

From the Co-Editors: On the Scholarship of Academic Advising

When Ernest L. Boyer published *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* in 1990, he noted the “renewed attention being paid to undergraduate education” in general and “. . . concerns about the priority assigned to teaching” in particular (p. xi). He stated in his Preface “. . . that, on far too many campuses, teaching is not well rewarded, and faculty who spend too much time counseling and advising students may diminish their prospects for tenure and promotion.” He developed his thesis for this book by stating “. . . the most important obligation now confronting the nation’s colleges and universities is to break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar. It’s time to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of functions higher education must perform” (p. xii). Boyer crystallized his point by proposing “four general views of scholarship—discovery, integration, application, and teaching” (p. xii) to keep American higher education vital.

Boyer reviewed the history of missions that have permeated higher education over time. In colonial days, the mission was on teaching for the “intellectual and moral development of undergraduate [sic] students.” Throughout the late 19th century, professional service and applied research that would improve agriculture and manufacturing was the mission focus of higher education. In the 20th century, research and graduate education became the model for the modern university, in which faith in authority gave way to “reliance on scientific rationality.” A subsequent change came with the GI Bill of Rights in 1944: “Higher education, once viewed as a privilege, was now accepted as a right” (p. 1). In post–World War II America, higher education became a goal for the masses, not just the elite. When society’s expectation changed about who should go to college, the practical mission shifted from teaching students to the professoriate, from general to specialized education, and from loyalty to the campus and its students to loyalty to the profession—with its concomitant emphasis on scientific research.

In his concluding sentence to Chapter 1, Boyer stated, “We proceed with the conviction that if the nation’s higher learning institutions are to meet today’s urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered” (p. 13).

In Boyer’s view, the traditional professorial mandates of teaching, research, and service were no longer adequate for making judgments about professional performance.

To tap the diversity of faculty talent, Boyer urged a new conceptualization of scholarship in which a fuller range of scholarly activities would be considered and that would move beyond the “teaching versus research” dichotomization. In this new conceptualization, scholars would not only engage in what has traditionally been considered “original research,” but they would also look for connections with other areas of inquiry, build bridges between theory and practice, and communicate their knowledge to students. Thus, “. . . the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are the scholarship of *discovery*; the scholarship of *integration*; the scholarship of *application*; and the scholarship of *teaching*” (p. 16).

The *scholarship of discovery* is characterized by scientific research and the advancement of knowledge for its own sake. Through it, researchers have the freedom to follow an investigation wherever it may lead.

The *scholarship of integration* is characterized by “. . . making connections across the disciplines placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, and [sic] often educating nonspecialists . . .” (p. 18). In integrating knowledge, the scholar “. . . seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research” (p. 19).

The *scholarship of application* is characterized by engagement and application of knowledge to consequential problems, the connection of theory to practice in a dynamic interaction, and the performance of service activities tied directly to a professional field.

The *scholarship of teaching* is characterized by “. . . bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning” (p. 23). Teachers must “. . . stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over” (p. 24). Scholar-teachers engage in reflective practice as they constantly assess their content and pedagogical processes.

Being a scholar in the context of Boyer’s new (1990) definition means recognizing that “. . . knowledge is acquired through research and dis-

covery, synthesis and integration, practice and application, and teaching” (p. 24). As *NACADA Journal* Editors, we contend that academic advising shares this definition of scholarship with the professoriate. In this sense, we think it appropriate to equate “advising” with “teaching” throughout Boyer’s treatise.

Because these four scholarship functions are tied inseparably to each other and form an interdependent whole, are they applicable to the *NACADA Journal*? We think so because some research articles published in the *NACADA Journal* reflect the scholarship of discovery; that is, the authors identify new theories and describe new knowledge about academic advising. Other articles (e.g., Crookston and O’Banion in Volume 14[2], Pascarella and Terenzini in Volume 15[2]) as well as book reviews in every issue are prime examples of the scholarship of integration. These authors have taken theories and ideas from other fields and applied them to the field of academic advising. Articles, in which scholars describe how advising practice at their campuses might be applicable at other institutions, are cogent examples of the scholarship of application. Finally, the emphasis on assessment of academic advising and reflective advising practice are credible examples of how the *NACADA Journal* encourages the scholarship of teaching/advising.

The *NACADA Journal* reflects the robustness of the scholarships of discovery, integration, application, and teaching/advising described in Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*.

References

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton University Press.
- Crookston, B. B. (1994). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 5–9.
- O’Banion, T. (1994). An academic advising model. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 10–16.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1995). The impact of college on students: Myths, rational myths, and some other things that may not be true. *NACADA Journal*, 15(2), 26–33.

Terry Kuhn
Gary Padak

Correction Notice:

NACADA Journal, Volume 24 (1 & 2), Spring & Fall 2004, pages 111–22

Holland’s Theory and Implications for Academic Advising and Career Counseling

Robert Reardon, Florida State University

Emily Bullock, Florida State University

Error: page 114, column 1, lines 14–17: “This finding means that students who intuitively and accurately use RIASEC codes to classify occupations of interest have more career uncertainty or indecision.”

Correction: “This finding means that students who intuitively and accurately use RIASEC codes to classify occupations of interest have less career uncertainty or indecision.”