

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 311

HE 025 096

AUTHOR Johnsrud, Linda K.
 TITLE Implications of Cross-Cultural Training for Faculty Careers: The Case of Korean Academics. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
 PUB DATE Oct 91
 NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Boston, MA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Differences; Faculty Workload; Foreign Countries; Foreign Students; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Research; *Teacher Attitudes
 IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Korea

ABSTRACT

A study of the perceptions of Western trained Korean faculty regarding the implications of their cross-cultural training for their careers in academe was done. Personal interviews were conducted with 27 Western-trained faculty members now teaching at 3 private research universities in Seoul, Korea. Principles inherent in the naturalistic inquiry paradigm guided the interviews. Individuals were selected to provide representation across disciplinary fields, academic rank and gender. Research focused on faculty members': (1) experiences as foreign graduate students and their socialization to the professoriate; and (2) perceptions of the impact of their cross-cultural training on their academic careers. Analysis found that most had abbreviated relationships with graduate faculty and advisors from their Western graduate training, most experienced a tension between Westernized expectations which place a value on research versus the Asian institution's emphasis on teaching, and all felt a strong sense of obligation to their current institutions. Overall, the study found that scholars who train in one culture with a defined set of norms and perform in another with its own set of norms serve multiple masters. Included are 16 references. (JB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED339311

IMPLICATIONS OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING FOR FACULTY CAREERS:
THE CASE OF KOREAN ACADEMICS

LINDA K. JOHNSRUD
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda K. Johnsrud

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

A PAPER TO BE PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
BOSTON, OCTOBER 1991

TE 025 096





Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Park Plaza Hotel & Towers in Boston, Massachusetts, October 31-November 3, 1991. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

**IMPLICATIONS OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING FOR FACULTY CAREERS:
THE CASE OF KOREAN ACADEMICS**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions of Korean faculty regarding the implications of their cross-cultural training for their careers in the academy. Personal interviews were conducted with twenty-seven Western-trained faculty members at three private research universities in the Republic of Korea. Individuals were purposively selected to provide representation across disciplinary fields, academic rank and gender. The study focuses on faculty members' 1) experiences as foreign graduate students and their socialization to the professoriate, and 2) perceptions of the impact of their cross-cultural training on their academic careers.

**IMPLICATIONS OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING FOR FACULTY CAREERS:
THE CASE OF KOREAN ACADEMICS**

INTRODUCTION

Asian universities are a rich, and often uneasy, mix of Asian tradition and Western influence. Although the impact of Western influence varies greatly by nation and with the experience of colonialism, the Western academic model predominates in Asian higher education (Altbach, 1989). Western models were often considered prototypical in establishing systems of organization, governance, and curriculum in Asian universities. One major conduit for this Western influence is the training of Asian faculty in North American and European institutions.

In "The emergence of the university in Korea," Sungho Lee (1989) reports that between 1954 and 1967, 2,883 Koreans received advanced training in the West. He argues that "the leadership role played by the U.S.-trained scholars in each college or university percolated into every corner of university administration, governance, financing, and curriculum development" (p. 104). In 1983, 31% of the total doctoral holders in Korean universities had earned their doctoral degrees in North America or Europe. Despite these significant numbers and their potential influence, we know virtually nothing about the role that cross-cultural training plays in the careers of faculty in their domestic institutions. Moreover, despite current U.S. efforts to increase sensitivity to cross-cultural issues in higher education, rarely are these issues addressed in doctoral training. Beyond concern to properly orient and train foreign teaching assistants, graduate education seems to assume a universal set of scholarly norms and expectations.

The purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions of Korean faculty members regarding their cross-cultural training and its implications for their careers as university faculty members in the Republic of Korea. Specifically, the following questions are addressed:

- 1) What are the common experiences of cross-culturally trained faculty during their graduate education that influence their socialization to academic careers?
- 2) What are the common perceptions of cross-culturally trained faculty regarding the impact of their training on their academic careers?

