographic case study methodology with faculty participants selected from two public colleges herein referred to as Anonymous Community College (ACC) and Anonymous University (AU). ACC and AU are co-located on the same campus in the Pacific Northwest. ACC offers two-year degrees, the first two years of transfer programs, professional-technical programs, and continuing education. Full-time faculty at ACC typically teach between three and five classes every term during the academic year, depending upon the teaching load associated with different formats such as lecture or laboratory. AU is a university branch campus and offers the last two years of transfer programs and four-year as well as a few graduate degrees. Full-time faculty at AU typically have a lighter teaching load than faculty at ACC, though the exact number of classes taught is variable due in part to specialized formats offered in some upper-division courses, such as seminars, independent study, internships, student research, or special projects.

Approval of the application for research involving human participants was obtained from the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (OSU IRB) in November, 2004. The Informed Consent Document developed as part of this approval process and used in the interview of study participants is attached as Appendix A. Interview protocols, including the specific wording of questions asked, were prepared for use with community college and university faculty participants, respectively, and are attached as Appendices B and C.

Study participants were selected purposively and serially as described previously in the research design. Faculty were selected from across different academic disciplines in order to enrich the diversity of perspectives; these included the fields of business, economics, English, geography, natural resources, mathematics, and speech communication. Only one faculty member initially

contacted was unable to participate, and another was selected to replace him. An impression of saturation and sufficient data was obtained by the time eight participants had been selected and interviewed: four from the community college, ACC, and four from the co-located university branch campus, AU.

Individual interviews of study participants lasted generally between 60 and 90 minutes and were conducted between December, 2004, and February, 2005. Participants were advised about the research purpose and procedures as well as their anonymity and other protections. A signed informed consent document was obtained from each, and a copy was later provided to each participant. Audio recordings were made of each interview using a battery-powered Sony[®] TCS-30D Stereo Cassette-Corder and external lapel microphone on Maxell[®] Type II or TDK[®] Type I 90-minute cassette tapes. Handwritten notes were also kept during the interviews as a backup and supplement to the audio recordings. The audio tapes were subsequently transcribed by the researcher using a Dictaphone[®] Desktop Voice Processor, model 2709, and pedal operator attachment. Member checks were conducted by sending interview data back to participants for verification.

The transcribed interview data were coded, and then the coded segments were compiled from across all interviews. Themes emerged through analytic induction by consolidating codes into a smaller number of broader categories. The ten themes, detailed presentations of which follow, are:

- 1) Attention to individual students, quality of students, and the burden of grading
- 2) Greater schedule freedom at the university versus heavier teaching load at the community college
- 3) Relative importance of research at the university versus teaching at the community college
- 4) Scholarship in place of simply research, and teaching breadth versus depth
- 5) Graduate school and cross-over work experience inform cross-perceptions
- 6) Perceptions of an academic hierarchy
- 7) Other dimensions of faculty work, in addition to teaching and research

- 8) Differing missions and matching the right person to the right job
- 9) Faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation: benefits, barriers, and improvements
- 10) Advantages and disadvantages of co-location or merger

Attention to Individual Students, Quality of Students, and the Burden of Grading

Many of the study participants, both community college and university faculty, saw the opportunity to interact with students individually as a very positive component of their professional roles. This interaction included that in the classroom, in advising sessions, during office hours, and elsewhere. One community college faculty member said,

The opportunity to work one-on-one with students is probably the most stimulating part of my job, because you actually get a chance to make things relevant to the students directly as opposed to the generic conveying information and getting them to absorb and understand it.

This person went on to state that, being a first generation college student himself, he remembered not having anyone at home to advise him, and as a consequence, he saw the great value of faculty advising students to help them understand “their opportunities or the possibilities” of higher education. He contended that at the community college the connection to individual students was necessarily at the undergraduate level in advising them in regard to course selection and suggesting possible academic majors, whereas at the university the connection was made more often through “mentoring and advising of graduate students.” He also alluded to the importance of the smaller class sizes at community colleges in providing more individualized attention.

Another study participant from the community college also stated one of her favorite aspects of the job was “working one-on-one with students, when they seek me out with questions – being able to really figure out what they don’t know, and why they don’t know it, especially at the developmental level.” She said she enjoyed the challenge of working with students in developmental courses where often it’s not

just that they might not know the answer to a question but that “they don’t understand what they’re being asked.” Also, many students in developmental courses don’t know how to ask questions themselves, or at least how to ask questions that really get at their problem. This faculty member said she first creates a comfortable, informal classroom atmosphere then seizes the opportunity when a student asks a question to “really probe,” figure out his or her thinking, and to help the student learn. She claimed to “lose a lot of class time doing that kind of thing...I’m always behind in the content, because I want to answer all the questions in the class that anybody has about anything.” She had been asked by university faculty at AU, ““Do you want to teach upper division classes over here?” assuming pretty much that I did, in the way it was asked.” She stated that while she might be interested in teaching upper division classes at some point, it was not her focus, and her apparent satisfaction with developmental courses was surprising even to her colleagues at ACC. She found the positive feedback from her students rewarding and encouraging. Her interest was held by the challenge of bringing students to an understanding: “The whole, ‘I never understood this, and now I finally do,’ is a motivator for me to not do it in a traditional way...They need another way. What I love about this job is trying to find different ways.” By way of contrast, she characterized her own education at a university as a more traditional presentation of material by the instructor with an expectation of student understanding. “That’s just not teaching; that’s telling. I think there’s a real distinction between telling and teaching.”

This study participant also addressed class size, extolling the value of the small class sizes often seen at the community college in contrast to larger classes often seen at the undergraduate university level. She contended that with the small class sizes at ACC, one could learn all the student names in a class in a few weeks, and this personal touch had “motivational benefits to students when they know that you can call on them by name, every single one of them!” In contrast she said,

I think that you can teach in a university and never call on a student in a classroom in an entire term, not one student, ever...It’s intimidating

to look out there and try to pick one out... To me that's a huge benefit of teaching in a community college.

The other community college faculty interviewed were also quick to point to the positive experiences of leading a relatively small group of students through a good lecture or an interesting lab.

The university faculty also liked the opportunity to devote attention to individual students. One referred to positive experiences in advising, mentoring, and helping students to "figure out where they want to go" as well as the attraction as an instructor of "expanding their minds and challenging people to think." Another described the rewards of seeing students "connect dots in a different way." Yet another university faculty member interviewed described working with students as her favorite aspect of the work: "When they get an opportunity to explore something that really strikes them, that they're passionate about, and to be able to work with them in a more focused setting, outside the classroom – that's really good." This person however admitted that individual attention to students, at least at the undergraduate level, was particularly characteristic of community colleges:

The opportunity for the students to have small classes, get the advising attention that they need, that is so much a prominent feature of community college campuses, that you just get a lot more one-on-one than when a student typically goes to a large, four-year university.

In fact she contended, while "some universities tend to be heavily research-oriented and they lose sight of students," AU, because of its immediate proximity to ACC, was pressured to maintain a more "student-friendly" atmosphere than it might otherwise, and that, according to her, was a "good thing."

Several community college and university faculty spoke about either the pleasure of teaching excellent students, the challenge of teaching poor students, or the drudgery of grading. One AU faculty member said she most enjoys "teaching students that just have a desire to learn, that aren't here just to get the grade or the minimal to get through." She depicted the "marginal performing" students as a real

“headache,” draining time and energy from the instructor and the rest of the class. Particularly problematic, according to this faculty member, were students who put all of their energy into challenging grades on homework or exams rather than into the learning to begin with that would have resulted in better grades. One of the ACC faculty members suggested that the quality of students at a community college depends upon the proximity of the institution to alternative higher education options: in regions with several community colleges and universities close together the quality of the community college student body as reflected in average SAT scores might be lower than in instances where a community college is in an isolated location and amounts to the “only game in town.” More than one of the ACC faculty described university students as better at writing compared to community college students where there is widespread antipathy to writing, characterized as akin to “pulling teeth.” The heavy load of grading was depicted as burdensome, “monotonous,” “grunt” work by ACC faculty. It was acknowledged that grading was part of the job, but a part that, while of value for the students, was one of the least personally rewarding to faculty. In addition to just the “mechanics of grading,” there was the additional responsibility of “trying to find different ways to assess,” characterized as a difficult but worthwhile endeavor.

Greater Schedule Freedom at the University versus Heavier Teaching Load at the Community College

University faculty interviewed stated they believed they themselves had more freedom, flexibility, and autonomy in arranging their academic schedules and selecting the courses to teach than did the community college faculty. One AU participant described his greater freedom “in choosing my classes, in choosing when I teach, what my hours are like, how I organize my day.” Others from AU also referred to their greater freedom to determine which classes they teach and when and how to teach them.

However, one of the ACC faculty members spoke to his own “academic freedom and freedom over my time,” though this was a senior faculty member and he was comparing his work schedule to that typical outside of academia altogether.

The ability to be self-directed, the ability to be in my office and decide what I need to do to get my job done is a real joy... There’s a general sense that if you’re getting the job done and you’re putting in reasonable hours, you are sort of in control of your time schedule... This work environment is a results-focused environment instead of a procedure-focused environment. Do the work, come in weekends and evenings if you feel like it, take work home with you, but you’ve got a key to the building, you can come in any time you want.

The university faculty believed that community college faculty had an especially heavy teaching load. “We both teach, but they teach way more than we do... typically a four-year university faculty versus a community college faculty is going to spend less time in the classroom,” said an AU faculty member who went on to assert that community college faculty also typically do “a lot more advising.” She elaborated, “Also their role [community college faculty] is they are educators first and foremost. In some ways I’m jealous about that... at the community college, faculty seem more invested in the idea of lifelong learning.” Conversely though, this person later suggested community college faculty might “get a little bored with teaching 100 and 200 level classes after eight or ten years, so then they begin to look at my job [at the university] more favorably,” especially the ability to teach upper division specialty or special topics courses related to one’s particular interests. Another AU study participant contended that typical community college faculty members do “a ton of teaching, much more than me” and that “they have a higher requirement for teaching.” Looking at the community college, she stated, “Geez, how can you teach ten classes well, and stay on top of the literature, and know what’s really happening, and do the other things in your community college mission too. I just don’t get it.” Yet another AU faculty member described his perception that community college faculty “have to teach a lot more writing than I do... they have to read all those papers.” He expanded upon that by stating,

I think I have a little more freedom in reach in what I want to do...They have certain classes they have to teach and every once in a while get an elective. I get to pick what I want to teach to a much larger degree than that. I guess I have more autonomy.

Study participants from the university expressed the belief that they were perceived by the community college faculty as having an easier time of it as far as workload is concerned. One AU faculty speculated on what ACC faculty might think:

[They'd] go like, 'Geez, you're only teaching five classes, what the hell else do you do?...I don't know what they do with their time. I mean if they're only teaching five classes, what the heck are they doing with the rest of their time? We teach ten! You know, God what a job, why can't we get jobs like that?'

Another of the AU faculty also felt that the ACC faculty held the perception that "we have life easy here...they think that we're not really working," and that the community college faculty suffered from jealousy or frustration because they wanted to teach upper division courses or a higher caliber of students. Yet another of the AU faculty stated, "I think that a lot of what goes along with that sort of resentment is this sort of idea that they think they work harder than we do, which isn't true. We do different kinds of work."

The AU faculty believed that at the community college students were acquiring basic college literacy and learning skills, while at the university there was an expectation of greater quantity and quality of reading and writing and higher learning skills.

In some ways they have the toughest job of teaching at the community college because they get the students right out of high school. As our high schools have struggled, they're the ones who have to teach them the basic writing skills, and library research skills, and learning-how-to-read-a-textbook skills...So in some ways they're there for very basic skills..., but they also can be the toughest skills to teach. [At the university] the students develop more critical thinking and analytical skills, rather than just memorizing, for instance...I want them to even further develop their abilities to write a research paper. In my 300 and 400 level classes they are exposed to academic

journal articles on a regular basis. Not that they wouldn't be in any particular class at the community college, but in my classes, particularly in 400, that's all you read. That's your textbook, is a set of those readings, and it's difficult to get through and a challenge for the students. That's a difference: I think we require a lot more reading...the reading expectations are higher, [and] we require more in terms of writing. One of the things they learn to do here is develop their own voice as a scholar in their writing...To me those are the ways that teaching is a little bit different here.

The ACC faculty interviewed largely concurred with this distinction in level of teaching, but with the interpretation that their own job was more difficult as it involved the roles of motivator and recruiter as well as disciplinary expert. They viewed the teaching AU faculty did as easier in that it amounted to "preaching to the choir," dealing with more capable and motivated students.

