Cultural Capital as an Interpretive Framework for Faculty Life

Jeffery P. Bieber
University of Kentucky

INTRODUCTION

Today's college and university faculty remain an important topic of study in the world of contemporary higher education. Part of this importance stems from the increasing variation we see with respect to many facets of faculty life. For example, intellectual specialization within disciplines has led to seemingly innumerable sub-specializations such that colleagues within the same department have difficulty communicating; shifting "resource streams" have favored certain academic areas and disadvantaged others such that faculty previously well-supported now find themselves struggling to keep their research programs intact; new pedagogical challenges abound, such as the arrival of internet courses and other forms of distance education, to which some faculty respond readily and to which others respond only grudgingly. Not that faculty members have ever been a particularly monolithic or uniform lot, the increasing complexity and variation that have defined academic life historically continue to persist; it is easy to see that for all we know about faculty, much remains undiscovered and unprobed.

Despite our lack of knowledge regarding faculty in many areas, one thing remains clear: faculty continue, and perhaps increasingly so, to be held accountable by their administrators, by their students, by various public constituencies, and by their institutional and disciplinary colleagues. Given the substantial variation in faculty roles and responsibilities and the wide-ranging and far-reaching interest in faculty attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors for purposes of accountability, there is little wonder that faculty have been studied from myriad perspectives. In this chapter I want to briefly recount some of the primary perspectives from which faculty have been studied and suggest an alternative approach, one based on the work of Pierre Bourdieu and his work relating to various forms of capital.

With some notable and important exceptions (e.g., Wilson, 1942), research aimed at understanding college and university faculty has taken place since the 1950s, the bulk of it taking place during the 1960s and subsequently. The reasons for the timing of this growth of interest are myriad and the relative influence of

J. C. Smart et al. (eds.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*
© Agathon Press 1999

each of these reasons is likely attributable to one's own inclination for understanding the world of higher education. One perspective might suggest that faculty came to be the focus of study because of the arrival of the "baby boom" on campus. With this influx, coinciding as it did with the campus unrest of the late 1960s and early 1970s, some researchers became interested in the political leanings of faculty (Bayer, 1974; Astin, Astin, and Bayer, 1975; Ladd and Lipset, 1975; see also Hamilton and Hargens, 1993), perhaps to gain an initial understanding of faculty's role in the campus unrest. Another factor for why faculty were becoming the topic of inquiry was the founding and growth of various campus-based programs and offices that, either explicitly or as a smaller component of their overall activities, accepted the charge to gather and analyze data relating to faculty. Whether coordinated by the campus strategic planning office or the institutional research office or the teaching and learning program, campuses started thinking more seriously about who their faculty were, where they came from, what kinds of courses they taught, how highly their teaching was evaluated by their students, how many credit hours they generated, and so forth.

Also making an impact was the arrival of technology (i.e., computers) that would allow large scale, national surveys of faculty to be conducted. Although much important work on faculty has been conducted without the use of surveys and large samples over the last several decades (e.g., Roe, 1953, 1972; Baldwin, 1990; Gumport, 1988; Weiland, 1995) there can be little doubt that the work done based on surveys (e.g., Blackburn, Behymer, and Hall, 1978; Astin and Bayer, 1979; Hamilton and Hargens, 1993; Fairweather, 1996) has been and continues to be a standard approach for gathering data related to faculty life. In this effort the computer and the development of statistical packages aided the research and assisted in the construction of our knowledge of faculty.

Another coalescing factor was the steady theoretical maturing of the social sciences. Quite apart from developments in the world of faculty or higher education per se, various academic fields were coming into their own and beginning to have an impact in the academy and the larger society. Although students of faculty have been rightly criticized for their lack of attention to theoretical underpinnings of their research (Astin, 1984), slowly they began to move away from basic descriptive and bi-variate studies to investigations more strongly founded on theory. This movement toward a more theoretical orientation gave researchers greater interpretive and predictive power for understanding faculty attitudes, values, and behavior.

With just these few examples highlighted, it becomes apparent how the study of college and university faculty became a staple in the field of higher education. Because of the amount of work that has been generated regarding faculty, it is occasionally helpful to take stock of the research and categorize it so as to make the overall volume of work more accessible and theoretically meaningful. Such categorization is also instructive with respect to identifying where theoretical holes still exist in the research.

For the purposes of this chapter, I will consider the theoretical genesis of studies of faculty based on their root disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, economics). My hope with this approach is twofold. First, I want to suggest that the theoretical work to date, while perhaps limited, represents important developments in our thinking and, for the most part, has served well those interested in faculty. The work has provided useful constructs for developing our collective understanding of faculty. Second, I want to further suggest that while the readily relied upon theoretical underpinnings for studying faculty have furthered our thinking considerably, we can only go so far with these approaches, applying them as we have in something of a vacuous fashion. Rhoades (1991) notes that most studies of faculty stem from a functionalist interest in roles and role strain, an approach that considers faculty only in their formal "roles" of faculty members, as if faculty work is devoid of other context and factors. I want to echo his observation and the implication that this approach leaves unaddressed significant questions pertaining to faculty life. Unless we are willing to adopt a view of faculty that is more sensitive to issues of politics and power, we are missing an opportunity to view the academic profession for what it is: a site that is not only enormously complex but one that is also rife with competition and one in which members of the profession—perhaps unwittingly, perhaps wittingly—circumscribe the lives of other members of the profession.

Various Perspectives

One of the standard approaches to understanding college and university faculty and why they behave the way they do has been to try to determine their psychological underpinnings. This perspective encompasses many different elements, all of which focus primarily on the individual. One approach from this perspective considers whether there are certain "kinds" or "types" of individuals drawn to the life of faculty. That is, do they exhibit certain attributes, tendencies, or traits that suit them for life as a faculty member and that the life tolerates and embraces? In his review of the literature on faculty research performance, Creswell (1985) identified three dimensions in this perspective: IQ, "sacred spark," and personality traits (including an individual's tolerance for stress). Studying the relationship between some of these factors and faculty behavior has been easier in some cases than in others. IQ, for example, has been found not to correlate very well with research performance (Bayer and Folger, 1966) while research into sacred sparks has been somewhat less illuminating.

Another standard approach is that of motivation theory. The focus of this work has been to ascertain the sources of motivation among faculty. A particularly attractive orientation in this work has been to consider whether faculty tend to be more intrinsically motivated or extrinsically motivated. Several researchers have found that faculty life demands/provides a high degree of intrinsic motivation and that the locus of control for faculty is more internal than external (Maehr and Braskamp, 1986). This research suggests that one strives to be a good teacher or

researcher or committee member because of the satisfaction it affords rather than, say, the salary increase to which it might lead. Much of the research on faculty from this perspective has circulated around the issue of satisfaction (see, for example, Eble and McKeachie, 1985; Finklestein, 1984) as well as dissatisfaction (Bowen and Schuster, 1986)

On the other side of the motivational coin, some researchers recognize that faculty do not live in a vacuum and that there are some important extrinsic sources of motivation. From this perspective, pay raises or tenure and promotion are viewed as principal motivators. Much of the faculty literature concerning extrinsic motivation circulates around how faculty tend to be more motivated by intrinsic rewards than extrinsic rewards (Matthews and Weaver, 1989).

Cast between the more purely internal motivation of satisfactions and the external motivation of pay raises and promotions is the middle ground of expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), whereby one performs a kind of calculation or assessment before engaging in an activity, trying to predict whether one will likely be successful in the activity (Lawler, 1981). From this perspective the outcome may be either intrinsic or extrinsic but either way it situates the individual within an environment. Developing the interaction between the person and the environment further, Bandura's (1982) work on self-efficacy is sensitive to both the person and the environment. Self-efficacy concerns itself with one's feeling of competence and effectiveness as well as a sense of mastery over one's environment. In the faculty arena, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) have explored how this approach might be most fully operationalized.

That research on motivation has received such attention is not surprising for it represents an important cog in some traditional approaches to understanding faculty. Specifically, if the sources of faculty motivation can be identified and those sources can be manipulated, then it is reasonable to assume that faculty can be motivated to behave (or think or perceive) in certain kinds of ways. That is, these standard psychological approaches are behaviorist in nature. From an administrative perspective, such information would be invaluable for increasing commitment to a wide array of activities, ranging from spending more time preparing one's instructional activities to spending more time writing grants proposals for research support to agreeing to chair the institution's blue ribbon committee on whatever pressing issue is being faced. From the perspective of faculty development, knowing the source of motivation brings with it suggestions for keeping faculty engaged in their work and preventing an increase in the amount of "dead wood" at an institution.

Other important psychological aspects in addition to the cognitive dimensions noted above have been the non-cognitive approaches. The overall approach here has been to understand those psychological factors that affect one's behavior but over which one can exercise little control. Of particular consequence for understanding faculty has been the work of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) in the tradition of dispositional theory as it relates to gender. Likewise, the

work of Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) on career stages among faculty has been widely cited. The work from these perspectives and others (e.g., personality theory) serve to remind the researchers that from the psychological perspective, all that is germane to understanding faculty does not emanate only from motivational concerns.