PERSPECTIVES

This study draws its theoretical perspectives from research regarding faculty careers conducted in the United States. Researchers have just begun to acknowledge the complex factors that interact to shape academic careers (Baldwin, 1987, 1990; Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Clark & Lewis, 1985). Academic lives are the product of graduate school socialization, disciplinary norms, organizational culture and climate, as well as personal and professional factors. Moreover, academic lives are not static but rather evolutionary as faculty members enter, advance and mature in their professional roles (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981). Although the literature speaks of a Western "academic model," in actuality the Western academic profession is complex and fluid, and we are just beginning to accumulate knowledge of those dimensions that influence the direction and success of faculty careers.

One dimension, the graduate training and socialization of faculty, is critical to the academy, and is receiving increased study. Researchers are beginning to uncover relationships between the career success of faculty and factors such as the prestige of their Ph.D.-granting institution, the quality of the mentoring and sponsorship they receive, the extent to which they have collaborated, and the site of their first employment (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Finkelstein, 1984).

We know very little, however, about the experiences of those graduate students who receive their training in the United States and return home to pursue academic careers. The numbers of foreign students who earn their doctorates in the United States has steadily increased since 1977 (Chronicle of Higher Education, March 6, 1991). Altbach (1989) posits that the impact of foreign training on Asian higher education has been considerable but acknowledges that little systematic work has been done in this area. Sungho Lee (1989) specifically addresses the tension that has divided Korean universities as a result of the differences in orientation between foreign trained doctoral holders and domestic trained degree holders. His ethnographic case study of the

research attitudes and practices of six male faculty in one department of a Korean University provides an important first step in understanding the meaning faculty assign to their professional careers. He notes differences in orientation toward research and teaching and toward international publishing depending on whether the faculty are U.S. trained or domestically trained. Case studies such as this are crucial to our understanding of the academic lives of faculty due to the distinctive nature of the faculty experience within any one setting. At the same time, to begin to understand the perceptions of a nation's faculty, it is important to gather data across institutions, departments, rank and gender.

METHODS

Data Source

Faculty from three research universities in Seoul are included in the study: Yonsei University, Ewha Womans University and Dankook University. All three are private institutions offering graduate as well as undergraduate education.

Yonsei is the oldest university in Korea, founded by Protestant missionaries in 1885, and is the most prestigious of the three study sites. Yonsei enrolls 30,000 students in 74 undergraduate departments and nine graduate schools. Yonsei has a wide variety of research institutes and one of the largest medical complexes in Asia.

Ewha Womans University was established in 1886 by the first woman missionary sent by the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. Until that time women had been denied education in Korea, and Ewha stood for the "humanization of women." Forced out of Seoul in 1950, the College returned in 1953 and began to re-build. Ewha is today a fully developed, modern university offering top quality education to Korean women, and is considered a first-class university by the Ministry of Education. The enrollment is 15,500. Ewha offers bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees and has eighteen affiliated research institutes.

Dankook University is the youngest of three institutions, founded in 1947. Dankook has two campuses, one in Seoul and one in Cheonan City. Enrollment is 19,000 students in thirteen

colleges and eighty departments. Masters degrees are offered in forty-one fields and doctorates in twenty-seven. Dankook does not have the long-standing reputation of either Yonsei or Ewha but it is recognized as a fast-growing and important contributor to higher education in Korea.

The twenty-seven individual faculty members interviewed from these three universities were purposively selected to provide representation across disciplinary fields, academic rank and gender. Interviews were conducted in English during the summer of 1990. The one hour face-to-face interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview guide developed by the principal investigator. The specific dimensions explored in the interview were modified appropriately by faculty members (not subjects) from Ewha and Dankook to ensure that the dimensions studied were relevant to the academic culture and professional lives of Korean educators.