If you're a university faculty member and you're not teaching lower division, you're preaching to the choir. You're mostly getting majors...I think a lot of university faculty, if they're teaching junior/senior level classes or graduate classes, they are preaching to the choir. These students have the foundational skills in the discipline and they have the love of that discipline already, and it's *so* much easier to teach a group of students like that.

Another of the ACC faculty said he was "really jealous sometimes" of the typical AU teaching assignment, "as little as they teach," in part because "They have the students who are motivated. They have students by the time they get into those courses that have a broader background, that have two years of college behind them at a minimum."

Relative Importance of Research at the University versus Teaching at the Community College

The university faculty interviewed all stressed that their perception of the most distinct difference between themselves and the community college faculty revolves around the expectations of research as part of their professional role. One participant from AU described it this way:

We have demands as faculty that [ACC], and traditionally community college faculty, do not have. In particular, of course, I'm speaking to the research part of our job descriptions...I would say where we're distinctly different is the fact that at a four-year university you are expected to maintain a systematic, nationally recognized research program. That to me seems to be the biggest difference in terms of our roles and how we divide our time and spend our time, is that we have to squeeze that research part into it.

More than one AU faculty member stated that 40% of their job was research. They did not believe community college faculty had that kind of scholarship requirement. One succinctly put it, "I have to publish to keep my job."

One particular study participant from AU spoke extensively about the pressure to publish at the university. She described the scholarship requirement as especially crucial in the first years at one's job while earning tenure. With all of the various aspects of learning a new job, "your scholarship can take a back burner really, really easily." She stressed, though, that "a big component of tenure at the university is your ability to demonstrate scholarship – quality and quantity," so in her first years toward tenure at the university "the highest priority and the biggest use of my time went towards scholarship...by far and away two times the other two [teaching and service]." After obtaining tenure, the stress level associated with research was portrayed as easing somewhat, though the pressure to publish, to "push pubs out," remains:

Now, the requirement is that I need to be working on two pubs a year, getting published in peer-reviewed journals, and it's a definite requirement. If I'm not pushing through two, an average of two a year, then I'm not meeting scholarship requirements. I don't feel the community college has that same expectation. Now there may be people that publish there, they do cool stuff, but I don't know that it's driven from the top that you have to do this or you're not meeting the requirements of [the] job.

This AU faculty member described the stress from the pressure to publish as ongoing and a result of a "clear cut measurement system" of whether or not one gets into a relatively small number of highly competitive peer-reviewed journals: "any spare

time I have should be working toward getting published, or I'll pay the price." The implication was research and publication as a component of one's work is inherently less structured relative to teaching and other day-to-day responsibilities, thus there is the dangerous tendency to put it off unless one is self-disciplined. There is also the constant necessity of "staying current," including awareness of current research in one's field and the demand for being able to cite literature published in the current calendar year or that is still in press. The study participant, however, pointed to the payoffs of this requirement: the confidence that comes from a focused, comprehensive knowledge of an area in the academic literature and the ability to take that knowledge into the classroom.

Finally, underlining the importance of research to the professional role of AU faculty are the constraints imposed on this branch campus by the university main campus, the "mother ship." One of the study participants expressed her perception that the main campus' biggest concern about the branch campus was mission drift, that the faculty will get caught up in the issues of starting a new campus and of heavy initial teaching and advising loads, and that the university branch will "become more like a community college." The uncertainty or debate around faculty research requirements at the university branch campus versus the main campus was apparently settled, "crystallized," however, and the decision was made in regard to tenure parameters that AU faculty "will perform to the same level of scholarship as the people on the main campus."

The community college faculty interviewed all contended that teaching was the primary component of their own professional role, while at the university teaching was secondary to research: "It's not that they don't teach or I don't do research...It's the teaching versus research as your primary responsibility." One of the faculty in describing hiring, tenure, and promotions criteria at ACC said

We teach a lot more than they [the university faculty] do, and we do less research... You can engage in research if you want, and it would help with your promotions, but that's not essential to what we do... I think a community college instructor is hired primarily to teach and,

on a secondary basis, college governance, advising, community liaison... Teaching is always the lion's share of what we're looking for, and then if you can add to it, professional development, college governance, and community service, that's great. But if you had those three without good teaching, you should not be able to get tenure or promotions at this campus [ACC].

He depicted his energy as devoted to teaching and explained the satisfaction that comes from it as his favorite aspect of the job:

You could know at the end of a lecture that things went well, that students connected, that you could feel an energy. So I guess teaching obviously, and that's the number one thing a community college instructor does anyway, so it's lucky that my number one assignment is my favorite assignment.

Another ACC faculty member elaborated on this perception of community college concentration on teaching in contrast to the university:

I would say that I view my position as teaching intensive and extensive! The focus really is about teaching in my position, whereas a university faculty member is really focusing more on the research aspect or the mentoring of graduate students which then often involves research as well, less on the teaching aspect...I think that with the university faculty member there's tremendous pressure to research, bring in grants, publish, be very active in their profession, the professional organizations with that. There isn't that same pressure or expectation, or for that matter support, at the community college level to do a lot of those things.

Yet another member of the ACC faculty said, "Teaching is definitely something I really feel passionate about...I feel that teaching here versus teaching at a university, I'm much more responsible and held accountable for my teaching than anything else I do really." She believed any research interests she had now were about teaching methods and ways to encourage student learning rather than about some very specific and narrow disciplinary phenomenon "that [only] seven other people in the world will understand, which is basically what my thesis is like." She recognized and appreciated the value of "pure" or basic research, but believed it was neither her desire nor did it match with her personality to perform it herself. While

acknowledging the appeal of performing ground-breaking research, she asserted, “A lot of people that do that are strange!”

In addition to the community college faculty self-perception of professional role as concentrated on teaching, they held the cross-perception that superior teaching was not rewarded at the university and in some instances teaching there was uneven or inferior. One ACC faculty member made this interesting remark about the university: “I understand research is the primary thing, but, you know, go work at a think tank if you want to just only do research!” Another of the community college study participants described some university faculty as suffering from an “ivory tower syndrome,” claiming their promotions were based too much on grants and publications and that “some of those folks have kind of removed themselves from the real world. Research may not be that applicable, and that’ll eventually come to haunt them in the professional community.” Remembering their own past experiences as undergraduate or graduate students in a university, some of the ACC faculty recalled “some of the most outstanding, stimulating, wonderful teachers and some of the most boring, horrible teachers.” They believed, because quality teaching was generally not rewarded or weighed as heavily as other criteria in promotion and tenure, university faculty can often “get away with” sub-par teaching, and those who did actually concentrate on excellence in the classroom were all the more remarkable for it.

I have to say I, in hindsight, really appreciate those few faculty that did put an effort into their courses because I’m also enough of a realist to understand that it really didn’t matter what they did in their classes as far as promotion and tenure was concerned. So why would they spend the time it takes to be an outstanding classroom instructor when their job doesn’t depend on that?

The community college faculty cross perception of the reward system of university faculty was that those whom were really prominent, on the cutting edge of their discipline, and cranking out publications

wouldn’t have to do a *thing* for the university. This is my perception. They wouldn’t have to be on a committee, they wouldn’t have to go to a meeting, they could sit in their office, and they could produce,

and their name would be printed in lots of places, and they would have their job for life. I think that's true.

There was this recurrent cross perception by ACC faculty that university faculty really accomplished at research need not necessarily be good at any other aspect of faculty work, including teaching.

In fact it was suggested by one of the ACC faculty, discussing the contentions of a speaker he mostly agreed with, that because of the rewards structure present in their institutions, many university faculty logically and largely ignore teaching.

He thought good community colleges and good small liberal arts colleges are on average doing the best the job of teaching across the board, where their contact with students is better and the classes are smaller and that's their primary assignment. He was very critical of these huge research institutions. He came up with the conclusion that, on average, the rewards to research are so much larger than the rewards to teaching, that a rational "maximizer" would put their energy into research and sort of ignore teaching at the undergrad level. Now, he said luckily there's a lot of faculty for integrity reasons that don't do that...they choose to be outstanding in spite of the rewards system at their institutions. Some of the very best teachers [are] also the best researchers...; they chose to put the time and energy into teaching. There was also some really *horrible* teaching going on at the four-year schools, at the research-driven institutions. His point also, and I kind of think I agree with it, not that there shouldn't be research institutions, but maybe there should be [just] a handful of prestigious ones...Not everyone has to have a huge research presence. They could scale those research presences back and put a little more time and energy into undergrad education.

This study participant observed that sometimes tenured faculty

can just become old and tired and stale. I guess that can happen anywhere and everywhere, but I have a sense that it's more likely to happen in a huge institution where you can get lost and kind of hide. My perception...is that there's some great scholarship going on and uneven teaching. But that great scholarship is great for society - most of it; some of it's just bogus.

There were a number of references by the community college faculty to research at the university as its primary “product,” or research “production” as the primary role of the university. One said, “their role is a little different in that they’ve got to produce that product. Our product here is students.” Another of the ACC faculty also described this cross-perception of the university faculty role:

I think much more of an emphasis on research, and production in that sense...I’m sure there are some that think, ‘I wish I was teaching at a community college instead of here,’ as far as when they’re feeling the pressure of that production. The production of ‘stuff’ is what I feel like is something that you have to do at the university. With the community college faculty I feel like it’s more the production of successful students, you know, focusing on the teaching.

The community college faculty perceive themselves as cranking out the students and the university faculty as cranking out the research.

The ACC faculty believed the AU faculty held a cross-perception of community college faculty as simply teachers. One suggested, “They see us more as ‘teacher types’ versus ‘research types.’” Another elaborated

I think, correctly so, that they see us as more teaching practitioners. I think they realize that they’re doing more cutting edge scholarship work, and we’re doing grunt work. Some of them don’t like the grunt work because for them it’d be a class of 300; for me it’s a class of 30, so it’s not as bad as they imagine.

There again was a reference to class size. It is worth noting that faculty from both types of institutions acknowledged that the community college experience was often typically one of relatively small classes whereas the university experience, at the freshman and sophomore level, was often typically one of much larger classes. This structural difference has important impacts on the ability, as discussed earlier, to provide individual attention to students and consequently on the perceptions of faculty roles at the two types of institutions.

Scholarship in Place of Simply Research, and Teaching Breadth versus Depth

The ACC faculty discussed their self-perception that most of them were not conducting original research themselves and were therefore usually not as fully knowledgeable compared to university faculty in regard to the very “cutting edge” of research in their academic disciplines. They contended, though, that they did try to generally “stay current” in their fields and did engage in continuing professional development.

The fact that we spend so much time teaching means that there’s a perception that we’re not “current” in our fields because we’re not researching all the time like they are. To be honest, there’s a certain aspect to that, I mean it is hard to stay “cutting edge.” I can stay current; I can’t stay cutting edge, as I could as a researcher. So I think that’s a fair assessment in that sense... We’re current, but we’re not cutting edge because of our teaching responsibility.

Another ACC faculty member mentioned that while he believed evaluation of community college faculty based on teaching was appropriate, it had the effect of sometimes shortchanging their other efforts:

Everything here is just straight out teaching. They want you to do those other things, and that’s good, but it’s not what you’re promoted on, or it’s not very clear. It’s always primary assignment teaching, which is a good thing basically. But it’s sometimes frustrating with all the hours we put into trying to keep up with the other stuff we need to do and stay current.

With their heavy teaching loads, community college faculty said they had only limited time and support from their institution necessary to do very much professional activity at all, let alone research specifically. They suggested that opportunities for research in order to be realistic for them would necessarily need to be accompanied by workload release and institutional backing and encouragement. However, they also thought of professional improvement as rather “open-ended,” one of them opining that all professionals, perhaps even to some extent nonprofessionals, need to “stay on top of their fields.” Specifically, these activities might include just attendance at regional meetings or, even more simply, reading

print or electronic material in one's discipline. The level of respect or status, or lack of it, based on professional or research involvement was a concern of the community college faculty. For instance, what does it mean to call oneself a "biologist?" If one's time is spent mostly in teaching biology in the classroom rather than performing research in biology in the laboratory or the field, is one still really a biologist? At least one of the ACC faculty answered in the affirmative, and further insisted she would even consider her students as versions of biologists: "It depends I guess on what your definition is, to some extent. I think that some people have a really rigid definition of who they're going to call what, you know." What much of the discussion about "staying current" in one's area as opposed to performing actual research was related to was the subtle but important distinction between research and scholarship.

The AU faculty interviewed described how their research informed their teaching as well as how sometimes their teaching improved their research:

I guess the favorite part of my work as being a university professor is the ability and the opportunity to do both research and teach, and to have that research inform my teaching and vice versa - to make that connection between research and teaching. That's the most rewarding part of it for me.