Inasmuch as our understanding of faculty has been greatly enhanced from the application of psychological perspectives, so too has it been enhanced from the application of sociological theories. Indeed, several principal researchers have availed themselves to frameworks derived from the sociology of knowledge and particularly its subs-specialization, the sociology of science, in an effort to understand faculty life. Although some dimensions of this theoretical work have implications for understanding teaching–related activities, investigations from this perspective have largely focused on research activity, reward structures, and knowledge production (Braxton, 1993; Bayer, 1991; Bentley and Blackburn, 1991; Gumport, 1991a; Creswell, 1985; Fox, 1985; Smart and McLaughlin, 1978). Like psychology, the whole of sociology's contribution to understanding faculty can hardly be addressed in a few short paragraphs but there are two specific theoretical perspectives that warrant acknowledgment for they permeate our thinking, both specifically and generally, about faculty.

The first is socialization theory. Rare is the study of faculty that in some way is not sensitive to which type of institution and in which discipline a faculty member received her/his degree. Rare, too, is the study that pays no attention to which type of institution a faculty member is currently working in, the assumption being that faculty are socialized to the norms and perspectives of the institutions in which they work. Equally rare is the theory-to-practice paper on acclimating new faculty to the academy that does not advocate some type of mentoring program for new faculty, another way of signaling the importance of socialization. Specific definitions may vary but all of them center on the inculcation of certain norms, values, and behaviors to new members of the profession. So powerful is this inculcation that how one is socialized is thought to color how one views almost all aspects of life in the academy. (Tierney and Rhoads, 1994; Bess, 1978; Van Maanan, 1983)

Reward structures represents the second sociological perspective that has widely affected our understanding of faculty. Work in this area suggests that faculty respond to a variety of reward options and that monetary compensation is not the only reward that faculty take in return for their toils. Informed by the work of Bayer and Astin (1975), Reskin (1977), Gaston (1978), Astin (1984) and others, opportunities and impediments for reward in the form of promotions in rank, citations of written work, professional association honors and awards, as well as overall prestige within one's discipline or institution have led us to understand that for a profession that is arguably underpaid in terms of salary, rewards can take other forms than that provided by salary. This understanding has been crucial for without it answering such basic questions as "Why do faculty spend the

amount of time working that they do given their salaries?" would be very difficult. Although we cannot answer this question completely with the help of reward structures, our answer is much more satisfying knowing that rewards take many different forms and structures and that faculty are adept at identifying those options. A significant component of this work has been to identify which faculty activities (e.g., research or teaching) are rewarded in which ways (e.g., salary, awards) (Fairweather, 1996).

Before moving on to discuss other theoretical perspectives, the obvious must first be stated. While some studies have relied exclusively on only psychological approaches or only sociological approaches, the great majority has borrowed freely from both camps via social-psychological investigations of faculty. Given the complexity of the issues being faced by individuals studying faculty and by faculty themselves as they go about their normal routines, it is easy to see why two or more perspectives have been employed simultaneously to study faculty. To focus only on the individual or only on the groups and the environment by which one is surrounded would often be to miss some of the most crucial aspects. It would also mean to under-emphasize the interaction that takes place which, increasingly, we have come to realize to be of utmost concern. Perhaps as a result of this concern for the interaction, we have seen in recent years a great deal of work deriving from the anthropological construct of "culture," a perspective that pays particular attention to this interaction.

If there is a trope that has been roundly received in the world of higher education over the last several years it is that of "culture." This concept has become so central to studying and understanding higher education that is difficult to pick up an issue of any of the core higher education journals and not find at least one article that examines some aspect of culture in higher education. We regularly speak of such topics as "institutional culture," "organizational culture," "student culture," "administrative culture," "the culture of a classroom," and so on. Those interested in faculty have been no less prone to avail themselves to the usefulness of "culture" as a metaphor and thus we regularly speak and write of "faculty culture," "disciplinary cultures," and even institutions' "research cultures," and "teaching cultures." The wide, and sometimes loose, use of "culture" in studying higher education and faculty is easy to understand: it provides an interpretive lens that simultaneously takes into account the individual, the environment, the socialization of new members, how and why individuals are rewarded or sanctioned for their activities, and how norms come to be institutionalized, to mention but a few of its significant dimensions. In effect, it theoretically has the capacity to incorporate many of the key variables that have traditionally been central to our study of faculty.

As a function of its interpretive usefulness, several of the most insightful and helpful pieces of work on faculty have relied on the concept of culture. Snow's *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (1959) was perhaps the first work to highlight the importance of academic cultures, drawing in sharp relief the dif-

fering perspectives of the humanities and the sciences. Subsequent work by Clark (1987), Kuh and Whitt (1988), and Becher (1989) have served to further our understanding of academic culture and have helped us to adopt a more nuanced appreciation for the intricacies of faculty life. By bringing together an awareness of the complexities of the individual and the environment, as well as the further complicating aspects of important yet relatively intangible components such as geographic location and physical space, the utilization of "culture" as an interpretive lens for studying faculty has significantly enhanced our understanding of faculty.

Beyond the psychological, sociological, and anthropological (cultural) perspectives, there have been, and continue to be, important developments in our thinking about faculty from other approaches. For example, the work of Tuckman (1974) has helped us to understand the importance of some economic perspectives for studying faculty, as has the work of Lomperis (1990), Finnegan (1993), and Youn (1988) with respect to the academic labor market. Likewise Weiland's (1994) investigations of academic biography suggest an intriguing approach for studying faculty. But important as these other approaches are for painting a more richly textured portrait of faculty life, the bulk of the work continues to be based on the theoretical backdrops of psychology, sociology, and anthropology.

In that these perspectives have served us well, there is no reason to think that additional contributions will not be made from these approaches. But what much of the work to date lacks is a recognition of the tacit elements of power that are part and parcel of everyday life within the educational system as a whole, higher education included, and within faculty life specifically. Of the three major approaches for studying faculty, the cultural perspective comes closest to displaying a concern for issues of power but in studies of faculty, this approach often satisfies with the requisite "thick description" (Geertz, 1973), too seldom going beyond the description to investigate some of the underlying tensions. To be sure, there are some notable exceptions (Tierney, 1989, Hackett, 1990; Gumport, 1991b) where the authors highlight and thoughtfully consider either directly or at least peripherally the conflicts and power relationships endemic to faculty life and how these relationships get played out in the "normal" course of events and decisions regarding instruction, curriculum decisions, selection of research topics, and the like. Also, campus-based survey research that uses controls to analyze data by discipline represents an awareness of disciplinary differences and, consequently, at least an implicit sensitivity to disciplinary power structures as part of a campus culture. As a rule, however, much of the research on faculty and on faculty culture(s) is unconcerned with the inherent power relationships and how those relationships are perpetuated. Even in areas where studies of the struggles for power and prestige are ripe with possibilities (e.g., women, minority, and part-time faculty), the work tends to be rather anemic in interpretation, often focusing instead on policy recommendations.

To highlight this gap in our understanding of faculty, in this chapter I want to

focus on the work of Pierre Bourdieu, and, along with other key components of his larger project on social reproduction, his concept of cultural capital. My purpose in using Bourdieu to scaffold this discussion is twofold. First, I want to suggest that even without a research agenda that has as its focal point issues of power and control among faculty, there are several elements of Bourdieu's work that indicate future issues and studies worthy of investigating. Second, if one is interested in systematically probing the sources and ways in which power and power relationships are perpetuated within faculty ranks, Bourdieu's work may be particularly well suited for providing tools and directions for embarking on such a journey.

Bourdieu: Social Reproduction Theory and Cultural Capital

The work of Pierre Bourdieu has received considerable attention for the last 25 years among scholars whose focus is K-12 education. Understanding why his work has garnered such attention requires that one understand the coming together of several disparate variables at the same time. Important among these is the fact that Bourdieu's work on education explicitly situates the role of education (and not just the practice and process of education) in the larger societal milieu. He argues that the purpose of education is the "cultural reproduction" of the larger society in which the educational system is found (see Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). What originally helped to draw attention to Bourdieu's work was in part the era in which it was advanced: on the heels of a decade in this country where there was heightened awareness to the inequities still found throughout society despite the abolishment of long-standing, institutionalized inequitable policies. Had his work come earlier or later it may not have been so readily embraced. Coming at a time when so many different groups within society were pointing out the inequities still present in society, it became reasonable to assume that perhaps some of the "cures" were, in fact, part of the problem. Hence, rather than seeing education as a means of breaking the cycles of poverty and racism and social class differentiation, an alternative interpretation would hold that education is a means of perpetuating the cycles and, hence, the status quo.