Data Analyses

The purpose of the data analysis is to generate a grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) of the role cross-cultural training plays in the process of faculty socialization. Principles inherent in the naturalistic inquiry paradigm (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) guide the interview study: the assumption of multiply-constructed realities, interaction between the inquirer and respondent, context-bound phenomena and value-bound inquiry. An inductive analytic process (Miles and Huberman, 1984) is employed to organize the data so that final conclusions can be drawn. The data analysis consists of three flows of activity: 1) data reduction, defined as the process of selecting and focusing, choosing emerging themes from the "raw data," in this case, the interview transcripts; 2) data display, an organized assembly of information to be used for conclusion-drawing; and 3) conclusion-drawing/verification, the process of deciding what things mean, noting regularities, patterns, explanations and propositions, and verifying the "confirmability" of findings.

Data description

Data were partitioned in several ways to encourage the development of a grounded theory of faculty socialization. Of the twenty-seven faculty members interviewed, nineteen (70%) had earned their doctorates in the United States, four (15%) in other institutions, primarily in Europe or Canada, and four (15%) in Korean institutions. Of the four who had domestic degrees, all had earned their master's degrees in the United States. Of the nineteen who had earned their doctorates in the U.S., all but two were taken at institutions with a Carnegie ranking of Research University I.

Of the twenty-seven interviewed, fourteen (52%) were men and thirteen (48%) were women. Fifteen (56%) were full professors, seven (26%) were associates and five (19%) were assistants. Eleven (41%) held degrees in the social sciences, eight (30%) in the natural sciences, four (15%) in the humanities and four (15%) in the professions.

The twenty-seven interviewees were selected to provide broad representation across faculty. To partition the group results in very small numbers; thus, the findings are reported for the group as a whole unless distinctions by rank, gender or discipline are striking.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analyses of the data with respect to the research questions revealed three broad themes that begin to explore the implications of cross-cultural training for these Korean faculty members. Broadly stated the themes are 1) the abbreviated nature of the relationships these faculty had with their graduate faculty and advisors, 2) the westernized expectations they developed regarding scholarship, and 3) the emphasis they place on service to their university and nation.

Abbreviated relationships with graduate faculty and advisors: The majority of these Western trained faculty reported that they did not have extended relationships with their faculty advisors or dissertation chairs. Although a number published with their advisors and a few maintained contact for many years, for the majority, the distance seemed to end the ties. Institutionally sponsored

travel was rare; thus, attendance at western-based professional association meetings that would allow relationships to be continued was often beyond the reach of these faculty members. Moreover, missing classes to attend conferences was seen as a problem by several faculty. Of those few that reported significant ties (i.e., a number of publications and long term contact), most were in the natural or applied sciences (e.g., chemistry, mathematics and engineering).

Many of the Western-trained faculty did not chose their graduate institution for the strength of its program or to work with a particular faculty member; in fact, more often, the choice was based on non-academic factors. When asked why they chose their particular graduate institution, representative responses included:

"My brother studied there."

"My father has a friend there and my sister was there at the time."

"Circumstances. I was married and my husband was there. And then my husband finished so I had to leave [one institution] and move [to another]."

"Tuition and fees were low at that time."

"I didn't have much information. . .just randomly applied."

"They offered a teaching assistantship."

Distance, lack of information, and comfort in being in geographical proximity to some family tie seem to determine the choice of graduate institution. As a result, advisors were sought out after arrival. Most of the faculty interviewed were not familiar with the term "mentor," and after they heard the term defined "as a personally close, long-term working relationship", most reported that they had not had the experience of working with a mentor. One full professor, probably in his mid-fifties, who did experience a long-term relationship with a mentor elaborated on the concept:

"I have only a few publications but most of them are with him. We worked collaboratively. I owe him a lot to what I am today. We [Koreans] have many expressions. We teach students about relationships. We appreciate the relationship; so we always treat him as a

teacher even though I don't take courses from him anymore. We can learn from his experiences. He still is my teacher as far as I'm concerned."