There was the suggestion that student reaction to concepts can be informative to faculty, and that a classroom can serve as an effective laboratory to test ideas. One of the faculty said about his students, "They're very smart, and are able sometimes to give a perspective on academic research that we don't see." Students, this faculty member continued, can constitute a sort of "bullshit test," able to succinctly distinguish between research that has merit or potential application from the rest. Another of the AU faculty reinforced the importance of research in improving teaching:

We can take our scholarship into the coursework. That helps get to a different level of depth for our students in terms of really understanding what the scholarship is in this area, what the current body of knowledge is. [It is] through our requirement in needing to

stay publishable that keeps us, that forces us to stay in touch with the literature and what's out there right now. We have to stay on top of it.

This phenomenon of research and teaching being mutually reinforcing is also a reflection of the utility of the broader concept of scholarship. One of the AU faculty put it into the following intriguing terms:

I don't really like the word 'research' so much as I like the word 'scholarship'... Scholarship in some sense, it's experimental of course, [but] it also has, to my mind, an added aspect to it of a retrievable...of the past, of historical import, to keep ideas current. So we don't just keep moving forward, forgetting about what happened in the past.

Community college faculty, not involved in cutting edge original research but often engaging in professional activities in their disciplines or around pedagogical innovation, agreed with this shift in focus toward an emphasis on the more encompassing notion of scholarship. The added attraction to this view was that it can by extension incorporate classroom learning and students themselves along with faculty into a continuum of scholarly involvement.

From both AU and ACC faculty, there was the belief that as a generality community college faculty teach with breadth, whereas university faculty teach with depth. One of the AU faculty members said, "I see the community college professors teaching a wider breadth of courses versus like me and other university faculty needing to teach less breadth, maybe more depth." She went on to suggest that this distinction between community college faculty as generalists and university faculty as specialists was an outgrowth of the research requirement at the university and its resultant focused expertise. One of the ACC faculty members described his teaching as at the introductory level in the subject and as "rather broad." He said he read "to stay abreast of what other people [researchers] are doing," but he himself was not "on top of" or "up to speed on" his academic discipline to the same extent. He referred to the level of depth in his subject area at which in the past he was working in graduate school as "way beyond" what students were exposed to in his classes

now in the community college where the approach is more general and broad. Another of the ACC faculty, one from a professional/technical area rather than a liberal arts area, said, “we teach more. The primary assignment here is to go into the classroom and instill information, critical thinking, problem solving, analysis skills, and...a lot of just flat skills, into students.” From his perspective, almost the inverse of that discussed above, training at the community college, at least in his program area, results in students prepared at the technician level with knowledge of specialized skills as well as some ability in “evaluating, interpreting, planning, and designing.” Further academic training beyond the community college level at the university, or else experience from on the job training, is needed to acquire a “breadth of knowledge and skills” necessary at the management level. Rather than an inconsistency in the view of differences in teaching at the community college as compared to teaching at the university, though, this would appear to be due to a somewhat different nature to what is meant by “breadth” versus “depth” in liberal arts versus professional/technical areas.

Graduate School and Cross-over Work Experience Inform Cross-perceptions

It was clear from comments during the interviews that for community college faculty, their experiences in graduate school, or sometimes even as an undergraduate, acted as a sort of crucible in both their cross-perception of university faculty professional role as well as their career choices. One of the ACC faculty said he graduated with a Ph.D. from a very reputable university and with these credentials could have gone to work at a university, but he didn't want to because as a graduate student he saw what he characterized as an imbalance at the university between teaching and research.

I was very disappointed with the effort or interest in teaching by university faculty. I saw that over and over and over - very few exceptions to that. I saw very few faculty that I could emulate or look up to in the teaching aspect in my graduate experience.

Another of the ACC faculty who had previous experience teaching at the university level as a graduate student said,

much of my view maybe of university teaching or teaching at four-year schools is influenced...somewhat from being in graduate school and just being a student, undergrad and graduate...When I was at [a university] in graduate school, I didn't see anybody teaching that much. On the other hand, they were doing a ton more research.

Yet another of the ACC faculty described her time teaching at a university as a graduate student and for a couple years immediately after getting her Ph.D. She claimed it was then that she realized she should have been in a program with an emphasis on teaching in her subject, rather than in the program she was in with an emphasis on "pure" (basic research) aspects of her subject, but, as she said, "I was in there and I was going to finish it!" It was with the mentorship from one of the university faculty in her subject area who encouraged her in her teaching interests that her desire to teach really developed. In fact she asserted that, not that she regrets having her Ph.D., but that if she had it to do over again knowing what she knows now about both herself and the nature of teaching versus research, she might just get a Master's degree and "go teach somewhere." There was also a comment from the community college faculty about having been exploited as a university graduate teaching assistant with a heavy teaching load but no employment benefits and a comment from another about experience as a university undergraduate student with foreign graduate teaching assistants as instructors who were very difficult to understand:

The graduate student will be teaching a class, and in many ways it's to the benefit of the graduate student to get that experience but the undergrads are saying, 'What in the hell is this guy saying?' I had that experience. I think you'd be hard-pressed to find anyone that hasn't had that experience in four years of education, to get a teacher whose English is so poor you just really don't understand them. If that happens once in four years, you survive, you get up off the canvass. If it happens more often than that, then the department is focused on its graduate department more than its undergrads.

The implication was again that this experience at the university helped turn this individual more toward the community college for his own career.

Some of the ACC faculty relayed extensive, vivid, and fascinating accounts of the attempts to discourage them, particularly while in graduate school, from pursuing a career at the community college, or disappointment with their decision to do so.

To give you an example from my graduate program, when I was looking for jobs and I only was looking at community colleges, my department was up in arms. They said, 'No Ph.D. from our program goes to a community college.' It was, pretty much, that just doesn't happen, and, 'are you crazy?' It was a big battle that I had to have with my advisor who was the chair of the department about even getting him to write a letter for me because they felt that that was a waste, it was going to lower their reputation, and, more importantly, not have someone that was graduating from their program furthering the profession by being in a key position. And being in a community college is not a key position in a discipline in their mind. So, I faced tremendous resistance to that. I was the first one ever with a Ph.D. to go to a community college from that program; it just doesn't happen. They're to this day still like, 'why did you do that?'... That continues today, this idea that I was a rogue black sheep that did this, and almost the sense that they wasted their investment in me by the fact that I ended up at a community college... That's how a university creates its reputation; graduates go out and do amazing things. And this perception that you can't go out and make a difference and do amazing things at a community college is explicitly implied [sic].

Another one of the ACC faculty also described this same sort of reaction from her graduate committee at the university and from others, as well as a feeling of guilt she experienced as a consequence of letting her thesis advisor down, although he had been supportive of her choice:

There were some that were, 'Oh yeah, that's going to be great.' But there were some that were like, 'Why are you doing that? Why are you going to go teach at a community college?' They saw that as a stepping down. 'What are you doing? What about your research.' I felt guilty in some way. 'You can write her off. She's gone to the dark side.'

Some of the faculty participants in this study talked about the difficulty, in fact the near impossibility, for an individual working as a community college faculty member to later land a faculty position at a university. From one of the ACC faculty was this candid remark,

One of the things my [graduate] advisor had said [was], 'You do this, and you *never* will leave a community college.' It's like a scarlet letter. Once you're a community college faculty member, you will never be anything else... You're branded; you're stuck.

This was an area where the community college and university faculty apparently agreed. According to one of the AU faculty,

It is a lot easier for someone like me who chose to go down this path to eventually go back and teach at a community college, if that's what I choose. It is much more difficult for someone who chooses the community college path to move to a four-year research institution simply because they have not had the structural and financial support to do research which would get them a job.

And another of the AU faculty commented:

We have a job opening, and if a community college person submits their resume for it, even if they have a Ph.D., you know what's going to be evaluated in a national search is the scholarship. The community college person, my guess, will have their feelings hurt.

In this instance it seems the community college faculty belief about how they were perceived, as being stuck or branded with a scarlet letter, was borne out by the similar university faculty cross-perception.

The study participants also felt that cross-over experience in the other type of institution, either as a student or a teacher, imparted a more informed perspective from which to make comparisons, although there wasn't agreement over whom, community college or university faculty, this described. One of the university faculty described at some length his own trajectory through college as beginning at a university from which he dropped out in the middle of a term so that his resultant GPA was fairly abysmal. After being out of college for 15 or 16 years, the most convenient and economical way for him to get back into college with a job and a

family was through a community college followed by a state university and then graduate school. He said, "Without a community college, I don't know that I would have been able to...find my way." He portrayed the particular community college he attended as a "quality place," providing a sort of "second chance" for him academically, "opening a lot of doors for me." As a consequence he contended that "We need community colleges. I have a strong feeling about that, and I respect what they do." He stated that this favorable impression of community colleges was part of what compelled him to join the faculty at AU, co-located at ACC, and he talked about some positive experiences he had had more recently in collaborating with ACC faculty on committees. Another of the university faculty said she believed the extent of the scholarship component to her job requirements was not as visible and consequently not really understood by the community college faculty who as a consequence, she contended, don't fully appreciate how different their jobs were.

My perception is that they believe that we're just like them, that there's no difference or minimal difference in what we do, expectations, requirements, what we do, because you know both groups are in the classroom a lot, both groups are interfacing with students a lot. So what could be different? I feel I've got a fairly good understanding of what's different that they don't see. They don't see the scholarship requirements and what that really means, and I don't see their community outreach as clearly.

Some of the community college faculty interviewed, however, felt they had the more informed perspective from which to make comparisons between the two types of institutions. One talked about her positive experience as a student at a community college before attending a university and how the teachers there inspired and encouraged her, "I think my own experience at a community college had a lot to do with my choice to come here [to ACC]." She conjectured that individuals who had never been to a community college had ill-informed opinions of them

as an extension of the public school system or something, and not really 'higher ed.' I'm sure that there are some university faculty that are in the same shoes, never having gone to a community college,

their perception of [the] community college being based on strictly hearing and reading – not really experiencing it themselves.

Later she elaborated on this contention that the community college faculty had a more informed perspective of the differences between their own institutions and universities:

I think it's kind of an interesting dynamic in that every community college faculty member has been in a university, but I bet a vast majority of university professors have never been to a community college, maybe stepped foot on one. Every single community college faculty have stepped foot on a university. There's a real one-sidedness of an awareness of what's happening. I feel like a community college faculty member is much more aware of what a university faculty member would be doing in general, because they've been on one at least five years, whereas I would suspect that the vast majority of university faculty members have never attended a community college, taken a class, and many of them have never stepped foot on the property of one, literally. I think that there's a real 'void of understanding' on that one side.

It appears that faculty at both types of institutions believed that faculty at the other were at least partly unaware of what goes on in their own academic spheres, and both faculty believed they had the more informed perspective from which to make comparisons and draw conclusions.

Perceptions of an Academic Hierarchy

The study participants from the community college all alluded to their belief that the university faculty see them as somehow lower in an academic "hierarchy." This hierarchy was described with a great variety of metaphors, including references to a pecking order, a totem pole, the bottom of the barrel, and looking down their noses, among others.

I think there is a pecking order, and it's probably realistic. It's fine. I don't envy them their position...I feel like I've got a blessed job, it fits what I want to do. I'm not upset that there is kind of an academic pecking order and research does get more recognition than teaching. That's just the way it is. My being upset about it wouldn't change

it...I think they're perception of us is that we're kind of the worker bees and we do a task that some of them don't like to do.

One of the other ACC faculty suggested that part of the "gulf" between the two faculties was the result of a difference in credentialing, the university faculty having Ph.D.'s and the community college faculty having master's degrees. He said there were exceptions, such as ACC, where many of the community college faculty did have Ph.D.'s, but there was still an "assumption of difference in credentials."

I don't want to reinforce a stereotype, but I don't feel that community college faculty are respected by the university faculty - maybe not going so far as to say respected, but not considered colleagues. Yes, they may respect us because some of us have the same credentials, but we're not colleagues. That's pretty clear I think for a lot of them.

Another of the ACC faculty members detailed the experience of participating in a working group with university, community college, and grade school representation. Though depicted as generally a positive and collaborative experience, one of the university faculty in this group "looked down on" and made "derogatory, stereotyping" comments about his colleagues from "lower" in the academic hierarchy. This ACC faculty member portrayed the hierarchy as a result of "insecurity somewhat in the community college faculty and also a condescending attitude of university faculty...I think that it's sort of like 'the higher up you teach, the more you know,' as a sort of gross generalization." She mentioned a "stereotypical stigma" many people attach to working for a community college and that even "a member of my family was like, 'Why are you teaching at a community college rather than at a university?'" Moreover, she stated, "I'm sure there are some [university faculty] that think, 'Oh, well they would all be teaching at a university if they could.'"