Bourdieu is not the only, nor was he the first, to consider education in something other than a liberal democratic light. Burton Clark, in his analysis of the "cooling-out" function of higher education (1960), considers ways in which education serves to perpetuate various stereotypes and distinctions based upon race and class. Likewise Randall Collins (1971) argued that "the main activity of schools is to teach particular status cultures, both inside and outside the classroom," making education less about the imparting of knowledge and more about the inculcation of "vocabulary and inflection, styles of dress, aesthetic tastes, values and manners" (p. 1010). What distinguishes Bourdieu from these other notable authors is that he contributes to our understanding of the ways that the educational system socializes students a kind of analytic device or "hook" for thinking about the conditions under which one is socialized. While Bourdieu

himself has considered the process by which the socialization takes place, he has a parallel interest in the "substance" that is transmitted and the conditions under which the transmission takes place. To this end he has suggested that there exist three principal forms of capital—economic, cultural, and symbolic—and that education serves as a mechanism for perpetuating the social class distinctions and the inequitable distribution of the various forms of capital already found in society. Hence, via cultural reproduction, the education system serves to keep the playing field tilted rather than leveling it out.

Before going into greater detail on Bourdieu's conceptualizations of cultural and symbolic capital and their application for understanding college and university faculty, it may first be helpful to consider his intellectual lineage. To be sure, Bourdieu has been influenced by several key thinkers in the fields of anthropology, sociology, and philosophy but two of the three "founding fathers" of sociology are regularly associated with his work: Karl Marx and Max Weber. Although Bourdieu himself, characteristic of his acerbic wit, is on record as suggesting that "whether or not to be a Marxist or a Weberian is a religious alternative, not a scientific one" (1988/89, p. 780), he seems to be more closely in tune with Weber. That noted, the strains of Marx are discernible. His use and reliance on the term "capital," although he adapts and extends it beyond Marx's more narrow economic definition, signals a sensitivity to a rift between the "haves" and the "have-nots." His extension beyond Marxists, who center their analyses on the issue of access to the means of economic production, recognizes that there is more to understanding class conflict than simple economic factors. Yet his extension runs into some of the same structuralist limitations that Marxists encounter whether one views the world as divided into two groups—proletariat and bourgeoisie; working class and controllers of the means of production—or into several groups as is more typical of Bourdieu's work: to what extent is there class consciousness? That is, assuming there are such classes of individuals, why do not the lower class(es) of individuals band together to improve their lot in life? To understand the complexity of this question, if not to answer it completely, one is well-served to turn to the work of Max Weber.

In many respects Weber concerned himself with several of the same issues as did Marx but in a more nuanced manner, and, while making adjustments along the way, Bourdieu has availed himself to some of Weber's key points. One way in which Bourdieu has borrowed from Weber is in the concept of status and status groups. The basic units of society, these associational groups share common cultures and have at their core such groups as family and friends but they may be extended to religious, educational or ethnic communities. Weber outlines three sources from which status groups may be derived: (a) differences in life style based on economic situation (i.e. class); (b) differences in life situation based on power position; (c) differences in life situation deriving directly from cultural conditions or institutions (e.g., religion, education, intellectual, or aesthetic cultures) (see Collins, 1971). Against this backdrop Bourdieu has been able to put a

finer point on the concept of status groups via his introduction of "capital" as a means for interpreting, and to some degree measuring, the accumulation of "wealth" in these three different arenas. Important in this regard, in work that to some degree is trademark of Bourdieu, he has attempted to empirically demonstrate and measure, for example, the "forms" that cultural capital takes. So not only can one measure one's economic wealth, so too can one measure one's cultural wealth.

Bourdieu has also been sensitive to Weber's notion that individuals within one status group acquiesce or are co-opted to embrace the values of another group. That is, Weber's turn on the Marx class consciousness issue is to suggest that one form of power is to help individuals of lower classes or disadvantaged status groups not to see themselves as persecuted or disadvantaged. Exactly how this is done, by what mechanisms, is an old question and one that has persistently defied definitive answers. Yet Weber's contributions to understanding these mechanisms are legion, including studies into how institutions are run and controlled, bureaucracy as a modern social form, and inter and intraorganizational politics. While answers continue to be elusive, a major component of Bourdieu's program is to keep the questions of acquiescence and co-opting always at the forefront. How he tries to answer them is to what this synopsis now turns.

Bourdieu has described his work as "genetic structuralism" (1990, p. 14), an effort to understand how an "objective," larger social reality and the "subjective," internalized mental worlds of individuals as cultural beings and social actors, are inextricably bound, each being a contributor to the other. This agenda, and in large part the argument that accompanies it, is neither original nor radical. Many readers will see it to be a form of social-psychology, an approach that has been around in the social sciences for decades. In large part their analytical eyes are well focused. But what separates Bourdieu's project from others is that his work, especially his work on the sociology of education and particularly work done in the realm of higher education, has an "edge" to it that many other authors do not. Via what may be called a kind of "double distancing" (Jenkins, 1992, p. 21) Bourdieu advocates an epistemological position that suggests researchers take a "second step" away from the object of their research so that they do more than just "be objective" about their research subject. The second step back allows and encourages researchers to consider how they are seeing their work (i.e., the assumptions they are making about their subject/topic and their relationship to that topic). In so doing it becomes apparent that researchers are not merely studying and describing their worlds or particular aspects of it; they are also constructing that world in certain ways. If higher education researchers, for example, ask themselves "Why are we constructing this issue/topic in this way?" they may well find themselves answering "Because we assume higher education to be an unequivocal good and want our research to improve upon what is already good." Bourdieu, in contrast, would have us take a second step back and challenge us to reconsider our assumption that higher education is an unequivocal good. He

would have us try to understand that by taking the second step back we might see that higher education may not be an unequivocal good and that it does, in fact, a disservice to significant numbers of individuals and groups.

Although Bourdieu's work and his overall project could be (and have been) the subject of entire books, his work and key features attendant to it, as it applies to higher education in general and faculty in particular, can be more succinctly described. Such abridged and annotated versions always disappoint and leave their authors open to criticism for having neglected this point or that, but for the purposes of this chapter which is intended to be more illustrative and suggestive than exhaustive, my descriptions and explication will hopefully suffice. At the heart of Bourdieu's work is the concept of cultural reproduction. Briefly, cultural reproduction holds that cultures have the propensity to reproduce themselves. The norms, values, mores, symbols, meanings, and behaviors that constitute a particular culture, if sufficiently well established, will tend to socialize subsequent generations of individuals into acting, believing, and valuing similar kinds of things as did previous generations.

On the face of it, cultural reproduction aligns closely with our basic understandings of socialization. Where Bourdieu's interpretation of this process differs is in his proposition of three main points: what is chosen or selected to be reproduced ("cultural arbitrary"); how the reproduction occurs ("symbolic violence"); and the differential weighting or valuing of certain aspects of a given culture ("cultural, symbolic, and economic capital"). Through these concepts, Bourdieu is able to suggest that "culture" is much less benign and sanguine than is typically thought. Rather, he suggests that cultures are competitive within themselves and between each other. At their cores exist deeply rooted contests for power.

For Bourdieu, culture is arbitrary in two senses: in its content and in its imposition. What he suggests is that rather than culture being a function of a discernible, identifiable course of events that clearly demonstrate one behavior or value as being "better" than another, culture cannot be derived or deduced based on any conceptualization of relative value or appropriateness. In effect he is arguing that all cultures are equally arbitrary and that in the end, behind all culture lies the arbitrary sanction of "pure de facto power" (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977, p.5). Critical here to understanding Bourdieu's point is not to assume that Bourdieu is suggesting a kind of relativism, i.e., everyone recognizes that one culture is as good as another and that one culture can be arbitrarily substituted for another. Rather, he is suggesting that there exists a dominant culture that is misrecognized by subordinate classes as being legitimate. As a result of being educated in a particular system, students do not recognize culture as arbitrary but instead bestow upon it a kind of "this is the way things are" quality of naturalness. The "legitimate" culture soon becomes experienced as an axiom, a resolved recognition, as taken-for-granted. Echoing Weber, Bourdieu is suggesting that the most effective form of constraint, censorship, or control is the variety imposed by one's self on one's self.

The method for bringing about this resolve and quiescence to the power rela-

tionships is neither physical constraint nor coercion. Instead, the dominant culture employs what Bourdieu calls "symbolic violence" to bring about it's desired ends. Symbolic violence is the imposition of systems of symbolisms and meaning upon groups or classes in such a way that they are experienced as legitimate. By experiencing the culture as legitimate, the inherent power relationships are obscured in the eyes of the subordinate class. As suggested above, a central agent in bringing about this misrecognition is the educational system. Bourdieu identifies three educational modes for exercising symbolic violence: diffuse education (e.g., peer groups), family education, and institutionalized education (e.g., school). The symbolic strength of any pedagogic agency is a function of its comparative weight or strength or wealth in the structure of power relationships. Hence, families, for example, who are in step with institutionalized educational agencies and systems and who have benefited in some way from participating in those agencies and systems will exert more power and influence in perpetuating the systems than will families who are not in step with the systems. Similarly, families who are in step with the institutionalized system hold the potential to amass greater wealth and to increase their capital holdings, not just economic but social and cultural capital as well.