Of the faculty interviewed, roughly one-third had held teaching assistantships during their graduate education, one-third had held research assistantships and one-third had neither. One faculty member commented that she had received a stipend but she felt that although a stipend gives you freedom to do what you want, the disadvantage is that it doesn't tie you to a Professor. "You really have to go to the professors and say 'Look I want to be a part of your research' rather than having an advisor" with whom you are working.

Another commented: "No, I didn't do a teaching or research assistantship, I just enrolled in the program and finished it. At one time, Professor [...] asked me to TA, but I had my family and I thought with studying and all, it just took up too much time so I just concentrated on studying rather than postponing or extending the time."

After completing their graduate study abroad, none received--nor seemed to expect--any assistance in seeking jobs in Korea. Many returned to the institution at which they had earned their undergraduate degree. For example, six of the ten faculty interviewed at Ewha, and five of the ten interviewed at Yonsei, had received their undergraduate degrees from their current institution. They relied upon old ties or family connections as their means of securing teaching positions. This was referred to as "in-breeding" and although criticized, seemed to be accepted as the means to faculty jobs.

For others, however, the relative prestige of their undergraduate degree is a factor. At Dankook, only one of the faculty interviewed had received a degree from Dankook but four of the seven had received their degrees from Seoul National, the most prestigious university in Korea. Of the ten interviewed at Yonsei, five had received their undergraduate degrees from Seoul National. Another two at Ewha had Seoul National bachelor's degrees. In other words, 41% of the faculty members interviewed held undergraduate degrees from Seoul National. It seems evident that Seoul National produces a significant portion of the undergraduates who go abroad for advanced training and then return to become faculty members.

Although Seoul National was not a part of this study, one faculty member at Dankook (a Seoul National bachelor's recipient) remarked that as many as 90% of the Seoul National faculty would hold their undergraduate degree from that institution. He also commented that political factions at each university tend to form around the site of one's undergraduate training; that, for example, those with Seoul National connections were a strong force at Dankook. One implication is that these factions also perpetuate the hiring of new faculty from their alma maters.

Although these Western-trained faculty members could not count on their doctoral advisors or graduate school connections to assist them in finding faculty jobs, there is clearly a network that serves returning doctoral holders seeking faculty jobs. The difficulty of getting jobs in Korea was frequently mentioned as was the preference for faculty trained abroad who are considered to have superior training to those who graduate from domestic institutions. One faculty member commented that today "getting a faculty job is as hard as it is to get a star from heaven."

Westernized expectations regarding scholarship: The Asian tradition of emphasizing the teaching role of faculty (Sungho Lee, 1989) was a source of difficulty for most Western trained faculty. The typical teaching load at all three universities was four courses per semester, and most faculty considered the teaching load to be heavy. Overloads seemed to be the norm, course reductions seemed rare, and the time spent teaching was perceived to detract from the ability to do research. Typical comments include:

"My load requirement is nine hours a week but right now I'm teaching 21 hours per week. So you can do nothing but teach. Very frustrating. Don't have time to do anything else, but teach, teach, teach."

"I prefer to do research but I do not have time. Too many courses to teach, too many students, too much work to do."

"You know that in Korea, mostly we have the heavy teaching load. We have to teach nine hours per week, but most of the professors, it could be me, teach twelve or fifteen hours sometimes."

The time spent in teaching was seen as the primary impediment to research. Other factors, however, such as the limited library holdings and lack of graduate assistants, also contributed to the frustration. Generally, faculty perceived that the institutional support for research was less than what is necessary to support an active research agenda. There was some variation by university in this regard. Clearly, the most frustrated were junior faculty at Dankook, the youngest university. The general sentiment there seemed to be that teaching was primary and that the institution neither rewarded nor actively supported research. At Ewha and Yonsei, where there is a longer tradition of teaching and research, there seemed to be more of an institutional expectation for research although faculty still expressed frustration with the degree of support. The majority of faculty across all three universities felt that the balance of time spent in teaching and research was not what they hoped for, and their preferences were to devote more time to research. Faculty were quick to acknowledge that, compared to the West, there was little institutional pressure--or reward--to conduct research or publish.