One of the ACC faculty discussed what he perceived as a distinction between universities which view community colleges and their students with respect versus those which view them with skepticism.

Some really, boy, they think we're probably the low end of the totem pole in the educational process. Others have a great deal of respect... Working on our articulation some of them are just really skeptical of articulating with us. They don't think we have the quality that they do. They believe they can do it better... You can think of the university as a customer too, although some of them are reluctant customers! Some want to buy our students, and some really say, 'Well, only at a certain price. We're only going to give them so many credits to transfer. We just really don't think your course is the same as ours.' Others, boy, they buy it lock, stock, and barrel.

He went on to say while the university could be thought of as a customer for community college students, the students themselves were more like clients in that they were not buying a product by paying tuition but rather forming a professional relationship with the instructor, much like with a physician or lawyer.

The faculty from AU confirmed the existence of this supposed academic hierarchy with the university "sitting on the top." They speculated that the community college faculty felt perceived as "less, looked down on, or seen in a lower light." They guessed that the ACC faculty worry that the university believed community college students were not being challenged and not performing adequately and that if the faculty were really good they wouldn't be teaching at a community college. However, all of the AU faculty interviewed flatly denied they themselves felt that way about ACC, its faculty, or its students, saying, for example, "I don't think it's that at all," or, "I want to make perfectly clear that I don't believe that that's true at all." One of the AU faculty members said,

I don't teach 100 and 200 level classes, and they don't teach the 300 and 400 level. So, it's sort of split up that way, which creates a sort of artificial hierarchy in my mind that I find a little problematic... I think there's some perception that we're threatening to them in some ways... I think that there is a kind of culture difference between the two colleges, the two institutions... that's fraught with problems in some ways.

It is interesting that, though all the interviewees from the university acknowledged the existence of widespread beliefs around a sort of hierarchy, they each contended they themselves harbored none such.

One of the study participants from the university spoke at some length about what he characterized as resentment on the part of the ACC faculty in regard to the existence of the university branch campus:

Most of the people I deal with at [ACC] have been great and willing to work together, though I know there are some that resent the fact that we're here very much. The most resentful ones seem to my mind to be the less thinking ones.

He went on to describe an extraordinary incident in which an ACC faculty member started an argument with him, ostensibly about politics and freedom of expression in the classroom but quickly generalized to resentment against AU, which got uglier and eventually amounted to a public scene. While stating that he believed this occurrence was anomalous in that it was "so open and public," he believed it was symptomatic of a broad feeling of resentment by some of the ACC faculty about the university branch campus. About the argument and the resentment he said, "I think that grows from a threat, I think that she perceives us as a threat to her." The university faculty appeared to suggest that feelings in regard to an academic hierarchy might have more to do with the fears and resentment of the community college faculty than with any action of their own.

Other Dimensions of Faculty Work, in Addition to Teaching and Research

Though teaching, in the case of the community college faculty, and teaching and research, in the case of the university faculty, were indicated as the biggest part of their jobs, study participants discussed several other dimensions of their work as well as how those differ between the two types of institutions. One of the AU faculty talked about her community service work, student advising, program promotion, and student recruitment. She said one of the things she particularly liked about working for AU, a small branch campus with small class sizes, was the opportunity to "mix

and blend my community service, my teaching, and my research in a way I never have before.” An aspect of her work she disliked was the student advising, not because of anything inherently unsatisfactory in it but because of the sheer number of advisees.

I don't think that I have enough time to do as good a job as I would like to, exploring things like, 'what really do you think would interest you for your life?' and 'how can we really think about shaping your degree, so that you make the most of opportunities you have at our unique campus situation?' I don't get to do as much of that as I'd like to; it's more of the nuts and bolts of, 'does this class meet this requirement,' those sorts of things.

She said another challenge was the fairly heavy burden of recruiting interested students and promoting relatively new courses and academic programs in the effort both to get them off the ground and to “gain an identity” as a newer institution. While admitting this work was sometimes fun, it was depicted as a sort of unacknowledged “add-on” to her job. She asked rhetorically, “We want to do service, we want to do research, we want to do teaching well. How do you balance those three?” However, she suggested that “community and campus service” represents an even larger percentage of the job for community college instructors than for herself at the university and “is very important to their tenure and promotion process.” Finally, this AU faculty member drew the distinction, also made by other interviewees, that university faculty derive much of their professional identity through their academic discipline, whereas community college faculty derive much of their identity through involvement in the local community.

At a research university your identity is strongly grounded in your discipline at a national and an international level, whereas at a community college, your identity, part of it seems to be oriented toward public exposure in the local community in bringing what you do to the local community, not just in terms of degree-seeking students, but in terms of continuing education, for instance.

Another one of the AU faculty members detailed his dissatisfaction sometimes with the service load, or “committee work,” of his position:

Sometimes it seems like we spend an awful lot of time going to meetings and shooting emails back and forth. I'm sure some end result will appear from that, but it doesn't always seem tangible to me. There's a lot of egos and stuff that come with that. I think that's just part of my personality; I don't thrive on conflict like some people do. I would rather keep my brain open for teaching and studying and learning...I know that sounds elitist but...it's not really. It's just not what I like to do. But I don't have too much to complain about.

That last remark was at least in part related to the admission, once again, that community college faculty were required to do even more of this type of work. As he later said, "I know that they probably do more committee work than I do. The involvement with the college governance and stuff is weighted a lot more in their tenure determination, as far as I know."

Another of the AU faculty confirmed the same dimensions of their work, parts of their job description and evaluation: "we've got three areas all university [faculty] are accountable for: teaching and advising, scholarship, and service," to which she later added "collegiality," or how well one works with the other faculty, as a fourth. She said the emphasis was on research previously while she was working toward tenure but now the emphasis was on teaching and advising. The service component she said included "service to our department, service to our profession, and service to our community" and was for her particularly heavy at the present time because AU is a new branch campus which entails much service work in the form of "program development, starting up a new campus, and hiring faculty and adjuncts." She stated that while she enjoyed research or scholarship, getting published, working in the community, advising students, curriculum development, and working with her faculty colleagues, her favorite aspect of the work, in contrast to the ACC portrayal of some university faculty as researchers isolated in an ivory tower or think tank, was teaching: "Why am I in this business? I'm a university professor because I really enjoy teaching."

The faculty at ACC also spoke to the parts of their work in addition to teaching, including student advising, college governance, community outreach, and

involvement in professional organizations. Advising was depicted as central to the job of the community college faculty, really amounting to an extension of teaching, and often labor-intensive. One of the ACC faculty spoke to his passion for this part of the job and said, "Advising I absolutely love...advising is something that I really enjoy tremendously."

College governance, more or less synonymous with committee work, was described by the community college faculty as a prominent part of the job and one that results in mixed experiences.

The committee stuff, the college involvement - that has aspects of it that I don't like. I wouldn't say I don't like doing committee stuff at all, because I've learned so much being on committees about the college and about my peers and all that. I know it's necessary, but it's definitely not one of my favorite things.

The other interviewees from the community college expressed similar views. One portrayed committee work as sometimes "enjoyable" or "rewarding" and sometimes not, but, regardless, a "critically important" part of the job. He mentioned that the different components of college governance –

hiring and promotions, and tenure committee, and academic affairs, and curriculum affairs, and being the department chair...all those things round you out. All those things are a way to see the college from different angles and get out of your cubicle and get involved.

There was also the clear implication that this was an important part of the job most particularly for community college faculty:

At least here at [ACC], we have a real high expectation of involvement in the college or the community as a whole. I'd say I put a tremendous amount of time in doing both of those. I don't know that most university faculty have the same kind of pressure.

Involvement in or connections with the local community also comprises a prominent and characteristic part of community college faculty work. The ACC faculty stressed the value of "public relations" and "appealing to the community," saying "It is their college in a sense." They pointed out that it is integrated into the

very job description: “[It’s] just something that the college asks of you if you’re going to get promotions and tenure, that you get out into the community and do stuff.” Various examples were offered of appropriate local civic engagement, participation in public forums, and membership in organizations, often where a faculty member’s disciplinary expertise could be of use. Again, this was seen as especially characteristic of community college faculty: “I see here [at ACC] much more involvement with the community than I ever saw at the university level...I think that that in my experience is more emphasized at the community college versus the university.”

Finally, participation in professional organizations was listed by the ACC faculty in addition to college governance and community involvement as an important area of their jobs outside of teaching. They indicated they “interface a great deal with the professional community,” through memberships, conferences, paper presentations, panels, and working groups. They liked the chance in these contexts to mix with university faculty and said the level of respect and affirmation given to them as community college faculty was often pleasantly surprising, even amazing. The community college faculty described being “shocked” and “pleased” to be acknowledged and valued as equals with the university faculty at professional meetings.

Differing Missions and Matching the Right Person to the Right Job

Most of the faculty interviewed proposed that differences in professional roles between the two faculty were really a reflection of the different missions of the community college versus the university. One of the AU faculty said,

There comes a point where you can’t avoid that there’s differences in missions...We certainly have very different missions in the community and in the state. There are times when those missions don’t match up as easily or as well as we would like them to, for sure.

One of the others from AU stated that the professional/technical students come out of the community college with great practical skills, then at the university they

“backfill” with theory; for transfer or liberal arts students, the community college covers the “basic, lower level aspects,” then the university “polishes” them. He depicted the place of the community college as providing for the needs of local people and preparing people for work. Another of the study participants from the university described as “very, very important” the “remedial” and “votech” aspects of the community college mission, aspects she asserted the university either doesn’t do very well or doesn’t do at all.

The university faculty suggested that this difference in mission between the two types of institutions should be embraced:

Everything...starts with mission, and then structure and roles and responsibilities flow from there. It’s both sides being happy with who they are. I think maybe there’s a tendency for the community college to think that university folks see them in a lower light than us...I don’t think it’s that at all. Their mission is really, really important. I mean they’ve got components of a mission that we do not have, that the community needs from them...Heck, let’s be happy with that and run with it. It’s what makes us *different*. We provide different things...We [AU] have a significant part of our mission being called scholarship, [but] we don’t do the remedial and we don’t do the vocational...The community needs us each to play our role.

Perhaps significantly, left out of this view of the community college mission were the academic programs in the liberal arts or transfer area.

A “division of labor” or differences in “specialization” was how one ACC faculty member characterized the distinction in what community colleges versus universities do.

The fact is some of that research is just outstanding. It has to be done. It’s part of the mark of our civilization. My job is sort of to pass on the conventional wisdom. The world we live in is because people have pushed the frontier of knowledge. Then back behind that frontier, we’re trying to inform the vast majority of professionals. I feel like I’m serving my students, and I think these people doing research are serving society. I think we all fit in; there’s a role for everybody.

He even speculated that perhaps

all freshman and sophomores should go to a community college, [letting] people like me who enjoy teaching the basic classes have the basic students,...free up the faculty who hate teaching to do 100% research, and find the faculty that like both to do the upper division undergrad with smaller classes and more in their fields.

The ACC faculty also addressed this specialization more from the perspective of differences in the students at the two types of institutions. They said students who were “stronger” or more “competitive” or “articulate” can thrive in universities, whereas students who were “place-bound,” facing financial constraints, “need more hand-holding,” or who had not found success at the university were better suited to community colleges where “the teaching expertise that we have is beneficial to them.”

Many of the faculty interviewed from both ACC and AU discussed as one implication of this division of labor the importance of the match between what a faculty member was interested in doing professionally and the type of institution for which they work. For instance, the ACC faculty talked about how their interest in teaching more than research made them better suited to, and more satisfied with, working at a community college:

The fact that I’ve specialized doesn’t bother me at all. In fact I like the niche I’ve picked. At some point you’ve got to pick a niche, or one falls in your lap, or somehow or another there’s an area in which you put your energy. My energy is in to teaching...I’m absolutely sure the number one thing I need to do is teach. That’s great. I think that’s a good division of labor. I think I’m a better teacher than I would be a researcher. I could do research - I’ve done it. It wasn’t as satisfying. So, I’m not sure that I’d want to be at a four-year school. I think I’d find it a little more stressful to not teach as often and to be chasing down grant monies and those sorts of things...I’m much happier focusing almost exclusively on teaching.

One of the ACC faculty members described the pressure she was under early in her career development in choosing between the community college or the university pathway:

The reason I wanted to work at a community college versus a university...is the student interaction - having the time for the student interaction versus having the time to do research...I really had to make myself think about what I really wanted, and not let all of those outside pressures come to play...‘This is what I really want to do, *really.*’ But why should you feel like you have to say that? It seems like people should accept the job that you choose as what you want to do.

It seems that due to the perceived academic hierarchy, or the insecurity that results from it, some of the community college faculty felt compelled to justify their career choices.