The suggestion that there are different forms of capital besides the typically recognized economic form is not new. Gary Becker's work with human capital (1993) represents perhaps the next most widely recognized and discussed form after economic capital. This form of capital rests on one's individual worth in some type of economy and has long been considered a rationale for attending school, at both the K-12 level and higher education level. The argument goes that if one attends school and receives various degrees along the way, one will be in greater demand on the job-market for one will have both greater skills and pedigrees than those who have not attended schools or completed their education. Notable and important though Becker's work is, it remains situated within an economic world. That is, his analyses revolve almost exclusively around the economic worth of one's human capital and do not venture beyond the economic domain to consider such ancillary and non-monetary dimensions as affective development, being a more informed and judicious citizen, or being a more informed consumer regarding health-care treatment or having had sufficient exposure to various forms of art to be able to more fully appreciate them.

In contrast to Becker, Bourdieu argues that not every form of capital is immediately and readily translated into economic capital (although he would argue that each form is, circuitously, transferable and that the other forms of capital derive from economic capital). Instead, Bourdieu would claim that each form of capital exists and is bartered in its own market and can be distinguished "according to their reproducibility or, more precisely, according to how easily they are transmitted" (1986, p. 253). These markets are certainly linked to the economic market and, to a large degree, are highly correlated with the economic market. But it is possible to think of them as separate. Consequently, in order to comprehend an

individual's or a group's "total worth" one must be able to grasp the significance and value of other forms of capital, notably social and cultural.

Acknowledging these other forms of capital is critical to Bourdieu's overall argument because they provide the contextual or cultural landscape for the carrying out of symbolic violence. If a society does not have (even subconsciously) other forms of capital besides economic, then there would be no need to co-opt those from the lower classes. Economic rule would be economic rule and as long as one retained economic power, one's authority would go unchallenged. Because, however, other forms of capital exist, groups in power must be careful to reify and then control other forms of capital. Hence, schools, for example, allow and encourage only certain kinds of speech, dress, behavior, questions, answers, and so on. By possessing not only the most central and readily transferred and acknowledged form of capital (economic), groups in power can more effectively and broadly exert control over lower classes.

What constitutes these other principal forms of capital and how does Bourdieu define them? Social capital "is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition—or in other words to membership in a group—which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word" (1986, p. 248-9). Historically, social capital was most readily observed in such networks as families, tribes, clans, and political parties. Increasingly in modern societies as families, for example, lose the establishment of exchanges which can lead to lasting relationships, social capital can still be enhanced and perpetuated by producing occasions (e.g., parties, receptions, reunions), places ("smart" neighborhoods, select schools, clubs, etc.), or practices ("smart" sports, parlor/board games, cultural ceremonies, etc.) which "bring together, in a seemingly fortuitous way, individuals as homogenous as possible in all the pertinent respects in terms of the existence and persistence of the group" (1986, p. 250). Enhancing one's social capital in the world of faculty, then, may take the form of what is euphemistically known as "networking" at professional meetings, campaigning for and eventually being selected into the American Association of Scientists (AAS), or working to establish an informal "invisible college" comprised of colleagues from institutions around the world who meet annually under no organization's auspices to discuss and "set" the research agenda for their discipline for the coming year.

Cultural capital can exist in three forms: the embodied state, the objectified state, and the institutionalized state. The embodied state or form of cultural capital is that which an individual brings upon one's self or that others (e.g., one's parents or teachers) choose to see brought about in an individual. Efforts at "self-improvement" through which one chooses to attend lectures on art history or music appreciation represent such effort to "work on oneself" (1986, p. 244) in an attempt to become more cultured or cultivated. Similarly parents who bring

their children to the theatre and teachers who arrange field-trips to the local museum represent efforts at embodying culture in their children or students, respectively. This form of cultural capital is closely linked to the objectified state for once capital becomes embodied, those who embody the capital serve to define what constitutes cultural capital in its objectified state. Hence, writings, paintings, monuments, and musical instruments can all be understood to be examples of cultural capital in the objectified state. But again, the relationship between the embodied state and the objectified state is significant: unless there are individuals with sufficient capital in the embodied form to be able to interpret and understand the writings or to be able to play the instruments, the writings and the instruments themselves are of little value. In any of the fields of cultural production, including the academic/scientific field, "agents wield strength and obtain profits proportionate to their mastery of the objectified capital, and therefore to the extent of their embodied capital" (1986, p. 247).

The institutionalized state of cultural capital is that most closely associated with education and the world of academe. Although academic degrees are not the only form of institutionalized cultural capital, they are a ready and instructive example, one that Bourdieu relies upon heavily. This form of cultural capital is distinct from the previous two by virtue of the fact that it is "academically sanctioned by legally guaranteed qualifications" and exists "formally independent of the persons [who possess the qualifications]" (1986, p. 248). The critical distinction to be noted is that institutionalized cultural capital represents "officially sanctioned, guaranteed competence" whereas "simple cultural capital...is constantly required to prove itself" (1986, p.248). As a result, "one sees clearly the performative magic of the power of instituting, the power to show forth and secure belief or, in a word, to impose recognition" (1986, p. 248).

Given these three forms of cultural capital, one must be careful to ferret out which form is being addressed or employed at different points in time. Indeed, Bourdieu himself has been known to fall into a seeming quagmire of forms of cultural capital. Usually, Bourdieu adopts a more holistic approach than specific, preferring to conceive of cultural capital as including such "soft" dimensions as language use, manners and dispositions, dress, and the like. Empirical researchers, however, and Bourdieu himself in his book *Homo Academicus*, often resort to academic qualifications (e.g., number of degrees held in which fields from which institutions) as a surrogate for cultural capital. Although the desire to objectify such a malleable concept as cultural capital is understandable and can legitimately be done to some extent, Bourdieu's work suggests too many possibilities to be hamstrung by a reliance on only quantifiable measures.

Finally, it should be noted that Bourdieu and others recognize other forms of capital also. Intellectual capital, is that which derives from the academic experience apart from the capital that may be gained through a degree or a credential (see, for example, Nespor, 1990 for a discussion of how undergraduate students develop intellectual capital in different academic disciplines). Symbolic capital,

generally understood to be associated with prestige and social honor, reputation and distinction, is often used as the generic phrase to suggest any form of capital whose conversion or transference into economic capital is something other than immediate and straightforward.

In concluding this brief introduction to some of the key concepts of Bourdieu's work, I must acknowledge that there are some central aspects of his work that I have chosen not to discuss, including his conceptualizations of the *habitus*, fields (structured systems of social position), his interest in "the objectification of the objectification," and more. In selecting to highlight the points that I have, I have consciously chosen those that I feel will be most approachable for understanding their implications for studying faculty. This is not to suggest that other aspects of his work are inapplicable or unrelated. To the contrary, many other aspects of his work may help us to think about issues relating to faculty and ought to be explored. I have simply chosen a few that seem most immediately applicable and fruitful.

Before moving to a discussion of the ways that Bourdieu's work might inform our investigations into faculty, an important caveat must be addressed. Namely, Bourdieu is not without his detractions. Although I am recommending his work as being "good to think with" (to borrow a phrase from one of his most outspoken critics, Richard Jenkins) when it comes to faculty issues, I do so while acknowledging that there are several dimensions on which Bourdieu could be, and has been, criticized. I'll note only two with the understanding that others could be added to the list. First, his writing and use of language are nearly impenetrable. His sentences are long, rambling, riddled with sub-clauses, and unnecessarily obfuscated. As though his use of language is evidence of his own symbolic capital, Bourdieu never chooses a straightforward phrase when a wordier, intellectually cluttered phrase can suffice. This approach may lend considerable credence to Jenkins' claim that Bourdieu is "more read about than read" (1992, p. 11).

Second, as a structuralist, Bourdieu faces the familiar criticisms of structuralism: unable to account for change and unwilling to acknowledge change. This reticence toward change is witnessed by his use of such terms as "cultural reproduction." In addition, while he appears to go to great lengths to avoid the use of the term, his work looks suspiciously similar to garden-variety socialization theory. The similarities leave his approach vulnerable to the standard criticisms of that general body of work. Bourdieu's approach is deterministic, not only failing to account for change at the system level but also failing to account for agency at the individual level.

Lessons for Studying Faculty

Criticisms acknowledged, the richness of the intellectual tradition upon which Bourdieu's work is based and the manner in which he extends that tradition suggests numerous examples of where his work might extend or shift our current understanding and interpretations of faculty life. However, rather than attempting

an exhaustive discussion, I want to focus on some specific examples that seem particularly fruitful for exploration. The examples make some assumptions about both Bourdieu's work and the world of faculty (e.g., it will be assumed that there is such a thing as cultural capital, that disciplinary cultures exist, and that certain aspects of these cultures have qualities of capital about them). Presumably these assumptions will not be too egregious nor outside of the realm of assumptions that are typically made about faculty.