"My institution's expectation [of me] is to give good lectures, to guide students in the right way, and to find more jobs for the students after graduation. They do not expect much research or publications [. . .] except for promotion."

"I am ashamed to say this but it [promotion] is almost automatic. It is not meritorious. It's rather seniority."

The tenure and promotion criteria emphasizes seniority, and although two publications per promotion are required, most faculty perceived this as minimal. That is, most faculty went beyond the required minimum because they were committed to conducting research and writing--a commitment they attributed to their training. Many had active research agendas and extensive lists of publications.

"...every professor wants to publish some papers or do decent research and get more funds. This is his personal duty."

"You see, I see professors as mainly researchers instead of teachers. Teaching is just a secondary thing. Professors will be respected for their research work."

"I think the main activity of the professor is research activity. It is my main duty I think."

The relative emphasis on teaching and research seems to be a source of conflict between those educated domestically and those educated abroad as well as between older and younger faculty.

"Of course, there are some faculty members who do not research; they only teach, especially the older professors. But just the young professors, they get involved in research activities. I came here eleven years ago, so, just below my generation, my age, we consider research to be more important than teaching. This is not the senior professors."

From a senior professor: "...when it [research] is emphasized too much, some people neglect teaching. Even now, some professors are more interested in writing and researching so they tend to neglect teaching."

From a junior professor: "Not much [research] is done. And not much is expected either because all the faculty are not that trained to do research."

"I think they want me to be a good researcher and then a good teacher. But if I get promoted and I get older then they will want me to change. I mean if I get older and I don't have research activities, capabilities, then they can ask me to serve for the university."

Many faculty commented on the enjoyment of teaching and the importance of teaching for their students. Although most faculty expressed a strong preference for research and, in a few cases, teaching, some commented on the reciprocity of the two activities.

"For the full professor, researching and teaching are of the same importance. If I don't do any research, I cannot be a good teacher and if I'm not a good teacher, then there's no sense being a good researcher."

Faculty often pointed to the difference between the scholarly standards in the West and those that exist in Korea. For example, faculty commented that traditionally submissions to Korean journals have not been peer reviewed, and that even those journals that have begun such a system typically have a 70 to 80% acceptance rate. As western-trained faculty, they are well aware of the scholarly norms that they were exposed to in their graduate education, and they were often anxious to clarify the realities of their situation. The heavy teaching load, the lack of resources devoted to support research and writing, and the minimal institutional expectations for research and writing are all sources of frustration for many of the faculty interviewed.

Service to the university and nation:

A strong sense of obligation and duty was frequently expressed by the faculty members interviewed. Service was not an activity discussed as distinct from teaching and research; rather service seemed to motivate many of the choices faculty made. For example, in regard to the teaching load, one faculty explained:

"I usually teach four or five units, but the obligation is only for three. If you teach a three hour course, then you fulfilled the obligation of full-time faculty so you don't have to do anymore. But usually, you have to--again it's an obligation. You don't have to meet the obligation, but the situation is such that you feel you have to--for the department."

Several faculty members noted that although there is additional compensation for teaching overloads, most do not take on extra courses for the money but do so because of a sense of responsibility to their students and their department.

For other faculty members, their acceptance of administrative assignments was prompted by their sense of responsibility to the institution. Serving as chair of the department was a matter of rotation; each faculty member took his or her turn. Typically the chair served for two years, and there was no course reduction. Faculty members were, however, frequently called upon to serve in other administrative capacities for two to three years at a time. Even when they took on the

responsibilities of deans and associate deans, they continued the bulk of their teaching load. Many did not want to carry administrative responsibilities but expressed their obligation to do so.