The faculty at AU also addressed this advisability of matching a person’s interests or abilities to the appropriate type of institution of higher education.

Peers I went to graduate school with who chose to go to a community college instead of a four-year university, those folks tell me very specifically they made those choices intentionally because they didn’t have as positive a view of my role as they did the community college, because they didn’t see themselves as researchers, quite frankly. They saw themselves as educators, and that a person who would take a position at a four-year research institution is committing themselves to do less educating just by the fact that they’ve got to do 40% of their time researching. And when I say ‘not as positive,’ I don’t mean that really as good or bad, but just in their own personal kind of desires of what they want to do in their careers. If they truly want to be educators first, the community college in some ways is a very unique opportunity, and a lot of people look at it in that way I think. A lot of folks in the community college have looked at the research institution and said, ‘You know I did that for years as a grad student, and I don’t want to go down that road anymore.’ I can see why they made that decision sometimes, absolutely.

Another of the AU faculty members alluded to the importance of having a clear picture of what she portrayed as the difference in missions between the university and the community college during the faculty hiring process, both from the standpoint of the applicant and of the employer. A faculty applicant whose primary interest is teaching and not research may not be a good match with the university and will more likely be both happier and more valued at the community college.

Conversely, an applicant who is interested in and has demonstrated ability in research may not be a good fit with the community college and will have more opportunities to thrive at the university. She stressed that this was not meant as a judgment about relative quality of applicants or institutions, but rather as advice to those looking at different jobs and those looking at different applicants.

Faculty Collaboration and Inter-institutional Cooperation: Benefits, Barriers, and Improvements

Many of the interviewees, particularly those from AU, characterized faculty collaboration at the university as typically restricted to within a particular academic discipline in contrast to the community college where collaboration was seen as much broader or interdisciplinary. One of the AU faculty said,

Another thing that is different about a community college is they don't necessarily have the disciplinary boundaries that a four-year university traditionally has...At the community college, I like that, it's more interdisciplinary. The nature of a community college campus, I think, is a lot more interdisciplinary. Faculty know people in different disciplines, and they work with these people on committees all the time. At the four-year campus you don't get that.

The study participants said collaboration between the community college and the university was typically and naturally first between department heads or faculty in the same discipline. From there, the collaboration can broaden, though it is challenging to establish connections that are simultaneously inter-institutional and interdisciplinary. The benefit though was that then "your commonality becomes educating students." Those faculty from AU and ACC who had established relationships with faculty from the other institution described them as positive and productive.

The desirability, even the critical necessity, of better inter-institutional cooperation between universities and community colleges was dealt with in some detail. One of the AU faculty stated,

To my mind it's always more interesting and productive if institutions interact with each other. A lot of my work, a lot of my research, my scholarship, is interdisciplinary, and part of my attraction to this whole thing [ACC/AU co-located campus] was the idea of inter-institutionality. I understand that that's hugely difficult. Institutions are monolithic, but the idea to start chipping away at those monoliths seems to me to be very valuable.

Another one of the faculty members from AU spoke to the need for inter-institutional cooperation in the broad context of improving access to higher education:

I think we're at that point where we're really trying to decide as a nation what we want to do with education more broadly. I think it would be in our best interests to forge relationships between community colleges and four-year universities. I am an educator; I think that a lot of the social problems that we face in our country would not disappear, but would be greatly improved with a more educated public. I think the biggest problem in our society with education is access...I think building relationships between the community [colleges] and four-year universities could improve access: one, by keeping costs down; two, by offering more flexible programs, degree programs that accommodate people who have all of these complicated issues and needs in our society...I think we benefit by having a strong relationship, by seeing how our visions and our missions overlap...I'm not saying we should reduce our mission to theirs or they should reduce their mission to ours, but we should explore the commonalities that we have and build those, and then continue to do the things that make us unique as well too. That way we serve a much *wider* spectrum of our population...It's important to forge relationships without dissolving differences.

Universities and community colleges with their distinct missions can maintain the integrity of their different identities while at the same time cooperating in a fashion that strengthens both and improves access for students.

Faculty interviewed described some of the barriers to more effective inter-institutional cooperation, either broadly speaking or specific to ACC and AU. One of the ACC faculty alluded to an instance where a university faculty member exerted "ownership" over a course he felt could not be taught to the same standard at a community college. The ACC faculty member contended that negotiating course

equivalency or program articulation between the two types of institutions has got to be done “face-to-face” and is ineffective if attempted over the phone or via email. An AU faculty member mentioned many areas where there were initial logistical issues of incompatibility with ACC which had subsequently been alleviated: computer systems, advising practices, course and classroom scheduling, financial aid, registration, library policies, etc. According to her, continuing problems included “bottlenecks” in some program areas where ACC cannot move sufficient students quickly enough through the “pipeline” to AU, and other areas where ACC offered a number of courses that would otherwise fulfill program requirements but that were necessarily numbered at the 200 level where AU requires 300 level courses.

Another issue where community colleges and universities might be operating with cross purposes is the advisability of the various Associate’s degrees. Faculty stated that the percent of graduates with an Associate’s degree was one of the critical measures of success and performance metrics for ACC, which consequently shaped their student advising. On the other hand, from the perspective of AU, a two-year degree was most often more or less irrelevant and may even slow a student’s progress toward a Baccalaureate degree, which influenced their student advising oppositely. It was suggested that the two types of institutions should not be compelled to “count beans,” or be held accountable, in ways that are not the most effective or realistic.

A common sentiment from both AU and ACC faculty was that the institutions’ administrators can be problematic, particularly with regard to inter-institutional cooperation or encouraging faculty collaboration between the university and the community college. One interviewee’s recommendation was to “get administrators out of the way,” suggesting that they care more about their respective institution’s “status” and less about functional articulation, which works better when representatives of only the two faculty sit down together. Another participant stated, “often-times administration is part of the problem of creating barriers between faculty,” instead of encouraging the kind of “cross-collaboration” that can create

“more seamless transitions” between institutions for students. “Administration... often is kind of out of touch with what’s really going on whether it’s in scholarship or in the teaching world – both places I think would have equal sentiments about that,” was another comment. Another faculty member described his frustration “dealing with administrative matters and administrators that do not understand professional technical programs. Sometimes it works to bring ‘em along, and then you can kind of see them coming along. Other times, boy, they don’t have a clue.” Finally, another one of the faculty spoke at some length about his impression of administrators:

There’s a radical difference between the perspective of administration and teachers...I found working with the administration adversarial...I think if the administration is willing to listen to the advice of the staff and the faculty, it’s a great way to keep them on track. The administration usually isn’t. I don’t mean to sound overly critical, but quite often the administration has these college governance things as window dressing. I know that sounds a little cynical... The managers have one or two people that have student contacts...and then the rest of them can be clueless about what’s going on with the students and the day to day issues of registration, and add-drop, and full classes, and classrooms where equipment breaks down...They want to make big mega-decisions, and they’re not very much nuts and bolts people.

This general “cluelessness” among the administration, according to both AU and ACC faculty, contributed to the difficulty of inter-institutional cooperation and the barriers to greater seamlessness for students.

Faculty from both AU and ACC made suggestions for measures to enhance collaboration between the two faculties or cooperation between the two institutions. Better communication, much more frequent personal interaction, and “more opportunities to just commune” were proposed in order to build trust and lower barriers. A study participant said, “It’s mostly about developing relationships. If you get that, everything else comes a lot easier once you have this kind of idea that, ‘hey we’re both working for the same thing.’” Conversations, both formal and informal, between faculty at AU and ACC about different classroom approaches could

strengthen pedagogy. Better relationships between faculty members at the two institutions accommodate even simply calling each other on the phone about program requirements in order to more effectively advise students. One of the more emphatic suggestions for building bridges was to, "Boy, give us more time! These things take time." The removal of structural barriers to a better flow of information between the two institutions was also advocated, such as possibly creating a common electronic conferencing system. Both institutions have guest speaker programs; it was contended that a better job could be done of inviting each other's faculty to attend.

I think anything that we can do to build spaces where not just faculty, but administrators and staff and students see less of a fence to cross between community college and four-year, then all of those sorts of things just will enhance the collaboration and the *product* that we can make available to our communities.

In the interest of promoting inter-institutional faculty collaboration, there was even the suggestion to form more committees (!) which have representatives from both.

One of the university faculty interviewed talked about how it simply made common sense for the co-located AU to collaborate with ACC in initiating new academic programs with "Interaction earlier in the process, more at the concept phase." Previously program development at AU was portrayed as carried out in isolation, with only after-the-fact solicitation of input from ACC: "typically we'll run down the path a long ways, and then we say, 'Okay, so what of all this that we've already developed does [ACC] already have.' By getting involved in the middle, it's not as smooth."

So, as we're thinking about some new programs we may be offering in the future... there's definitely room for improvement on collaborating on how we establish those programs and lay out the curriculum - definitely room to see more of [ACC] faculty and [AU] faculty in rooms putting their heads together on how can we offer the best program... It's been hard to learn, how we work together to develop new programs. It's brand new for us, and we're learning how to work with the community college in doing it, and it hasn't been smooth.

A member of the ACC faculty openly speculated whether in fact it's worth the trouble at all to promote collaboration between the community college and the university:

If there's a real need to get together, they should get together, but we shouldn't create artificial get-togethers if there's no real business being done. Maybe collaboration doesn't have to happen. Maybe it just happens naturally and organically if it happens, or it doesn't happen. Maybe it's not important for it to happen. Maybe the benefit of that collaboration is modest. Maybe the time and effort isn't worth it. That might be a different perspective than other people's perspective. I don't know that I'd go out of my way to create collaboration if it just didn't naturally occur for a real reason.

Other study participants presented with this same speculation acknowledged that it was something to consider but believed better collaboration would in fact have significant positive impacts.

Most of the faculty interviewed mentioned the desirability of co-teaching, faculty exchanges, or cross-training opportunities between the university and the community college. One of the ACC faculty said,

I'd dearly love to take some of those [AU] faculty and have them teach down here in their areas of expertise – teach lower division. I think it'd be good for them. I'd dearly love to go up there and teach some upper division.

Another of the ACC faculty also supported exchanges

so that the faculty can operate in the other's world a little bit and it gives them some growth because I think that for a community college faculty member that's always teaching lower division that can get stale sometimes. [So it'd] give them a chance to get into some of their areas of expertise that they can't do at the introductory level. At the same time the university faculty [could] remember what it's like to teach a freshman class, a sophomore class, and get back to some of those basics.

He also described the potential benefits of co-teaching opportunities:

I think some opportunities to co-teach courses at the lower division and upper division [would be good], because I think that, while the

community college faculty would really find some stimulation and learn a lot from working with a researcher at a university, I think the same could be said of the university faculty researcher learning some things about teaching from the community college faculty member.

He also pointed out that as a result of faculty from the two institutions “putting ourselves in the other person’s shoes and getting some cross-training” a better understanding of students’ needs could be accomplished and the faculty could then “make that transition smoother” between the community college and the university.

Some of the community college faculty contended that the university faculty experience at the freshman and sophomore level is one of very large, impersonal classes. It was suggested more than once that it would be an “eye-opening” experience for university faculty to see the pedagogical innovation and positive learning atmosphere possible at the lower division with the smaller classes typical of a community college. It was also proposed that in some ways we ought to be doing the opposite of what is often the case in higher education by having the “most experienced faculty with the broadest philosophical outlooks” teaching introductory courses and having the newly minted Ph.D.’s with the most active and current research teaching specialty courses.

Faculty exchanges were also supported by some of the study participants from AU. One said, though “it’s not something I relish doing,” he could see the benefit “if I taught some lower division classes, and they were able to teach a couple upper division classes over here.” One advantage would again be to “create a deeper understanding of the transition between those two places” from the student perspective. “I think if we were able to sort of create a joint culture through the involvement of faculty from both institutions,” suggested this AU faculty member, multiple mutual benefits might result, including improving student recruitment and retention. The AU faculty alluded several times to being impressed with the caliber of faculty at ACC and the prevalence of Ph.D.’s among them, a factor which the AU faculty believed made teaching exchanges between the two institutions entirely

possible. However, several “arcane” logistical or contractual issues around teaching load and faculty pay remained as obstacles to such arrangements.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Co-location or Merger

The fact that ACC and AU are co-located on the same campus appears to have both advantages and disadvantages according to the two faculties. An AU faculty member said, “I think the fact that we have co-located creates opportunities but also creates problems. The idea that people get along better once they’re close together isn’t necessarily true.” He thought the community and the students were in many ways “well served” by the arrangement, but on a personal level it made his “life a real pain in the ass.” Other AU faculty pointed to the students’ financial advantage of the co-location: “You can get the least expensive degree in the state by coming here and working with [ACC] and [AU],” and “It’s way cheaper to go your first two years to a community college and then come to the university.” Some talked about better efficiencies in terms of space and physical resources with co-location, though the opportunity for AU to expand on the same campus was described as limited. There is some possibility AU might move its physical presence to a separate campus in the same city, and one of the AU faculty stated that in that case the institutions might possibly lose much of their complementary natures if they were to “sever their tie” and might begin competing by offering overlapping programs. If there were to be two different campuses, ACC and AU might maintain an appropriate and strong programmatic presence at either location in order to maintain that “tie” and promote seamlessness for students. One of the interviewees from the university even alluded to possibly merging the two institutions “into a single unique university,” though she suggested that the “technical and logistical” considerations would be daunting. Perhaps one example of those considerations was supplied by the comments of a different AU faculty member about the ACC library: “It’s a great library for a community college; it’s not a research library.”