One of the first challenges to be faced that derives from Bourdieu is to recognize that culture, in whatever form (e.g., institutional, disciplinary), is not simply there. "Culture" does more than just exist; it has an edge to it and suggests certain kinds of competition. For Bourdieu, to talk about "faculty culture" is to suggest that there are more than associated norms, values, beliefs, and symbols within a discipline or an institution. It is something over which individuals and groups struggle and fight. It is both a means and an end. With the introduction of the concept of "cultural capital" Bourdieu has helped to emphasize the notion that culture is value-laden. Although not the first to observe that culture represents and defines both the rules for playing the game and the prize for winning the game (anthropologists have recognized as much for years), Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital captures and emphasizes that point.

The significance of understanding culture as a form of capital that is both a means and an end can be illustrated by considering an example where the struggle exists *within* a culture and where the struggle also occurs *between* two cultures. Some 30 years ago, Robert Merton introduced what he termed the "Matthew effect" in science (1968). This effect, also known as "accumulative advantage," is evidenced by certain researchers or teams within a discipline developing access to resources (capital) disproportionately to other researchers or teams within the discipline. The reason for such advantage is that once one has access to resources and is "successful" and productive with those resources, one tends to secure further resources and enhanced access to additional resources: "them that has, gets." The subtext to this phenomenon goes beyond basic acquisition of resources and judiciously using those resources (e.g., using them to gather and analyze preliminary data for the next grant/project one will seek funding for, thereby demonstrating a competitive advantage). The advantage also suggests that such success shapes the culture of the discipline by exhibiting both how knowledge is to be produced and what counts as knowledge. As resources are increasingly garnered by a given method/technique/approach for addressing a problem (how), certain kinds of results are obtained and validated within the field (what). So, within a disciplinary culture, bona fide economic capital in the form of grants can eventually influence what is valued within the culture and, ultimately, determine what counts as cultural capital and what can be translated into cultural capital.

Inasmuch as cultural capital exists within a specific discipline, it also exists between disciplines. This is observed on virtually every college or university

campus where certain disciplines exert an undue amount of influence on sundry issues within the institution and, often, without. Certain groups of faculty (often from the same or similar disciplines such as the "hard" sciences), have disproportionate "access" to key administrators. In this instance, their social capital is closely aligned with their cultural capital, making their overall worth in symbolic capital a significant force.

Cultural capital also exists between groups of faculty, as represented by the classic work of Gouldner (1957a; 1957b). His identification of *cosmopolitans* and *locals* suggests in a different yet very real and tangible way the importance of cultural capital. In this example, not only could one make some rough estimates of the economic value of cosmopolitans' cultural capital (e.g., estimating the total worth of their trips to different conferences, the amount of money they earn from consulting), it is also possible to see how locals are subjected to a form of symbolic violence by not availing themselves, either consciously or unconsciously, to the cultural capital available. Here, also, perhaps more pointedly than in the previous examples, the element of the cultural arbitrary comes into play. That is, just as students from lower classes have no real say in their educational lot in life, so too do some faculty have little say in the fact that their discipline does not provide them the chance to become true cosmopolitans. Due to no fault of their own, they find themselves in disciplines or fields where research funding, for example, is non-existent. Their ability to gather cultural capital, quite apart from their willingness to do so, is greatly limited. Their stature in their own field my be considerable but on their own campuses they are underappreciated.

These brief examples hopefully demonstrate that who, and via what mechanisms, defines cultural capital is critical. Apart from the operationalization issues that surround this discussion (see below), the tensions that exist between groups of faculty are palpable. So, too, are the tensions that exist between faculty and administrators on many college and university campuses, lending evidence to the significance of the struggle over culture and control of the cultural arbitrary. These tensions exist for very real reasons. Not only do they often have implications for monetary issues and fiscal resources but they also have implications for defining the essence of faculty work, what of that work will be valued, as well as why and how it will be valued. Succinctly, these are battles over forms of cultural capital in particular institutions and for the academy as a whole. As such, these are not only battles over who will be allocated which resources; at their essence they are struggles over how academic work will be defined and rewarded in the various forms of capital that exist.

The struggles over cultural capital take still other forms in the lives of faculty. The current situation for women faculty and minority faculty may be instructive. Apart from important issues of equality—women and minority faculty continue to be underemployed in almost all fields—their situation can readily be interpreted as a lack of access to the means of cultural capital. Consequently, they come to behave in certain ways and value certain things in an effort to be success-

ful. They strive to gain sufficient capital but to date the academy has been successful in prohibiting these two groups from institutionalizing their successes such that as groups, sufficient capital has not been generated.

Amidst this discussion of just a few examples of how we might come to recognize forms of cultural capital in the academic profession, we must also turn our attention to the manner in which cultural or social capital can be accumulated. In some ways, understanding the process is as complicated and sinewy as understanding the processes of socialization and enculturation. Understanding the transmission of cultural and social capital is further complicated because the issue is not only concerned with the transmission of any form of culture; it is concerned with the transmission of specific, valued dimensions and forms of culture.

Because of the intricate and highly individualized nature of the transmission process, it is not surprising that Bourdieu's larger project places at its center the family and the educational system. Nor is it surprising his work considers the interaction of these two structures. His basic premise holds that one or the other (and most typically both) will bring about the preservation—the reproduction—of the existing social structures. For the family that holds appreciable cultural capital and, as a consequence, values certain activities, possessions, and outlooks, the educational system need not exert much of an influence. For the family that possesses little or no cultural capital, the educational system steps in to shuttle the children into conformity so that by the end of their education, while they may not possess any more cultural capital nor means to procure it than when they started, they are sufficiently co-opted so as to believe such capital is of little consequence.

The academic profession has at its disposal a unique combination of "family" and education in the form of graduate school and, more particularly, doctoral programs. Although what may be counted as capital may differ for the profession than for society as a whole, the dimensions and process of transmission remain largely intact despite the setting. In particular, this perspective signals the importance of the dissertation chair/advisor, the selection of the dissertation topic and the writing of the dissertation, and where (which institution) one chooses to do one's work. Despite some overlap in these dimensions (advisors work at certain institutions), they coalesce to make the doctoral program a highly personalized and carefully structured experience that serves to give some students/graduates greater capital than others. This bestowing and garnering (from the students' perspective) of capital occurs on many different levels.

The first step in the cultural capital transmission process occurs when the student decides where he or she will attend graduate school. One of Henry James' undergraduate students recognized in the 19th century that his degree from Harvard would be of (economic) value in Chicago, and the same is no less true for graduate students today, especially in the cultural capital marketplace. Given the tightness of the current academic labor market, savvy students recognize which institutions have resources not only to support them throughout their graduate

careers but to help them establish a research program that will carry them into their first years as a faculty member or post-doc (i.e., the topflight research universities). Consequently, these students avail themselves of cultural capital resources (e.g., the chance to travel to association meetings on the grant that their advisor has received, the chance to participate in a colloquium featuring an internationally prominent scholar who is visiting campus for a few days) that graduate students from other institutions do not. Perhaps going unnoticed by the student, these opportunities serve as a basis for their development of intellectual cultural capital.

In concert with the larger environment the graduate student also works closely with an advisor in her or his specific area. This relationship may or may not be of much consequence while the student is doing coursework. As the student approaches the dissertation stage and typically while the student is working on the dissertation, however, the relationship takes on additional characteristics and importance. Through the close and regular interaction typical of these relationships later in the graduate student's career, the student is able to observe at very close range how her or his professor approaches "the work." Apart from the skills or techniques or specific knowledge that the student may learn as a result of this intense interaction, the student also, and perhaps more importantly, comes to see the commitment and attitude that the advisor has toward "the work." This commitment and attitude, what Bourdieu calls *habitus*, is the result of being exposed for an extended period of time to a kind of world view that not only colors one's attitudes but eventually may be demonstrated outwardly via dress, carriage, and the like. The impact of this relationship appears to be far from negligible and there appears to be at least preliminary evidence that the development of *habitus* is what many new faculty perceive to be the most important influence that their chairs had on their professional development (Bieber, 1997b).

As alluded to above, part of the transmission of cultural capital is the role that students play, themselves, in their acquisition of capital. The identification and selection of the dissertation topic represents an example of where the advisor and the student work together to increase their individual symbolic capital. From the student's perspective, this is her or his chance to identify a new area of study and to make a name for her or himself; this is the opportunity to demonstrate to the intellectual community that he or she can contribute in ways that further a field. From the advisor's perspective, this is the point where several years worth of investment in time, energy, and resources pay off via the chance to claim this new and important contributor as "my" student. By being aware of what is at stake in the dissertation process itself and by taking appropriate steps to ensure a reasonable outcome, both student and advisor stand to augment their individual symbolic and intellectual capital.

