

CULTURES OF RESEARCH

Academic research typically is organized by discipline and funded through departments, divisions, centers, and schools, resulting in distinct “cultures of research.” These cultures include dimensions such as: (1) mode of inquiry; (2) the nature and extent of collaborations among scholars, including those with student researchers and postdoctoral fellows; (3) scholarly products; and (4) economies of research based on funding. Hence, cultures of research cover both the intellectual context and the characteristics of the enterprise in which research is conducted. Scholarship may be limited to one culture of research or cut across several cultures. It may be supported with “hard money” tied to a faculty line or “soft money” from external sources, but a growing number of scholars depend on a combination of hard- and soft-money funding streams.

The dynamic nature of research allows cultures to shift, sometimes even becoming new ones. Emerging cultures of research, be they informal or formal, can provide an important space for innovative scholarship. If Emory is to capitalize on a robust intellectual community, it must recognize the changing nature of cultures of research, including the emergence of new ones. Such an approach will enhance the vitality of Emory.

The commission has identified distinct cultures of research in the humanities, social sciences, sciences, health sciences, business, law, and theology. In addition, the commission recognized the importance of interdisciplinary research centers and concludes this section with a brief overview of their role at Emory.

ARTS AND SCIENCES

The arts and sciences typically can be divided into three main cultures of research. These are the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences. The culture of research for each of these will be described below.

HUMANITIES

Most scholars in the humanities engage in scholarly inquiries that focus on producing and critically interpreting cultural objects, values, and knowledge. Depending on the mode of inquiry and the scholarly outcome, humanists may work in teams—as do those in

“Working with graduate

students is vital because teaching subjects close to my research is just another way of thinking about it. Otherwise, the work itself is fairly solitary.”

theatre and other performing arts, for example; whereas those in disciplines such as philosophy, religion, and history primarily engage in the solitary pursuit of scholarship. All require opportunities for intellectual exchange, however, either through formal mecha-

nisms such as faculty or graduate seminars, or informally with colleagues who share a similar theoretical orientation or geographical interest. In many ways, the seminar room and library are to humanists what the laboratory is to bench scientists.

A scholar in the humanities captures the importance of interactions with colleagues and graduate students as follows: “I don’t collaborate much on projects, but my colleagues provide an important source of feedback by commenting on my work and sharing their own. In that regard, meetings and conferences are necessary for me to stay in touch with others in my field. Working with graduate students is vital because teaching subjects close to my research is just another way of thinking about it. Otherwise, the work itself is fairly solitary.” The increasing prominence of information technology provides another means of collaboration between humanists and colleagues in computer science for pedagogical, archival, and compositional purposes.

Although graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in the humanities participate in the faculty’s research, their responsibilities tend to involve support activities such as identifying, acquiring, and coding materials. The scholarship of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows often is less directly connected to that of a mentor than it is in the sciences.

The most prestigious scholarly product in the humanities fields is a single-authored book, followed by peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. In some areas of the humanities, for example, in the arts, the assessment of scholarly products such as a musical score, dance choreography, theatrical production, or annotated museum collection catalogue is less standardized yet equally prestigious. Within the humanities, scholars are expected to devote an equal amount of effort on research and teaching. Faculty recruitment and retention tend to revolve around salary levels and sup-

port for research time and travel to conduct research. Sabbaticals are a highly valued commodity. Several humanists expressed frustration with the lack of understanding of the time-consuming nature of their research and found university leave and sabbatical policies inadequate. As one humanist notes: “Emory does not have a leave culture. The one semester leave that assistant professors get is too late to be valued for their tenure track. It does not give them enough time to work on a book and actually finish it by the time their tenure review is up.” This person added that even renowned senior scholars need time to conduct their research.

Formal avenues for support of humanists’ research are limited to travel funds, access to library sources, and sabbaticals. An increasing number of humanists have sought internal and external funding to support their scholarship. Typical funding sources are foundations such as Rockefeller, Guggenheim, and Mellon, federal agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts, and internal sources such as the University Research Committee. Sometimes departmental budgets can be tapped to provide informal and ad hoc arrangements for course reductions. Because of the unique nature of the humanities research culture, which seems less likely to prove competitive in gaining external funding, the university must continue to support and recognize its special place within the academy.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Scholars in the social sciences typically examine topics ranging from human behavior to political, economic, and social systems. Their scholarship can involve the production and interpretation of knowledge, using multiple modes of inquiry. In addition to those used in the humanities, common modes of inquiry among social scientists are sociohistorical studies, primary collection of data including ethnographic information, self-reported interview data, results from standardized tests, biological markers, and secondary analysis of existing data sets. While some social scientists prefer solitary work, others collaborate with departmental colleagues and social science scholars in a variety of departments and disciplines, often beyond the social sciences. For example, scholars in sociology at Emory tend to work with other sociologists, whereas a number of anthropologists and psychologists highlighted collaborations with colleagues in the health sciences. Many social scientists include

“*I know of no other major college or university that we consider to be our peer that is as lacking as we are in the infrastructure to support social sciences research.*”

undergraduate and graduate students in their research and, to a lesser extent, postdoctoral fellows. The connection with the mentor’s own research portfolio is more direct than in the humanities, and publications coauthored with students and fellows are more common.