The ACC faculty also talked about the co-location of the two institutions. One of them admitted “there’s a lot of politics there to overcome” as far as sorting out which classes or programs are to be offered by whom. She said though the “physical proximity” was a significant advantage in advising students, with individuals from the other institution whom she can simply visit in person with questions. She further suggested this communication facilitates a better understanding of each other’s programs.

A different community college faculty member spoke at length about the possibility of merging ACC and AU into one institution. He advocated a merger, “in spite of the fact that it’d be a pain in the ass for me, because I don’t have a Ph.D.” He clarified that in the event of a merger, existing faculty without a Ph.D. should be permitted to continue until retirement when they can be replaced with others who possess a doctoral degree. He also argued that a university resulting from such a merger should keep the professional/technical and continuing education programs as well as the two-year degrees offered by the community college. Such a merged institution could focus on teaching rather than research; he contended that really only “one or two research institutions in the state are fine.” A merger and resultant integration, he contended, would make real colleagues of the two faculties and provide efficiency by consolidating administration and possibly providing a better, more attractive, “traditional” college campus. He envisioned, as part of such a campus, athletics that are regionally appropriate and fit in with an active community as well as the attraction of a rich array of cultural activities. This ACC faculty member suggested, however, that “turf wars” or “territorial prerogatives” remain an obstacle to merging and that if the currently co-located university were to move elsewhere the separation would result in inefficiencies and duplication and in neither institution having sufficient resources: “Now you’d have two libraries, but their collections are both half what they ought to be and they’re separated.” He asserted that the drive to build a separate AU campus is motivated more by economic development than by what makes sense educationally. While acknowledging that a

hypothetical merger represents a “gamble” that might place programs or institutional identity at risk, he argued that “there’s no guarantee that autonomy creates quality.” For a merger to work, though, he believed there must be full commitment, budgetary and otherwise, at the state level to establish and grow such a new institution. He suggested that if state legislators can be convinced to consider long-term community vibrancy rather than short-term economic gain, an independent university resulting from the merger of AU and ACC is the correct path to take.

These were the themes that emerged from the interviews of faculty at ACC and AU. In the following conclusion section, the relation of these data to the literature reviewed earlier and to the research questions will be explored along with the broader implications of this research.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about similarities and differences in their professional roles. In particular, there were four research questions this qualitative case study proposed to answer: 1) How do community college and university faculty perceive their own professional roles, particularly relative to each other's?, 2) How do community college and university faculty perceive each other's professional roles, particularly relative to their own?, 3) How do community college and university faculty say their own professional roles are perceived by the other?, and 4) What do community college and university faculty see as barriers to inter-institutional cooperation, and what measures do they suggest might enhance collaboration between the two faculties or cooperation between the two institutions? The literature reviewed included material about teaching and other dimensions of faculty professional role, self-perceptions and cross-perceptions of faculty professional role, and mechanisms for and benefits of improved faculty relations. The research design proposed a qualitative ethnographic case study methodology on the site of what were herein referred to as Anonymous Community College (ACC) and the co-located branch campus, Anonymous University (AU). Faculty participants were purposively selected for individual interviews, the transcripts of which were coded then subjected to analytic induction in order to develop themes. Ten themes were described in the results:

- 1) Attention to individual students, quality of students, and the burden of grading
- 2) Greater schedule freedom at the university versus heavier teaching load at the community college
- 3) Relative importance of research at the university versus teaching at the community college
- 4) Scholarship in place of simply research, and teaching breadth versus depth
- 5) Graduate school and cross-over work experience inform cross-perceptions
- 6) Perceptions of an academic hierarchy

- 7) Other dimensions of faculty work, in addition to teaching and research
- 8) Differing missions and matching the right person to the right job
- 9) Faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation: benefits, barriers, and improvements
- 10) Advantages and disadvantages of co-location or merger

This conclusion will use the themes presented in the results to answer the research questions while comparing the results in this study to those contained in the literature review. Study limitations, broader implications, and directions for future research will also be suggested.

The study participants from ACC shared a number of self-perceptions, how they perceive their own professional role, which appear to be characteristic of community college faculty. They saw themselves as master teachers, able to devote more individualized attention to students and promote learning through relatively smaller class sizes, through one-on-one interactions with students including advising, and through an intensive focus on teaching rather than research. The ACC faculty discussed other components of their professional role, including college governance, connections to the local community, and involvement in professional organizations. Attendance at meetings of professional organizations was described as enjoyable and a valuable opportunity to mix with disciplinary colleagues from universities and elsewhere, but these opportunities were limited because of their heavy teaching load and relatively little financial support in this regard from their institutions. They consistently argued that they do make efforts to “stay current” in their fields, though not as “cutting edge” as they perceived university researchers do. This is an intriguing result: further exploration is called for as to what it means to stay current in one’s field, whether community college faculty are actually doing so, and how this activity fits within a broad notion of scholarly activity.

The focus of community college faculty energy and efforts at innovation as well as their professional rewards and recognition are centered on teaching. They viewed their primary “product” as students. These results are aligned with research

cited earlier in the literature review that indicated community college faculty had a clear sense of pride and focused purpose in teaching (Baltimore, 1991; Barry & Barry, 1992; Callan, 1997; Community Colleges, 1990; Fugate & Amey, 2000; Richardson 1993). The drawbacks to this focus on teaching, according to the ACC faculty interviewed, included the potential for teacher burnout and a heavy load of grading that often seems like burdensome grunt work, as was also depicted in Fugate and Amey (2000), Kinney (1976), and Seidman (1985). There was also the perception that community college faculty as disciplinary generalists teach breadth, while university faculty as disciplinary specialists teach depth. This was portrayed as a division of labor, professional niche, or specialization in academia with which the faculty seemed largely content. They further commented that this distinction results in the opportunity for students to attend and for faculty to work at the particular type of institution to which they are best suited and consequently where they are more likely to meet with greater success. This confirms the contention of Leslie (2002), who stressed the importance of matching a person's interests and abilities to the right academic environment.

The study participants from AU also provided a clear image of their self-perception of professional role, much of which by comparison to the literature seems characteristic of university faculty. They described the pleasure they took in helping students with their intellectual growth and in exploring possible future plans, though it was conceded that community colleges typically offer a particular focus on individual students through advising and small classes. The AU faculty interviewed also appreciated the freedom and autonomy they enjoy in selecting and shaping the courses they teach and in arranging their own work schedules and daily activities; as Kinney (1976) indicated, they clearly have relatively more time for thought and reflection. The university faculty also spoke about their campus and community service but again admitted that the expectations of them in this regard are not as high as those for community college faculty. They contended that at the university they concentrate on students' higher order thinking, while at the community college they

felt the focus is on more basic skills, in line with the discussion in Barry and Barry (1992) of the university faculty perception that they hold higher academic standards and expectations. The AU faculty agreed with the faculty from ACC that university teaching is deep and narrow (or specialized), while community college teaching is broad and shallow (or generalized). They stated that this difference is due at least in part to their research requirement as university faculty and its resultant focused expertise.

The most distinguishing component of the university faculty self-perception of professional role was their uniform emphasis on the demanding expectation placed on them for research. They described this demand as especially challenging because of the need to be self-disciplined enough to ensure that they're getting it done; it appears that their schedule freedom can be a double-edged sword. Because of the research expectation, there is the consequent necessity of staying absolutely up-to-date on the latest research in their area. These demands are similarly emphasized in previous research on self-perception of faculty professional roles (Community Colleges, 1990; Leslie, 2002; Richardson, 1993). The AU faculty felt that their research, beyond the value for its own sake, informed their teaching but also that their teaching provided a useful proving ground for the value of their research. They described integrating research and teaching in ways that improved both. This is another intriguing result of this study: it would be interesting to further explore this perception of faculty research informing teaching and teaching as a filter for research.

Both community college and university faculty felt pressure or experienced stress as a result of multiple demands of their professional roles, although interestingly the mix of those demands was not the same. Research is the focus of much of the expectations as well as the rewards of the work of the AU faculty, to which is added teaching and involvement in the community of their academic discipline. Teaching is by far the bulk of the job for ACC faculty, to which is added involvement in college governance and the local community. This is consistent with

the suggestions of Austin (1994) and Baltimore (1991) that university faculty derived professional identity more from their disciplinary affiliation and research orientation, whereas community college faculty derived professional identity more from their particular institution and teaching orientation. Both faculties though acknowledged the value and place of both teaching and research. Both teaching and research expand the knowledge base of an academic field; the latter pushes the frontier of what we know, while the former interprets and disseminates that new knowledge. Faculty from both ACC and AU supported the attractiveness of the inclusive notion of “scholarship,” including research (both basic and applied), teaching (interpretation, dissemination, and promotion of understanding and appreciation), and study (student learning). This ties together into a more intuitively logical and elegant continuum the activity of researchers, teachers, and students; indeed this broader concept of scholarship more accurately reflects the reality of many academics who find themselves simultaneously in all three of those roles (see also Fugate & Amey, 2000; Seidman, 1985). Ernest Boyer and others have previously explored this productive definition of scholarship that includes the discovery of knowledge, the integration of knowledge, the application of knowledge, and the transmission of knowledge (Boyer, 1990).

The faculty interviewed from ACC described several cross-perceptions, how they saw the professional role of university faculty. They believed the undergraduate experience at the university is often one of large, impersonal classes in which the teaching tends to follow, rather than innovative or alternative formats, a traditional lecture format portrayed as actually more like “telling” than teaching. The ACC faculty stated their belief that on average, the AU students were better writers, read more, and were more self-motivated. In fact, this was depicted as “preaching to the choir:” teaching that was significantly easier than their own because the university faculty were dealing with students who for the most part already possessed foundational skills and knowledge and, in the case of upper division courses, were majors already interested in the subject area. Among the most striking and consistent

cross-perceptions the community college faculty held was that at the university, faculty are compelled to devote more attention to their research than to their teaching. The ACC faculty contended that university faculty were primarily evaluated, tenured, and promoted based on the quantity and quality of their research, the often inferior quality of their teaching notwithstanding. They said that less able teachers were not likely to survive at the community college but might well survive, if they were good researchers, at the university. Research was portrayed as the primary product of university faculty. Many of these contentions of the ACC faculty were based on their experiences in graduate school at universities (see also Barry & Barry, 1992; Fugate & Amey, 2000; Kinney, 1976).

In comparing the community college faculty cross-perceptions of the university faculty to the university faculty self-perceptions, both ACC and AU faculty said that, on average, university students tended to be stronger academically. Interviewees from both institutions agreed on the importance of research at the university. However, ACC faculty claim that research detracts from teaching at the university, whereas AU faculty claim that their research informs and enriches their teaching, allowing them to teach more specialized courses with more depth and with examples from very current research in the field. These are dramatically contrasting views of faculty research.

The AU faculty interviewed revealed their cross-perceptions, how they viewed the professional role of community college faculty. They believed that at the community college students tend to get more individualized attention, both inside and outside the classroom; in fact AU faculty even contended that because of its co-location with ACC, AU was pressured to maintain a more student-friendly atmosphere. The AU faculty uniformly believed that ACC faculty carry heavier teaching loads and that community college faculty professional role is largely defined by teaching. In fact, they speculated that such a heavy focus on teaching might be problematic and potentially lead to burnout, perhaps especially because it can be such a challenge to repeatedly teach the basic or even developmental skills

that many community college faculty must (see also Fugate & Amey, 2000; Seidman, 1985; Steinberg, 1999). The AU faculty said they did not see research as an appreciable part of the job for ACC faculty but that college and community service as well as undergraduate student advising were more important or prominent at the community college. Some of the AU faculty interviewed said it was easier for a member of the university faculty to subsequently secure a faculty position at the community college than for the reverse career shift. This exclusively one-directional option for a shift in career would seem to significantly reinforce an academic hierarchy, which the AU faculty acknowledged exists as a pervasive perception if not a reality and that has been discussed in the literature (Barry & Barry, 1992; Kinney, 1976; Seidman, 1985; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000). However, every one of the AU study participants spoke about their respect for and appreciation of the ACC faculty and the mission of the community college. The mission of the community college they usually depicted, though, was one involving developmental, professional/technical, and continuing education programs rather than the transfer programs – the first two years of traditional higher education programs. The question remains whether this is an inadvertent omission or an attempt to exert university ownership of the liberal arts curriculum. If the latter is the case, this becomes a very important and potentially very contentious issue as roughly half the students at ACC are in transfer programs. For inter-institutional relations between community colleges and universities located close together, the first two years of the liberal arts curriculum are often an area of competition and overlap in mission that needs to be resolved.