The examples provided above all exhibit aspects that are desirable and beneficial to individuals involved. The graduate student who has the opportunity to witness first-hand how her or his advisor experiences problems, satisfactions,

irreverent colleagues, frustrations and entanglements with administrators, rejections, acceptances —i.e., the work— is given a chance for real insights into academe and what life for a faculty member is like. What is more, apart from merely observing, the student also has the chance to become imbued with faculty life—in effect, to experience it personally and to come to hold many of the same values and attitudes that her or his advisor holds. In many ways, this represents professional socialization at its finest. But what distinguishes Bourdieu and reproduction theory from socialization is that reproduction theory has at its core concerns of power and privilege and how they exert themselves. As such, the examples provided above might well be viewed not merely as descriptive but as an indictment of business as usual.

To this end, I'd like to forward another interpretation of the implications for employing Bourdieu's work and, specifically the notions of symbolic violence and cultural capital, an interpretation that is not so benign and acquiescent. As threads of the discussion in the above examples suggest, there may be reason for indictment of business as usual, due in no small part to the dominant role that research has occupied in higher education for the last 50 years and continues to occupy today. That research has come to play such a central role is not difficult to understand. In a profession that rewards modestly economically, involvement in research takes on increased importance and becomes the principal mechanism for bestowing cultural capital. How it came to be the principal market for bartering cultural capital is also not difficult to understand. Prior to the early 20th century when research began to be emphasized at many institutions, higher education was sufficiently elitist and meritocratic that faculty members could derive sufficient cultural capital from the unique and comparatively specialized role they played in society. Salaries may not have been substantial but faculty were recognized clearly to be members of "high" culture. Moreover, the great majority of their colleagues were engaged as they were, principally in the instruction of undergraduates. This situation made distinctions among faculty on any given campus or between campuses negligible.

With the progression of the 20th century—the success of the Manhattan Project, the passage of the GI Bill, and assuredly with the arrival of the baby-boom on higher education's doorstep—life for faculty was becoming increasingly segmented and research increasingly achieved a pre-eminent place for several reasons. One significant reason is the fact that the act of teaching came to provide very little capital, especially as the doors to higher education swung open more widely and the students entering came increasingly from other than the upper and upper-middle classes. Contributing to the decrease of capital associated with teaching is the fact that students, especially undergraduates, are transient, rarely taking any individual faculty member for more than a class or two; exacerbating the situation even further were the shifting demographics. The student body was becoming increasingly older and, due to jobs, family obligations, etc., increasingly part-time.

With the steady decline of teaching as a source of capital, research became a vehicle for faculty to demonstrate to themselves and to their administrations that they were worthy of status as "professionals" and whatever capital could be appropriated or accorded with that status. What faculty as a whole failed to notice is that research, save for a very few exceptions, became a mechanism for decreasing their cultural capital opportunities even further.

In effect, "research" became a mechanism for perpetuating "false consciousness" among the faculty ranks. This false consciousness gave faculty the impression that they retained some cultural capital but in reality they were merely co-opted into participating in symbolic violence against themselves. That is, institutional administrations readily employed research and those who participated in its conduct as shining examples of professionalism among faculty ranks. Despite the well-known and often-cited problems with the research enterprise, for most faculty and administrators it embodies significant dimensions of self-policing and self-regulation, mainstays of professionalism. Over time, this self-regulation and the associated commitments to professionalism served to decrease the faculty's cultural capital while simultaneously increasing the relative power of institutional administrations. By coming to see research activity as the *sine qua non* of life as a faculty member; by believing that they were participating in a "professional" activity; by believing that they were preserving the one dimension of cultural capital that was wholly theirs, faculty have allowed themselves to contribute to their own reduction of cultural capital. Or perhaps more accurately, the few who have been extremely "successful" in the research arena commit a form of symbolic violence on the remainder of the faculty who have been less successful.

Moving from a macro to a more micro-level examination, the symbolic violence takes many forms. In the highly stylized description of graduate student life provided above, the violence begins via institutions selecting only those they perceive to be the best and the brightest (Crane, 1965). The violence continues throughout the doctoral program as students become increasingly engaged with the world of research (Hackett, 1990) to the virtual exclusion of teaching activities. In advising relationships, despite the very real and important intellectual and personal benefits that might be derived from working closely with one's advisor, it cannot be mistaken that one is learning to succeed in an apparently professional environment, an environment in which there are clearly "haves" and "have-nots." With the selection of a dissertation topic and the conducting of the dissertation itself (and perhaps an associated research program), the chair and student work jointly to find a topic that exploits the student's interests and abilities, one that serves both their intellectual and professional needs.

Assuming success in graduate school and a similar experience as a post-doc, the violence continues as the new faculty member joins a department. Here, again, any interest in teaching is largely disregarded by senior faculty (Boice, 1991) and the new faculty member is counseled to identify a research program and rapidly engage it. At the end of the probationary period the new faculty mem-

ber goes through the tenure review process. At this point, from an institutional perspective, the violence between senior faculty and junior faculty becomes less symbolic and more overt for now, in those cases where a junior faculty member may not have excelled as a researcher, a department must decide to what extent it is willing to expend its own symbolic capital on a case that may be marginal. The significance and importance of this decision is exacerbated by the fact that the department's role is only advisory. In some cases it may be wiser not to recommend the marginal case for tenure, thereby expending no capital and conceivably increasing their own capital in the eyes of the institutional administration in the name of "high standards."

In those cases where there is a positive recommendation for tenure, one that ultimately must be approved by a cadre of administrators, the newly tenured faculty member is presumably sufficiently imbued with the values and norms of the system that he or she is likely oblivious to future acts of violence that he or she may commit on other faculty. As one's career continues to unfold, one goes about engaging in any number of activities that commit violence upon other faculty, all under the vestiges of "research" and the development of one's own cultural capital.

The violence that faculty commit upon each other and the concomitant struggle for capital can be witnessed across the profession as a whole and within specific institutions but also between institutions and institutional types as well. Research universities and their faculty enjoy the greatest amount of cultural capital in the current environment and are perhaps the most violent of all. What allows this violence to be perpetrated is other institutional types' willingness to also identify research activity and productivity as the currency of cultural capital in academe. By subscribing increasingly to the norms of research universities, other types of institutions (all but two-year colleges) find themselves rewarding their faculty for research productivity (Fairweather, 1996). Moreover, such "institutional drift" finds an increasing number of institutions apparently striving to become "research universities" (Gumport, 1991b). Going unnoticed in all of this flurry of research activity is that despite the huge growth in the number of journals in some disciplines since the 1970s (Bieber and Blackburn 1993), there is preliminary data to suggest that the space within the journals is being disproportionately "consumed" by faculty from research universities (Bieber, 1997a). Consequently, developments in the world of research that would appear to allow faculty from other types of institutions to develop their own caches of cultural capital are being appropriated by those faculty who already possess, relatively, substantial capital.

There are a host of additional practices and factors that serve to enhance or reduce an individual or group's cultural capital. In the world of journals, for example, the role that editors play as "gatekeepers" represents one such example. With nothing but good and judicious intentions in mind, editors routinely make decisions regarding who will review which manuscripts, a decision that can

readily affect the production and accumulation of capital. Beyond the individual editor's role, the practices that revolve around the journals of certain disciplines, and the degree to which paradigmatic consensus exists within those scholarly communities (see Hargens, 1988), serves to affect capital accumulation. As Hargens and Hagstrom (1982) have noted, "Consensus and codification [of various knowledge claims in some fields] make it easier for skilled academic scientists to achieve various kinds of success. Conversely, in fields with less consensus, scientists are less able to determine their fates on the basis of their own efforts" (p. 194). Collaborative patterns and practices among and between individual researchers (see Bayer, 1991) also serve to affect the accumulation of capital. Regardless of the wide variations that exist within different disciplines, some collaborations become examples of "sponsored mobility" within academe (especially for junior collaborative partners) while others do not. And some collaborations become part of disciplinary lore, despite the realities and circumstances of the relationship (Merton, 1995), all the while contributing to or detracting from the accumulation of cultural capital.

In the end, while one may legitimately question the extent to which faculty really control the means of production of cultural capital in academe—i.e., whether they really control, as part of their "profession," the research activity in higher education or whether the administration does or whether some other party does—to the extent that they do, there is some reason to believe that they engage systematically in symbolic violence against members of their own and "lower" classes (e.g., faculty from non-research universities, faculty from disciplines with lower paradigmatic consensus, faculty from disciplines whose scholarship does not translate into easily recognized forms of "research"). This form of violence results in what might be seen as the "full Matthew effect" rather than only a partial effect: "For unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath" (Merton, 1973, p. 445). Instead of only the partial realization that "them that has, get more," Bourdieu helps us to understand also that "them that haven't, get less."

No doubt apparent by this point, given the array of examples presented above, the metaphor of "cultural capital" may be used to interpret issues pertinent to faculty life descriptively or it may used in a more charged, political, and indicting manner. From the examples and scenarios I have presented above in an attempt to illustrate some of the dimensions and interpretive powers of cultural capital, an essential challenge that lies before researchers, regardless of their intellectual (and political) intent or agenda, is to effectively operationalize the concept in the various arenas where it may be conceptually applied. To this end, there are several considerations to be addressed.