"Usually we do not volunteer. The president appointed the dean and the dean recommended one of the professors as an associate dean. So then that dean recommended me and then the president appointed me. The university requires someone who can do the job, so if I said "no," then they would have to find someone else."

"I really do not want to do administration but I have no choice. I feel I must take on the responsibility."

"No, no choice."

"No, I was drafted. All I wanted to do was teach."

"...in the future, if they give me an administrative job, I should accept it you know. Administration jobs in Korean universities is a kind of rotation. But, personally, I don't like that kind of thing."

"I had to do academic administration quite a long time. That was a tough job for me when I came back from the states and I wanted to study, and I wanted to teach, I had to work as an administrator. If I insisted, I think I could have avoided it, but I thought that I shouldn't, because when the university wanted me to work, I thought that I should."

Although a number of faculty had held administrative assignments, a good number had not. The criteria for selection was not clear but it seemed that if the President or other senior official decided a faculty member had administrative talent or that it was his or her turn, faculty members felt obliged to serve.

Another professional activity that was discussed in terms of its service was research. Some faculty voiced concern that their research serve Korean national interests. As professionals in a developing nation, they expressed a responsibility to meet national needs in their area of expertise. Although there were many critical comments regarding the lack of rigor in Korean scholarly journals, the majority of the faculty saw these journals as their primary outlet. It seemed more

important to publish in national journals that reached national audiences than to publish in international journals that they recognized as more scholarly or prestigious.

"Especially in the women's studies field and in the field of labor, I want to do some more practical research and that means that the content of the study is very concrete. The major thing that motivates my research is from the need, from the [women's] movement. If there is some issue that can be applied in a more general way, I mean beyond Korea, then I write in English."

"We must promote the quality of colleges and universities [and that] depends on the quality of college professors. So there is a priority on professor's research activities, not on an international level, but a national level."

Another faculty member in food and nutrition commented on her commitment to work on nutrition issues specific to Korea. Similarly, another commented that his research was motivated by national issues--issues that were important to the economy of Korea. He remarked that "the social status of intellectuals is high," and that "professors are expected to have a social voice."

Sungho Lee (1989a) argues that institutions of higher education in the Republic of Korea are faced with two strong pressures: one, for an increased nationalism of the academy, and two, for a standard of excellence patterned on the academic model of the Western advanced countries. Both pressures were expressed by the faculty interviewed. They spoke to their obligation to exercise their social voice, to serve Korea through their teaching and research, at the same time that they clearly articulated an internalized model of scholarship based upon their cross-cultural socialization.

An additional challenge to faculty juggling these pressures is the criticism of their "western bias." Student protests have included criticism of the number of Western trained faculty who they label as "colonialists." For instance, in one department of sociology, all eight of the faculty members were Western trained. One faculty member remarked that "some people who studied within Korea reject some scholars who studied abroad. For the first year, when I say something, for instance if I don't agree with their idea, then their response is 'western bias'."

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

With the exception of the ethnographic study mentioned (Lee, 1989b), researchers know very little about the experience and perceptions of Korean faculty who have received their socialization and training in Western institutions. This study provides a beginning step in examining the academic careers of Korean faculty members by building and analyzing a data base of their perceptions. Based upon the analysis of data, it is clear that cross-cultural training has both an initial and continuing impact upon the careers of faculty.

Themes emerging from these data indicate both commonalities and differences between the perspectives and experiences of Asian faculty trained in the West and Western faculty. In many respects, these faculty are socialized to be "cosmopolitan" by their graduate education and encouraged to be "local" by their home institutions (Gouldner, 1957). These expectations are certainly not unique to this group of faculty but the press of the cultural norm of service seems to govern faculty choices in Korean universities.