In comparing the university faculty cross-perceptions of the community college faculty to the community college faculty self-perceptions, both faculties agreed that community colleges typically provide for more individualized attention to students; this conjures Seidman's (1985) caution, though, of excessive concern for student-centeredness leading to a blurring of the line between instructor and counselor. Both AU and ACC faculty saw the heavy teaching load characteristic of community college faculty as paradoxically both a meritorious attribute and a

potential source of burnout. This was analogous to the paradox among the university faculty where research was described as both an attractive and valued part of the job on the one hand and a source of stress on the other. The AU faculty expressed the belief that community college faculty are not compelled to do research as part of their professional role, but the ACC faculty alluded to their efforts to at least “stay current” through involvement in the communities of their academic disciplines. Indeed, it appeared that the ACC faculty don’t see conducting research as necessarily improving one’s teaching.

Repeated comments were made by AU and ACC faculty, both in describing self- and cross-perceptions, about the division of labor represented by how the two have specialized in their professional roles. While there were certainly areas of overlap in what they do, characteristic distinctions emerged in the relative proportion of effort and reward given to teaching, research, college service, involvement with the local community, and engagement within the community of the academic discipline. These distinctions are also reflected in the comments made about differences in the mission of the community college and the university. In some contexts, it is more productive to bridge these distinctions with the inclusive notion of scholarship, as discussed above. For example, when engaging in articulation efforts or looking for the common ground from which to launch collaborative efforts, it is helpful to consider that both community college and university faculty, as well as their students, are engaged in scholarship. In other contexts, it is more useful to sharpen rather than blur the distinctions between the community college and the university missions. For example, when engaging in the advocacy for different types of student options for higher education in the same region, or particularly in the instance of a co-located community college and university branch campus, it is necessary to minimize counterproductive competition or redundancy. The context, obviously then, determines whether the emphasis is best placed on commonalities across different types of institutions of higher education or on a sort of institutional pluralism that embraces differentiation.

The third research question of this study asked how community college and university faculty say their own professional role is perceived by the other. The ACC faculty spoke often about dramatically formative experiences in graduate school at universities in regard to how community college faculty work is perceived. As graduate students considering career options, they were strongly discouraged from the community college. If they expressed an interest in that direction, their graduate school advisors or committee members were said to be greatly disappointed: there was the belief that they were “wasting” themselves as well as lowering the reputation of the graduate school. Comments from their graduate faculty advisors included that if they were to go to the community college, there would be no going back: they would be “branded,” “stuck,” or labeled with a “scarlet letter” or “stereotypical stigma.” Kinney (1976) referred to this pressure on graduate students as attempts to prevent them from straying from “the sacred calling,” becoming university researchers (p. 36). Fugate and Amey (2000) suggested that community college teaching as a career option is at best ignored in graduate school and at worst it is stereotyped negatively. The belief the ACC faculty expressed about this scarlet letter was at least in part confirmed by the cross-perceptions of the AU faculty who conceded the great difficulty individuals face when trying to secure a university faculty position with a background in community college work. However, the AU faculty implied this was due primarily to the lack of research activity with most faculty applicants attempting to move from the community college to the university, rather than any broader stigma.

The study participants interviewed from ACC said they thought they were seen by the AU faculty as practitioners involved in the “grunt work” of heavy teaching, grading, and advising. They believed their community college was viewed as an extension of high school and not really part of “higher education.” The ACC faculty felt they were perceived as at the “bottom of the academic hierarchy, pecking order, totem pole, or the bottom of the barrel” and that university faculty don’t respect them as colleagues but “look down their noses” at them as simply “worker

bees” (see also Barry & Barry, 1992; Kinney, 1976; Seidman, 1985; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000). These suspicions, however, were not confirmed by the interviews of the AU faculty in this study who, while acknowledging the existence of this perceived hierarchy, professed to respect and even admire the work ACC faculty do and to appreciate and value the mission of the community college. Assuming the university faculty were being candid in stating their respect for the community college faculty, where does this perceived hierarchy then come from? While ACC faculty appeared to have grounds based on their experiences in graduate school for the belief that they are seen in a lower light, at least part of the reason for the pervasiveness of their fears as to how they are perceived may be due to insecurity or a collective inferiority complex. A fascinating finding of this study is that this perceived academic hierarchy seems largely self-imposed. Seidman (1985) discussed this “nagging, pervasive” sense of inferiority despite the value and significance of what community college faculty do, despite local pride and support, and despite salaries often comparable to the university (p.11). It also appeared that these beliefs about how they are perceived by the university faculty did not strongly affect the confident self-perception ACC faculty have of themselves as master teachers, similar to the findings of Townsend and LaPaglia (2000). Perhaps an implication of this study is the need for community college faculty to develop the confidence that excellence in teaching truly is a scholarly activity and that their professional pathway is parallel to, not lower than, that of the university faculty.

The faculty at AU also spoke about what they believed to be the cross-perceptions ACC faculty may hold about them. They suggested that there is the perception that they “have life easy” or are “not really working” because of the light teaching load at the university relative to the community college where faculty probably feel they are working harder. The AU faculty contended that this is a misperception due to their research requirement not being as visible. They said their work relative to the work of the ACC faculty was not different in terms of degree of effort but different in terms of the nature of the work, their own involving a

significant research expectation. Reviewing the cross-perceptions of the ACC faculty about the AU faculty, it appeared they did indeed think in some ways the university faculty have life easier, though for a different reason than their lighter teaching load. The ACC faculty, though they may not have fully understood the extent of the research and publication expectations, did acknowledge the research AU faculty did. But, the ACC faculty argued that the teaching expectations of the AU faculty, such as they were, were made even lighter or more pleasant by the fact that university students, especially in upper division courses, were more motivated to learn and had stronger foundational knowledge and skills. This was alluded to as “preaching to the choir.” Some of the AU faculty also talked about what they characterized as “resentment” on the part of some of the ACC faculty about the establishment of the university branch campus. These feelings were not confirmed by comments from any of the ACC faculty interviewed about cross-perceptions of AU or its faculty. Faculty from both institutions should be encouraged by the often apparent groundlessness of fears about negative cross-perceptions of them. This study suggests that such anxiety could well be dispelled by improved inter-institutional faculty collaboration.

Both ACC faculty and AU faculty felt they were more qualified than the other to make a comparison between the types of work in which faculty at either institution engage. ACC faculty felt they were in a better position to make such characterizations because they had spent time at both types of institutions: at the university during their own education and often as teaching assistants in graduate school followed by employment at the community college. AU faculty claimed a more informed perspective because while both types of faculty taught, they alone engaged in research and could therefore better draw contrasts. Even though ACC and AU are co-located, this study found their faculties to be still largely isolated from one another, at least in part due to these disparate aspects of their past work experience and present job expectations.

The institutional pluralism in higher education described above, illustrated by the presence of both two-year and four-year colleges or universities in the same

region, has at least two important consequences. One is that this differentiation provides opportunities for students and faculty to find the institution in which to study or work that best matches their needs or abilities. One of the study participants in this research referred to this as discovering one's proper "niche" in higher education, the place at which one can be most satisfied and productive. Another implication of this diversity in types of institutions of higher education, often in close proximity to one another, is that to survive and thrive, particularly in challenging fiscal situations, colleges or universities may need to move from counterproductive competition to the types of cooperation that leverage the strengths of each other. Study participants from both the university and the community college in this research suggested that differences in institutional missions and faculty professional roles should be acknowledged, celebrated, and built upon, rather than be grounds for insecurity, resentment, or elitism. They did not, however, agree entirely on what those distinctions are.

In the results section of this study are comments from faculty participants about the potential benefits of community college and university faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation. Such measures are desirable and necessary in order to promote the interests of students and of higher education generally. Example benefits the faculty mentioned included improving access to higher education, decreasing costs, and increasing program flexibility in ways that accommodate students with complicated and busy lives. Interviewees in this research suggested that community colleges and universities should stick with their distinct missions, but should "forge relationships" in order to "serve a much wider spectrum of our population." The promotion of seamlessness between the community college and the university not only makes student pathways clearer but also results in benefits to both institutions. The university stands to gain a ready supply of transferring students already past some of the issues associated with the transition to higher education. The community college can leverage its partnership with the university to attract and retain more students.

Also in the results of this study are comments from faculty participants about the barriers to faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation. While faculty disciplinary identification is natural, there were comments made about the attractiveness and value of interdisciplinary communication and committees. Sometimes strong notions of the "ownership" of either courses by an individual faculty member or programs by an institution were cited as a barrier. Also cited were myriad small logistical issues of getting different systems to mesh and the problem of program bottlenecks in the flow of students from one institution to the other. More than one of the faculty described the problem of two-year colleges being accountable for the percent of graduates with two-year degrees while the four-year colleges seeking to recruit those students do not have much of a reason to care about those two-year degrees. Faculty also depicted often obstructionist or territorial college administrators and the need for them to be better informed as to the faculty and student realities "on the ground," including numerous detailed logistical and financial challenges.

Faculty participants in this research made both general and specific suggestions about how to overcome many of the barriers to faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation. There was a frequent call for more and better opportunities for formal and especially informal channels of communication. More meaningful and productive program articulation was repeatedly called for: faculty claimed this was much better if done from the outset at the initial program planning stage rather than part way through the process or after the fact when articulation takes on the awkward and difficult nature of a retrofit. Specific suggestions to learn from each other included co-teaching opportunities for community college and university faculty, faculty teaching exchanges between the two types of institutions, and other "cross-training" opportunities. Such mechanisms would go a long way toward promoting better understanding of each other's professional roles as faculty and each other's students, and could render the transition that many of those students will make between the community college and the university smoother and more

seamless. Particularly valuable in instances of co-location such as ACC and AU is the creation of a single, integrated joint campus culture.

Finally, the advantages and disadvantages of community college and university branch campus co-location or merger were also described by study participants. On balance, though there are challenges, it appears to be an effective arrangement, offering both benefits of institutional pluralism as well as numerous efficiencies and the possibility of greater seamlessness for students. This research will help inform the decision-making process in regard to the future of the relationship between ACC and AU as well as other inter-institutional relationships between the community college and the university. In particular, this study suggests that community college and university faculty are prepared to embrace their common involvement in scholarship. There are distinctions in their professional roles, but these constitute alternate paths that can intersect in complementary ways rather than necessarily resulting in an isolating academic hierarchy.

As this particular research was a qualitative ethnographic case study, by definition it had certain limitations. Future research could address these limitations and expand upon this study. The qualitative methodology employed provided for the exploration of issues and the emergence of deep, rich themes that are plausible, authentic, credible, and relevant (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). It would be productive to follow up with a quantitative approach where the focus is on reliability and validity in order to verify results and to provide the analysis that might reveal more specifics as to faculty perceptions about professional roles and the consequences of them for collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation. For example, now that some of the general issues and perceptions have been identified, a survey of community college and university faculty would reveal more specific information. The ethnographic focus in this study on one culture-sharing group, college faculty, could be followed now with an examination of perceptions among students, administrators, staff, or others about the community college versus the university. Such a broader view would provide a better perspective of perceptions and cross-

perceptions among the two types of institutions as well as more informed suggestions for improved inter-institutional cooperation. This case study of one community college and one co-located university branch campus supplied the focus needed for this research, but subsequent research into similar faculty perceptions might employ a broader technique involving sampling from a number of institutions. It is noteworthy that even at the institutions in this case study, ACC and AU, where the university is a small branch campus, many of the archetypal perceptions of community college and university faculty roles emerged. The pervasive perception of an academic hierarchy is fascinating and has important consequences; further exploration of its origin and extent throughout all “levels” of education is called for. The effectiveness of faculty hiring processes in appropriately matching a candidate’s ability and interest with the position’s requirements and institution’s mission is also a fertile area for further research. Finally, a report on the implementation of the recommendations contained in this study for the promotion of collaboration and cooperation could describe whether a better understanding of faculty perceptions about professional role did indeed have the benefits proposed.

