

from **Scholarship in Psychology: A Paradigm for the Twenty-First Century**

Diane E Halpern, Daniel W. Smothergill, Mary Allen, Suzanne Baker, Cynthia Baum, Deborah Best, Joseph Ferrari, Kurt E Geisinger, Eugene R. Gilden, Maureen Hester, Patricia Keith-Spiegel, Nicholas C. Kierniesky, Thomas V. McGovern, Wilbert J. McKeachie, William E Prokasy, Lenore T. Szuchman, Ross Vasta, and Kenneth A. Weaver
The Society for the Teaching of Psychology's Task Force on Defining Scholarship in Psychology
from December 1998 *American Psychologist* Vol. 53, No. 12, pages 1292-1297

(from page 1293) We are not proposing a single definition of scholarship that would define all academic work in psychology. Instead, we prefer a multidimensional definition. No individual faculty member can be expected to excel at every type of scholarship. More reasonably, it can be expected that faculty will expend their talents in ways that serve institutional, departmental, and personal goals.

(from page 1294) After reviewing statements on scholarship written by panels from several different academic fields, Diamond and Adams (1995) concluded that six features seem to characterize the work that most disciplines would consider "scholarship":

The activity requires a high level of discipline-specific expertise.

The activity breaks new ground, is innovative.

The activity can be replicated or elaborated.

The work and its results can be documented.

The work and its results can be peer reviewed.

The activity has significance or impact. (p. 14)

(from page 1295) **A Five-Part Definition of Scholarship in Psychology.** Thinking of scholarship as contributions to the social fabric of psychology led us to a five-part definition in which any single dimension or any of the five parts in combination can be considered scholarship.

(from page 1295) **1. Original Research.** By original research, we mean the creation of new knowledge—collection of original data, an advancement in methods of inquiry, theory generation or testing, and the dissemination of this activity in a referred scholarly journal or other outlet.

(from page 1295) **2. Integration of Knowledge.** New knowledge, represented in the category of original research, is of limited usefulness if it is not integrated into a larger body of concepts and facts. For this reason, the integration or synthesis of knowledge is as valuable and as difficult as the generation of original data.... Review articles and books, meta-analyses, and well-crafted texts that bring diverse findings together to enhance knowledge are examples of scholarship involving the integration of knowledge.

(from page 1296) **3. Application of Knowledge.** Psychology is useful. We live this message when psychologists use their knowledge in applied settings. Applications can take many forms. They include writing amicus briefs in which psychological evidence is used to assist judges in resolving difficult legal issues, developing software and other new forms of media in accord with our knowledge of how people think and learn, writing for a popular audience to help those with psychological problems, using psychological principles to establish or review community projects such as a school for learning disabled adults, and conducting site visits in which one's knowledge of a quality program guides the evaluation.

(from page 1296) **4. The Scholarship of Pedagogy.** When psychologists conduct research on ways to promote learning and evaluate the effectiveness of their applications, they are engaging in the scholarship of pedagogy.... Scholarly activities in this category include the development of learning software, textbooks, and other materials for use in or out of class, assessing variables that influence learning outcomes, supervising student research (which can include scholarly aspects of both teaching and research), and teaching via any of an assortment of methods or media using our knowledge of how to enhance learning.

(from page 1296) **5. The Scholarship of Teaching in Psychology.** Scholarship in teaching in one's subject area, like any of the other categories of scholarship, can vary in quality and in the extent to which it uses disciplinary knowledge. Teaching is scholarship when it makes an original contribution, for example, through synthesizing information in new ways or through an insight of psychological importance. Like all other forms of scholarship, it builds on an accumulated knowledge base. Teaching can be made public and thus available for peer review by assembling a teaching portfolio that might contain syllabi, student papers, tests, and statements of one's teaching philosophy and goals (Seldin, 1991). Peer visitation can also be used, with multiple visitors providing the degree of reliability that is needed for valid assessment. Team teaching also provides an opportunity to make teaching public for peer review. Quality teaching that adheres to these criteria is substantive scholarship, and as such, it needs to be honored and rewarded.

RESPONSES TO THE TASK FORCE'S REPORT

Abstract from **Scholarship in Psychology: Conversations About Change and Constancy**

Diane E Halpern and Jill Reich (May 1999 *American Psychologist* Vol. 54, No. 5, pages 347-349)

Mounting pressures on higher education led the Task Force of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology to propose changes in the way the work of faculty is defined and in the criteria used to identify scholarship (D. F. Halpern et al., 1998). Prominent psychologists representing undergraduate universities, research institutions, and professional schools of psychology contributed commentary on the proposals in the Task Force Report. Although there was disagreement concerning some of the recommendations made by the Task Force, there was general agreement on the need to reflect on the roles and rewards of psychology faculty, with special emphasis on the diversity of institutional missions and faculty needs and abilities.

Abstract from **Scholarship in Psychology: The Advantages of an Expanded Vision**

Roger L. Peterson and Steven J. Trierweiler (May 1999 *American Psychologist* Vol. 54, No. 5, pages 350-355)

The authors comment positively on "Scholarship in Psychology: A Paradigm for the Twenty-First Century" (D. F. Halpern et al., 1998) and further expand that vision of scholarship. Giving high priority to social responsibility, they criticize overly narrow scholarship, including its effects on the discipline, and examine the economics of scholarship and the criteria for evaluation. Emphasis on applied research and the integration of knowledge is encouraged, along with the application of psychology and the scholarship of pedagogy and teaching. A broader, flexible, more grounded vision of scholarship and a modification of the culture of academic psychology is required.

Abstract from **Refereeing on Different Playing Fields: Diversity in Higher Education**

Joan S. Girus (May 1999 *American Psychologist* Vol. 54, No. 5, pages 356-357)

The Society for the Teaching of Psychology's Task Force on Defining Scholarship in Psychology (D. F. Halpern et al., 1998) argues for an increased emphasis on the scholarship involved in teaching in faculty-evaluation processes. Teaching, and the scholarly work on which it depends, should certainly be an important part of the faculty-evaluation processes in all colleges and universities. However, there is great diversity in the institutional missions of colleges and universities in the United States, and different missions require different emphases. Each college and university should be urged to examine its institutional interests and goals and to translate these into the faculty evaluation processes, and the emphases within these processes, that will best serve the institution, its students, and its public.

Abstract from **Reflections on Scholarship From the Liberal Arts Academy**

David G. Myers and James E. Waller (May 1999 *American Psychologist* Vol. 54, No. 5, pages 358-361)

The authors reflect on "Scholarship in Psychology: A Paradigm for the Twenty-First Century" (D. F. Halpern, 1998) from their perspective as liberal arts college professors. They applaud various features of the report's multidimensional understanding of scholarship, suggest points of clarification and critique, and conclude with a suggestion for defining faculty priorities and rewards.

Abstract from **Recognizing Teaching as Teaching**

James H. Korn (May 1999 *American Psychologist* Vol. 54, No. 5, pages 362-363)

The task force report on scholarship in psychology (D. F. Halpern et al., 1998) defined the scholarship of teaching in terms that make it comparable to publishable research. I contend, however, that the activities of teaching can and should be distinguished from research, in order to give teaching the respect it deserves.