The first and perhaps most important consideration of all is determining what constitutes a "culture." Without knowing what a culture is, identifying capital dimensions of it is impossible. Higher education has appropriated the term quite willingly so that we regularly speak of "institutional culture," "disciplinary cul-

ture," and "faculty culture." These represent narrower and more specialized notions than what Bourdieu uses himself. His work relies on an approach more closely aligned with dimensions of status and prestige within a given society. To this end, his work appears to be far removed from what constitutes the great majority of the research on faculty "culture" in this country. Instead of studying faculty only in their work roles, his approach (especially in *Homo Academicus*, 1988b) is to examine the "larger" cultural dimensions of faculty life in an effort to understand how those aspects relate to the relative status and prestige that various disciplinary faculty enjoy on campus. What section of town you were born and raised in, what kinds of schools you attended, how many books you own, how many hours a week you spend reading, how often you attend the theater, whether you own a CD player, how many hours a week you watch TV all become grist for Bourdieu's cultural capital mill. For those who believe there exists a narrower, distinct, and discernible faculty culture more closely associated with their professional lives, dimensions of capital comes in other forms.

These various forms bring with them different attributes and qualities depending on whether one is seeking discreet, quantitative variables for operationalization or whether one is seeking more nuanced, qualitative variables. In either case, some variables may be applied across the profession or disciplines while others are applicable at the institutional level. Figure 1 contains examples of potential cultural capital variables broken into profession/discipline and local/institutional categories. Those in the far left column represent dimensions of cultural capital that are most widely recognized at the profession/discipline level; the variables in the middle column represent capital that is recognized by both the profession/discipline and the institution; and the far right column contains examples of capital recognized principally at the institutional level.

Some of the variables listed in Figure 1 are quite familiar to those who study faculty and need no further explanation other than to reiterate that it is not the variable per se that is of interest but how the variable is used to what ends i.e., what interpretive framework is used to study aspects of the variable. It is also quite likely that some of the variables could be placed in another column than where I have placed them. Still other variables, regardless of their placement, may need further explication in order to justify their inclusion. In particular, curricular influence, knowledge and language control, and time warrant further comment.

Recognizing that neither all disciplines nor all faculty within a department are equally influential is tantamount to acknowledging the importance of cultural capital in curricular decisions. The issues arise most notably for those institutions that utilize a core curriculum. Which courses from which disciplines offered in what order are part of the core? Similarly, how many works of which authors will be taught by whom in a given class? For institutions that do not have a core curriculum similar questions and issues arise: Which courses and how many of them from which disciplines will be offered as part of the general education requirement offerings? The process by which these questions are answered and the deci-

Profession/Discipline	*Intermediate*	*Institutional*
Who was your dissertation chair? (With whom did you study?)	Number of grants; size of grants	How many institutional committees are you on // do you chair; how "important" are they?
At what institution you currently work?	Number of publications; in which journals	What discipline are you in?
How prestigious are your current departmental and institutional colleagues?	How many of your students have gone on to prestigious jobs/careers?	What influence do you exert in curricular issues?
Who were your classmates in grad school?	Which journals do you publish in // review for (which presses publish your books)?	How many introductory courses do you teach (as compared to advanced courses/seminars)?
Who is in your current network of professional acquaintances (invisible college)?	Which agencies do you review proposals for?	Are you // Have you been an elected member of your institution's faculty or university senate?
What offices in disciplinary organizations have you held?	How often and how widely is your work cited?	What influence do you exert in departmental/ college decisions?
With whom do you participate or collaborate on projects?	From where did you receive your degree?	Have you served in a temporary administrative position (e.g., chair, assistant dean, assistant to the chancellor)?
What influence do you exert on disciplinary or specialization research directions/agendas?	What status does your specialization have in the discipline?	Have you won any institutional teaching awards?
What influence do you exert over disciplinary language and knowledge?	How many grad student/ post-docs do you support?	On how many doctoral committees, inside and outside of your department, do you serve?
	At how many national and international conferences do you present ?	

FIGURE 1. Forms of cultural capital at the profession/disciplinary level, intermediate, and institutional levels.

sions that are ultimately made signal the importance of cultural capital on a given campus. As much as no two curricula look exactly alike, so will no two weightings of different forms of capital look alike. Quite apart from how the larger academic disciplines might codify knowledge, differing institutional cultures interpret that knowledge and appropriate their own capital orientations upon the knowledge. In that curricular decisions are not "objective" and based upon some universally agreed-upon definition of an "educated person," various individuals from various departments on a campus will exert a stronger influence on the decisions than will others, thereby providing clues about which kinds of cultural capital are most valued on a campus.

Just as cultural capital contributes to the valuing of certain kinds of knowledge on an individual campus, so it also contributes to the certification and codification of knowledge and the language that is used to convey and discuss the knowledge in and across disciplines. On one level, which questions and issues receive funding for exploration as well as which results are accepted as satisfactory explanations or answers to questions rests largely on where and with whom the cultural capital in a field rests. As a kind of corollary to economic capital and goods production where those with the economic means choose which goods they will produce, those with sufficient cultural capital choose which knowledge they will produce.

The concept of time is one that indicates very different approaches to the understanding and application of cultural capital. From one perspective, who "controls" time is central to seeing where capital is nested. For a faculty member, whose time one controls represents one's capital worth. As an assistant professor in biology whose work relies on timed experiments, whether you have access to jointly shared equipment in the middle of the day versus the middle of the night can be seen as a measure of your capital. So too whether you have sufficient economic capital to hire appropriately trained technicians or post-docs to stay up throughout the night or whether you must do it yourself because you currently find yourself in a "funding slump." Who controls faculty time represents another perspective. Is a faculty member on a 10-month contract really "free" to do what he or she chooses in the summer or will one's capital diminish at the hands of administrators or colleagues if one does not show up at the office regularly? From yet another perspective, how much capital rests with the faculty member in the eyes of departmental colleagues who is nominated by her or his chair to serve on a committee because he or she has "the time"? And from yet another perspective, time (i.e., access and availability of an advisor) appears to be a very critical dimension to the satisfactory transmission of cultural capital between academic advisors and graduate students. More so than skills or knowledge, having had sufficient time to observe and interact with advisors is paramount in the generation of cultural capital for many untenured faculty members.

Understanding the importance of cultural capital in the lives of faculty is predicated upon sensitivity to the significance of who defines capital. That is, capital

from whose perspective? Capital from an administrator's perspective can look very different than capital from a faculty member's perspective. In a field that is heavily funded, grants and articles may be the commonly agreed upon currency whereas in a field that is not heavily funded, there may be great disparity between the two perspectives. Likewise in the realm of teaching. Capital will be defined very differently by faculty, students, or an institution worried about its public relations image if questions about having too few full professors teaching introductory courses arise. Operationalization must be sensitive to these differences for unless one takes a macro approach as does Bourdieu himself, what is considered, why, and by whom becomes crucial to the meaningful application of cultural capital to the study of faculty.

Future Opportunities

The relative dearth of research that has utilized Bourdieu's work makes available several avenues for studying faculty with the help of cultural capital (and other forms of capital) as an interpretive aid. Hopefully the description of his work provided above is sufficiently detailed to suggest future directions. Likewise, my description of how Bourdieu and his work may be helpful in understanding faculty life suggests some opportunities for future investigations. Along with the research that might be derived from the descriptions provided in this chapter, there is also some specific work that might be done to further inform the possibilities and limits of Bourdieu in the world of faculty.

One area would be to describe the ways in which cultural and symbolic capital actually exists among faculty. It is clear that these forms of capital are present and exert an influence on faculty but the contours, extent, and nuances are much less clear. Work that can help to delineate what the various forms of capital look like and feel like would greatly contribute to our understanding of faculty and the extent to which Bourdieu's work is applicable.

Another area would be to consider how the various forms of capital are transmitted among faculty and, concomitantly, what impedes the transmission of capital. Stated differently, what are the mechanisms by which social reproduction occurs within the academic ranks? While the list of factors is no doubt long and unwieldy, work that can identify the principal components and how and why they exert the influence they do would markedly advance our knowledge of power and conflict among and between various groups of faculty.

Yet another area would be to investigate the currency of various forms of capital in the academy and what are the "exchange rates" for that currency. That is, for faculty who possess certain amounts of cultural capital, what benefits do they accrue as a result of their possession? Is there a correlation between cultural capital and salary, for example? If so, how much of what forms of capital translate into how many dollars? Or, what are the parameters for exchanging capital in one area of faculty life (e.g., status and prestige within one's discipline) for another area of faculty life (e.g., influence on campus as part of a blue-ribbon commit-

tee)? Understanding such issues of currency and exchange may advance our thinking for why and how some groups of faculty find themselves with certain kinds of advantages that others do not.