In summary, the major findings of this study include:

- The community college faculty perceive their own professional role as teaching experts and disciplinary generalists who devote much individualized attention to their students and make efforts to stay current in their fields.
- The community college faculty perceive the university faculty as compelled to be more often devoted to research than teaching and as having it somewhat easier with a lighter teaching load and in teaching more able and motivated students.
- The community college faculty believe they are perceived by the university faculty as at the bottom of higher education in the academic hierarchy, a belief with its origin in their experiences in graduate school but which may be perpetuated by their own insecurity as to their image.

- The university faculty perceive their own professional role as subject area specialists and combinations of teacher and researcher, the two being complementary rather than in conflict.
- The university faculty perceive the community college faculty as burdened by a heavy teaching load primarily in the areas of developmental, professional/technical, and continuing education and, without a background in research, at a disadvantage in attempts to make a career shift from the community college to the university.
- The university faculty believe they are perceived by the community college faculty as having it easier with a lighter teaching load, though they claim that the expectations placed upon them for research and publication are not well understood by others.
- Rather than a simple dichotomy of teaching versus research, a broader concept of “scholarship” more accurately and comprehensively reflects the work that faculty and students do while engaged increasingly today in lifelong learning.
- The institutional pluralism resulting from the presence of both the community college and the university provides options for students and faculty seeking a match for their interests and abilities and also provides opportunities for productive inter-institutional cooperation.
- The study participants suggested that benefits of better community college and university faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation include improving access to higher education, decreasing costs, and increasing program flexibility to accommodate student needs.
- The study participants suggested mechanisms to improve faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation including more and better formal and informal channels of communication, program articulation earlier in the program development process, and faculty co-teaching and exchange opportunities.

In summary, the major recommendations of this study for future research include:

- A quantitative survey of a larger sample of community college and university faculty about self- and cross-perceptions of professional roles and the consequences of those perceptions for collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation.
- Examination of comparative perceptions among students, administrators, staff, or others outside of faculty about the community college versus the university.
- Further exploration of the origin and extent of the pervasive perception of an academic hierarchy.
- Investigation into the effectiveness of faculty hiring processes in selecting employees matching the position at community colleges and universities.
- Measurement of the effectiveness of implementing the suggestions made by participants in this study for improving community college and university faculty collaboration and inter-institutional cooperation.

The purpose of this research, to explore the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about similarities and differences in their professional roles, was accomplished through the qualitative ethnographic case study employed. The significance of this research is clear first in extending the literature in regard to the interface of the community college and the university, second in providing for potential improvements in higher education policy and practice, and third in its application to my own professional work history and career interests. In addition to the importance of its findings, this study has given rise to several provocative directions for future research.

Bibliography

- Austin, A. E. (1994). Understanding and assessing faculty cultures and climates. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 84, 47-63.
- Baltimore, L. O. (1991). *Faculty stress: A study of the satisfaction and dissatisfaction in four types of higher education institutions*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California – Los Angeles.
- Barry, R. J., & Barry, P. A. (1992). Establishing equality in the articulation process. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 78, 35-44.
- Behm, R. J. (1983). *Community college – University cooperation and its benefits*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 484).
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Callan, P. M. (1997). Stewards of opportunity: America's public community colleges. *Daedalus*, 126 (4), 95-112.
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Community Colleges: A sector with a clear purpose. (1990). *Change*, 22 (3), 23+. Retrieved September 16, 2003, from EBSCOhost database (Academic Search Premier).
- Cooper, J. (1991). *A case study of institutional divorce: The separation of a community college from a university*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 300).
- Corbin, S. K. T. (1998). *Role perception and job satisfaction of community college faculty*. Doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fincher, M. (2002). Private university and community college strategic alliances: The case for cooperation. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 349-361.
- Fugate, A. L., & Amey, M. J. (2000). Career stages of community college faculty: A qualitative analysis of their career paths, roles, and development. *Community College Review*, 28 (1), 22+. Retrieved October 26, 2003, from EBSCOhost database (Academic Search Elite).
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (1994). Evolution of junior colleges into community colleges. In G. A. Baker III (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America* (pp. 17-27). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnographic and qualitative design in educational research*. San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Ignash, J. (1992). *In the shadow of baccalaureate institutions* (Report No. EDO-JC-92-02). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 129).
- Kinney, J. (1976, November). Community colleges and universities: What can they offer each other? *ADE Bulletin*, 51, 34-37.
- Kintzer, F. C., Martorana, S. V., Sullins, W. R., & Wattenbarger, J. L. (1985-86). How can community colleges improve relations with four-year colleges and universities? *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*, 56 (3), 40-44.
- Koltai, L. (1981). Cooperation – Key for the 1980s. In T.M. Stauffer (Ed.), *Competition and Cooperation in American Higher Education* (pp. 96-99). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Leslie, D. W. (2002). Resolving the dispute: Teaching is academe's core value. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (1), 49-73.

- Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (1993). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Oregon State University Institutional Review Board human research handbook* (2002). Corvallis, OR: Institutional Review Board.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Prather, J. E., & Carlson, C. E. (1993). *When four-year and community colleges collide: Studies in planning for enrollment maximization*. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 812).
- Prather, J. E., & Carlson, C. E. (1994). When four-year and community colleges cooperate: Studies in planning for enrollment maximization. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 1, 129-42.
- Richardson, R. C. (1993). Faculty in the transfer and articulation process: Silent partners or missing link? *Community College Review*, 21 (1), 41+. Retrieved October 6, 2003, from EBSCOhost database (Academic Search Premier).
- Rifkin, T. (2000). *Improving articulation policy to increase transfer* (Report No. CC-00-5). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Center for Community College Policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 439 770).
- Seidman, E. (1985). *In the words of the faculty: Perspectives on improving teaching and educational quality in community colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Steinberg, S. K. (1999). [Review of the book *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*]. *Community College Review*, 27 (2), 106+. Retrieved October 7, 2003, from Findarticles.com.
- Townsend, B. K., & LaPaglia, N. (2000). Are we marginalized within academe? Perceptions of two-year college faculty. *Community College Review*, 28 (1), 41+. Retrieved October 7, 2003, from http://www.findarticles.com/cf_0/PI/index.jhtml.
- Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, Ontario: State University of New York Press.
- Witt, A. A., Wattenbarger, J. L., Gollattscheck, J. F., & Suppiger, J. E. (1994). *America's community colleges: The first century*. Washington DC: The Community College Press.
- Wolfson, G. K. (1994). *The seamless flow*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 120).

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed Consent Document

Project Title: **Community College and University Faculty: A Comparison of Perceptions about Professional Role**
Principal Investigator: **Dr. Betty Duvall, School of Education**
Research Staff: **Nathan Hovekamp, OSU Doctoral Student**

PURPOSE

This is a research study. The purpose of this research study is to explore the perceptions that community college and university faculty have about similarities and differences in their professional roles. The study is expected to reveal themes which will inform and enhance collaboration between community college and university faculty, facilitate inter-institutional cooperation, and provide a more seamless transition for students transferring between the two types of institutions. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether to be in the study or not. Please read the form carefully. You may ask any questions about the research, what you will be asked to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this form that is not clear. When all of your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in this study or not. This process is called “informed consent”. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

We are inviting you to participate in this research study because you are a faculty member at a community college or university and can provide the kind of information needed for this project. It is tentatively anticipated that this study will include four to five participants selected from the community college faculty and four to five selected from the university faculty, for a total of eight to ten participants.

PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate, your involvement will consist of a one to two hour, face-to-face, audio-recorded interview followed within one or two months by a ten to fifteen minute, non-recorded in-person contact or telephone conversation, or a brief written note or email to follow up on, clarify, and confirm points made during the interview.

The following procedures are involved in this study. During the interview, the researcher, Nathan Hovekamp, will ask you questions closely related to and aimed at answering four research questions:

1. How do community college and university faculty perceive their own professional roles, particularly relative to each other's?
2. How do community college and university faculty perceive each other's professional roles, particularly relative to their own?
3. How do community college and university faculty say their own professional roles are perceived by the other?
4. What do community college and university faculty see as barriers to inter-institutional cooperation, and what measures do they suggest might enhance

collaboration between the two faculties or cooperation between the two institutions?

Interview questions will be followed by probes asking for clarification, expansion, or examples.

RISKS

Risks to you for participating in this study are minimal, as pseudonyms will be used to ensure that both your identity and that of the institution for which you work remain anonymous.

BENEFITS

The potential personal benefits that may occur as a result of your participation in this study and upon the results being made available to you include a more informed understanding of how your professional role is viewed by other faculty and suggestions for enhanced collaboration with academic colleagues. The researcher anticipates that society may benefit from this study by improved inter-institutional cooperation that in turn will have positive effects for programs and students that span across community colleges and universities.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs for participating in this research project. You will not be compensated for participating in this research project.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Records of participation in this research project will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. However, federal government regulatory agencies and the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies involving human subjects) may inspect and copy records pertaining to this research. It is possible that these records could contain information that personally identifies you. Pseudonyms will be used to ensure that both your identity and that of the institution for which you work remain anonymous, and all data collected will be stored in a secure location to which only the researcher, Nathan Hovekamp, will have access. In the event of any report or publication from this study, your identity will not be disclosed. Results will be reported in a summarized manner in such a way that you cannot be identified.

AUDIO RECORDING

By initialing in the space provided, you verify that you have been told that audio recordings will be generated during the course of this study. Interviews will be recorded to assist the researcher in the accuracy and completeness of data collection. If participants are referred to directly during the recording, it will be by pseudonym only. Audio recordings will be accessed only by the researcher, will be stored in a secure location, may be transcribed either by the researcher or a paid transcriptionist, and will

be erased or destroyed when the research is completed.

_____ Participant's initials

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Taking part in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you agree to participate in this study, you may stop participating at any time. During the interview, you are free to skip any question that you would prefer not to answer. If you decide not to take part, or if you stop participating at any time, your decision will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled. If you decide to withdraw, some data collected prior to your withdrawal may be included along with data from other participants in the study results.

QUESTIONS

Questions are encouraged. If you have any questions about this research project, please contact: Dr. Betty Duvall, duvallb@orst.edu or Nathan Hovekamp, (541) 383-7556, nhovekamp@yahoo.com. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Human Protections Administrator, at (541) 737-3437 or by e-mail at IRB@oregonstate.edu.

Your signature indicates that this research study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. You will receive a copy of this form.

Participant's Name (printed):

(Signature of Participant)

(Date)

RESEARCHER STATEMENT

I have discussed the above points with the participant or, where appropriate, with the participant's legally authorized representative, using a translator when necessary. It is my opinion that the participant understands the risks, benefits, and procedures involved with participation in this research study.

(Signature of Researcher)

(Date)

Appendix B: Interview Protocol – Community College Faculty

- I. Date:
Time:
Location:
Name and position of interviewee:
Contact numbers for interviewee:

- II. Informed Consent

- III. Begin Audio-Recording

- IV. Questions:
 1. What is your favorite aspect or part of your work?
 2. What is your least favorite aspect or part of your work?
 3. Have you had experience working for a university?
 4. Have you had experience working with university faculty?
 5. How would you characterize the nature of your job or professional role (what you do; the components of your work), particularly relative to that of a university faculty member?
 6. How would you characterize the nature of the job or professional role of a university faculty member, particularly relative to your own?
 7. What do you believe to be the perceptions of university faculty about your professional role?
 8. What measures would you suggest might reduce barriers to or enhance collaboration between community college and university faculty or cooperation between the two institutions?
 9. Anything else you'd like to add?

[Follow-ups for clarification, elaboration, justification, or examples]

- V. Thank you
 - will provide a copy of the informed consent document
 - will be in touch for a brief follow-up
 - others I might talk to?

Appendix C: Interview Protocol – University Faculty

- I. Date:
Time:
Location:
Name and position of interviewee:
Contact numbers for interviewee:
- II. Informed Consent
- III. Begin Audio-Recording
- IV. Questions:
 1. What is your favorite aspect or part of your work?
 2. What is your least favorite aspect or part of your work?
 3. Have you had experience working for a community college?
 4. Have you had experience working with community college faculty?
 5. How would you characterize the nature of your job or professional role (what you do; the components of your work), particularly relative to that of a community college faculty member?
 6. How would you characterize the nature of the job or professional role of a community college faculty member, particularly relative to your own?
 7. What do you believe to be the perceptions of community college faculty about your professional role?
 8. What measures would you suggest might reduce barriers to or enhance collaboration between university and community college faculty or cooperation between the two institutions?
 9. Anything else you'd like to add?

[Follow-ups for clarification, elaboration, justification, or examples]
- V. Thank you
 - will provide a copy of the informed consent document
 - will be in touch for a brief follow-up
 - others I might talk to?