The experiences of these faculty reveal the demand placed upon Western trained faculty who must bridge the tension between their training and the realities of the academic culture in which they work. The question that emerges for western-based graduate programs is how are we serving--or failing to serve--the students who come to culturally different settings for advanced training. We are preparing graduate students for norms and expectations that we do not ascribe to or condone. The basic tension experienced by these faculty--that is, the appropriate balance between teaching, research and service--is the very tension being debated in the United States (Boyer, 1990). The training and socialization of graduate students remains traditional, and the traditional concern is not with producing faculty members prepared to take on the many roles and responsibilities of faculty life but rather with producing researchers. Doctoral training is research training. The emphasis is on disciplinary expertise and research competence. Virtually no attention is paid to teaching, much less to service.

The fundamental question may go beyond attention to cross-cultural training to how doctoral education prepares all faculty members for the realities of today's colleges and

universities. The recent Ph.D. holder who secures a job at a comprehensive university or a liberal arts college may have an experience closer to that of the Korean faculty described here than to their colleagues at major research universities. Boyer (1990) is eloquent on the need for re-thinking the professional roles and responsibilities of faculty members. Many faculty members are already living with the realities that their doctoral training prepared them for only a fraction of their job. Research on junior faculty documents their frustration with the teaching load, the lack of time and resources for research and the lack of clarity in institutional expectations. The issue may not be clarity; the issue may be the lack of consistency between expectations resulting from the socialization of doctoral training and the reality of faculty life at any but the most well-endowed and prestigious research universities. What may not be clear to these junior faculty is how they can live up to the standards they assimilated in graduate school given the constraints under which they work.

This line of thinking is not meant to equate the experience of cross-culturally trained Korean academics with all other faculty; there are clearly issues, such as in-breeding, non-meritorious promotion or accusations of western bias, that make their experience particular to their culture and fraught with tension. Nonetheless, attempts to address the concerns that arise due to cross cultural training demand sensitivity on the part of doctoral faculty to the fact that traditional scholarly norms are not universal. They do not accurately describe the situations countless numbers of academics find themselves in. It is time that doctoral faculty question the assumptions which govern their priorities regarding doctoral training. This is not to suggest that excellence in research capability should not be a priority. In fact, for a rapidly developing nation such as Korea, increased capacity for research is essential to the advancement of the nation. Nonetheless, research capability is not enough to ensure faculty success or satisfaction in many of today's colleges and universities, in the west or abroad.

The findings of this study suggest an emerging substantive theory regarding cross-culturally trained faculty--faculty who have trained in one culture with a fairly defined set of norms and expectations for scholarly performance, and who are performing in another culture with

another set of norms and expectations. These faculty serve multiple masters. Such cross-cultural comparisons are essential not only for furthering our understanding of the multifaceted character of the international community of scholars, but also for the insight they offer on western-based graduate education.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (1989). Twisted roots: The Western impact on Asian higher education. Higher Education, 18, 9-29.
- Baldwin, R. G. (1990). Faculty vitality beyond the research university: Extending a contextual concept. Journal of Higher Education, 61, 160-180.
- Baldwin, R. G. (1987). The academic profession in search of itself. Review of Higher Education, 11, 103-112.
- Baldwin, R. G. and Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process. Journal of Higher Education, 52, 598-614.
- Blackburn, R. T., Chapman, D. & Cameron, S. (1981). Cloning in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. Research in Higher Education, 15, 315-327.
- Bowen, H. R. & Schuster, J. H. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Clark, S. M. and Lewis, D. R. (1985). Faculty vitality and institutional productivity: Critical perspectives for higher education. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chronicle of Higher Education, March 6, 1991.
- Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). The American Academic Profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine.
- Gouldner, A. (1957). Cosmopolitan and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 281-306.
- Lee, Sungho. (1989a). The emergence of the modern university in Korea. Higher Education, 18, 87-116.
- Lee, Sungho. (1989b). Faculty research attitudes and practices: The case of an electrical engineering department in Korea. In P.G. Altbach (Ed.), Scientific development and higher education, pp. 249-277.
- Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Miles, M. and Huberman, A. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.