In addition to looking at faculty only, there are other lines of inquiry that focus on the relationships faculty have with other populations of the academy that may be informative. For example, do faculty and the higher education system commit symbolic violence on postsecondary students in similar ways that K-12 faculty and systems commit symbolic violence against K-12 students? Similarly, how does the curriculum bestow capital on certain students and groups of students in differential ways?

Understanding faculty—their attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors—continues to be an important and intriguing challenge to students of higher education. Research that has focused on faculty work lives and professional roles has contributed significantly to our knowledge of faculty and to our knowledge of higher education as a whole. Important as that research is and continues to be, other aspects, including those relating to issues of power and conflict, increasingly beckon to be investigated. The work of Pierre Bourdieu suggests some potentially useful approaches for studying these issues although the specific strategies for conducting such work may be less apparent. Still, by recognizing and developing programs of research that are sensitive to the accumulation, depletion, and interaction of various forms of capital, our understanding of contemporary academic life stands to be enhanced significantly.

References

Astin, H. S. (1984). Academic scholarship and its rewards. In M. W. Steinkamp and M. Maehr (eds.), *Women in Science.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Astin, H. S. and Bayer, A. E. (1979). Pervasive sex differences in the academic reward system: Scholarship, marriage, and what else? In Lewis, D. R. and Becker, W. E., Jr. (eds.) *Academic Rewards in Higher Education.* Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Publishing Co.

Astin, A., Astin, H. S. and Bayer, A. E. (1975). *The Power of Protest: A National Study of Student and Faculty Disruptions with Implications for the Future.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baldwin, R. G. (1990). Faculty vitality beyond the research university: Extending a contextual concept. *Journal of Higher Education* 61(2): 60-80.

Baldwin, R. G. and Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education* 52(6): 598-614.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanisms in human agency. *American Psychologist* 37: 122-147.

Bayer, A. E. (1974). *Teaching Faculty in Academe.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bayer, A. E. (1991). Career publication patterns and collaborative "styles" in American academic science. *Journal of Higher Education* 62(6): 613-636.

Bayer, A. E. and Astin, H. S. (1975). Sex differentials in the academic reward system. *Science* 188(4190): 796-802

Bayer, A. E. and Folger, J. (1966). Some correlates of a citation measure of productivity in science. *Sociology of Education* 39(4): 381-390.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures*

of Disciplines. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education.* (3rd Edition.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., and Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind.* New York: Basic Books.
Bentley, R. J. and Blackburn, R. T. (1991). Changes in academic research performance over time: A study of institutional accumulative advantage. *Research in Higher Education* 31(4): 327-353.
Bess, J. L. (1978). The anticipatory socialization of graduate students. *Research in Higher Education* 8: 289-317.
Bieber, J. P. (1997a). Institutional productivity and "institutional drift" 1972-1982. Paper presented as part of the symposium "American Research Universities Since World War II: A Historical Perspective" at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Albuquerque, NM.
Bieber, J. P. (1997b). Transmitting cultural capital: Untenured faculty members' relationships with their former chairs. Unpublished manuscript.
Bieber, J. P. and Blackburn, R. T. (1993). Faculty research productivity 1972-1988: Development and application of constant units of measure. *Research in Higher Education* 34(5): 551-67.
Blackburn, R. T., Behymer, C. and Hall, D. (1978). Research note: Correlates of faculty publication. *Sociology of Education* 51: 132-141.
Blackburn, R. T. and Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
Boice, R. (1991). New faculty as teachers. *Journal of Higher Education* 6(2): 150-73.
Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* New York: Greenwood.
Bourdieu, P. (1988/89). Vive la crise! For heterodoxy in social science. *Theory and Society* 17(5): 773-787.
Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C. (1977). *Reproduction: In Education, Society, and Culture.* London: Sage.
Bowen, H. R. and Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Braxton, J. M. (1993). Deviancy from the norms of science: The effects of anomie and alienation in the academic profession. *Research in Higher Education* 34(2): 213-28.
Clark, B. (1987). *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Endowment for the Advancement in Teaching.
Clark, B. R. (1960). The "cooling-out" function in higher education. *American Journal of Sociology* 65: 569-576.
Collins, R. (1971). Functional and conflict theories of educational stratification. *American Sociological Review* 36: 1002-1019.
Crane, D. (1965). Scientists at major and minor universities: A study of productivity and recognition. *American Sociological Review* 30: 699-714.
Creswell, J. W. (1985). *Faculty Research Performance: Lessons from the Social Sciences.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
Eble, K. E. and McKeachie, W. J. (1985). *Improving Undergraduate Education through Faculty Development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty Work and Public Trust: Restoring the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Finklestein, M. J. (1984). *The American Academic Profession: A Synthesis of Social Scientific Inquiry Since World War II.* Columbus: Ohio State University.

Finnegan, D. E. (1993). Segmentation in the academic labor market: Hiring cohorts in comprehensive universities. *Journal of Higher Education* 64(6): 621-56.

Fox, M. F. (1985). Publication, performance, and reward in science and scholarship. In J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. I). New York: Agathon.

Gaston, J. (1978). *The Reward System in British and American Science.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Geertz, , C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957a). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles-I. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2(3): 281-306.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957b). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles-II. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2(4): 444-480.

Gumport, P. J. (1988). Curricula as signposts of cultural change. *Review of Higher Education* 12(1): 49-61.

Gumport, P. J. (1991a). E Pluribus Unum? Academic structure, culture, and the case of feminist scholarship. *Review of Higher Education* 15(1): 9-29.

Gumport, P. J. (1991b). The research imperative. In W. G. Tierney (ed.), *Culture and Ideology in Higher Education: Advancing a Critical Agenda.* New York: Praeger.

Hackett; E. J. (1990). Science as a vocation in the 1990s: The changing organizational culture of academic science. *Journal of Higher Education* 61(3): 241-279.

Hamilton, R. F. and Hargens, L. L. (1993). The politics of the professors: Self-Identifications, 1969-1984. *Social Forces* 71(3): 603-627.

Hargens, L. L. and Hagstrom, W. O. (1982). Scientific consensus and academic status attainment patterns. *Sociology of Education* 55(4): 183-196.

Hargens, L. L. (1988). Scholarly consensus and journal rejection rates. *American Sociological Review* 53(1): 139-151.

Jenkins, R. (1992). *Pierre Bourdieu.* New York: Routledge.

Kuh, G. D. and Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Ladd, E. C. and Lipset, S. M. (1975). *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lawler, E. E. (1981). *Pay and Organization Development.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lomperis, A. M. T. (1990). Are women changing the nature of the academic profession? *Journal of Higher Education* 61(4): 643-677.

Maehr, M. L. and Braskamp, L. A. (1986). *The Motivation Factor: A Theory of Personal Investment.* Lexington, MA: Heath.

Matthews, M. D. and Weaver, C. N. (1989). What college professors want from a job. *Psychological Reports* 65: 792-794.

Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew effect in science. *Science* 159: 56-63.

Merton, R. K. (1973). *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R. K. (1995). The Thomas theorem and the Matthew effect. *Social Forces* 74(2): 379-424.

Nespor, J. (1990). Curriculum and conversion of capital in the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 22(3): 217-231.

Reskin, B. F. (1977). Scientific productivity and the reward structure of science. *American Sociological Review* 41: 597-612.

Rhoades, G. (1991). Professional education: Stratifying curricula and perpetuating privilege in higher education. In J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory*

and Research (Vol. VII). New York: Agathon.
Roe, A. (1953). *The Making of a Scientist.* New York: Dodd, Mead.
Roe, A. (1972). Patterns in productivity of scientists. *Science* 176: 940-941.
Smart, J. C. and McLaughlin, G. W. (1978). Reward structures of academic disciplines. *Research in Higher Education* 8(1): 39-55.
Snow, C. P. (1959). *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution.* Cambridge, ENG: Cambridge University Press.
Tierney, W. G. (1989). Cultural politics and the curriculum in postsecondary education. *Journal of Education* 171(3): 72-88.
Tierney, W. G. and Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Faculty Socialization as Cultural Process: A Mirror of Institutional Commitment.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington D. C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
Tuckman, H. P. (1974). What is an article worth? *Journal of Political Economy* 83(5): 951-967.
Van Maanen, J. (1983). Doing new things in old ways: The chains of socialization. In J. L. Bess (ed.), *College and University Organization: Insights from the Behavioral Sciences.* New York: New York University Press.
Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation.* New York: Wiley.
Weiland, S. (1994). Writing the academic life: Faculty careers in narrative perspective. *Review of Higher Education* 17(4): 395-422.
Weiland, S. (1995). "Belonging to romanticism:" Discipline, specialty, and academic identity. *Review of Higher Education* 18(3): 265-292.
Wilson, L. (1942). *The Academic Man.* London: Oxford University Press.
Youn, T. I. K. (1988). Studies of academic markets and careers: An historical overview. In Breneman, D. W. and Youn, T. I. K. (eds.), *Academic Labor Markets and Careers.* New York: Falmer Press.