The recruitment of new faculty into the social sciences primarily is driven by programmatic priorities. To maintain faculty in the social sciences, incentives such as access to graduate students and to a social science laboratory are fundamental. A common concern among social scientists is the lack of a statistical support center. As one faculty member notes, “What is unique at Emory is the lack of support for research in the social sciences. I know of no other major college or university that we consider to be our peer that is as lacking as we are in the infrastructure to support social sciences research. We have no social sciences research center. No public policy center. No urban center. No survey research capabilities. No mechanism for bringing together researchers in the social sciences. Almost every other institution in the top twenty has some entity or entities like that to perform that function.”

The scholarly products in the social sciences range from books, including monographs, textbooks, and handbooks, to book chapters and peer-reviewed articles. Most scholars in political science, sociology, anthropology, and education publish a combination of books and articles. On the other hand, articles are viewed as more prestigious in disciplines such as economics and psychology. Like their colleagues in the humanities, social scientists are expected to divide their time equally between teaching and research.

Funding requirements reflect modes of inquiry. Those whose research is similar to that in the humanities primarily desire funding for travel and time off from teaching, including sabbaticals. Others require more extensive funding for data collection and analysis. One social scientist elaborates on the need for resources and the time it takes to gain access to these: “It takes resources to go out and interview people, especially if the sites are elsewhere. You need travel money and money to acquire data and hire pro-

grammers to put data files together. Sometimes it takes as long to get money for a project as it does to do the project. This doubles your lead-time to publication. All the front-end work is on your shoulders, because you don't have a staff to turn to in the grant solicitation and preparation process. It's all you. The energy you spend putting a proposal together is time you could be spending substantively on your research." Several social scientists voiced concerns about pre- and post-award management.

For social scientists, funding is obtained from departmental resources, the University Research Committee and other internal funds, foundations such as Ford, Guggenheim, and the Social Science Research Council, and federal agencies including the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health.

SCIENCES

Scholars in the sciences generally adopt a discovery-based approach, using modes of inquiry that include observational analysis and hypothesis testing. At Emory, scientists may be appointed in the college, Oxford, or in the health sciences. Collaborative research is the norm, typically conducted by teams that consist of faculty colleagues at Emory and elsewhere, post-doctoral fellows, graduate students, and staff with technical laboratory skills. Collaborations with graduate students are essential not only to the research, but also as part of the apprenticeship-based training common in the sciences. Typically, research teams have their own laboratory.

In the words of one scientist, Emory offers exciting possibilities in terms of collaborations: "Because an idea can take so long to work through conceptually, I multi-track with colleagues at Emory and other institutions. Sometimes, a research idea will lead me into a completely different area where I can take advantage of Emory's breadth. A problem in chemistry could lead to a problem in biology, then suddenly veer into physics. Fortunately at Emory there is an excitement about collaboration that makes it easy in many ways to work within departments and disciplines. The philosophical barriers between disciplines exist, but they are easy to surmount because of a level of freedom and excitement about where things can go and one's ability to participate and be a part of it."

The most valued scholarly products in the sciences are peer-reviewed articles, followed by peer-reviewed abstracts, invited

“*At Emory there is an excitement about collaboration that makes it easy in many ways to work within departments and disciplines.*”

papers at professional conferences, and book chapters. Books are viewed as less prestigious and, if written, often take the form of textbooks. In addition, the number of references in the scientific citation index is con-

sidered a key indication of scholarly productivity as well as of contributions to scientific advancement. Those scientists whose appointments are in Emory College are expected to devote equal amounts of time to teaching and research as opposed to those appointed in the health sciences, where time allocated to research tends to exceed that for teaching. In addition to publications, presentations and citations, the level of external funding and the associated indirect costs are considered important research products. A key factor in the recruitment of scientists is the availability of start-up packages, including office and laboratory space. Other incentives to recruit and maintain science faculty are support for graduate assistants and postdoctoral fellows and having colleagues with common scientific interests.

The funding needs of scientists are extensive and cover expenses such as laboratory space, equipment, and technical staff. Time for research also is a major expense. Those who are appointed in the college have the option and responsibility to charge their summer research time to external sources. Policies allowing “buying out” of courses during the academic year are currently under review. Scientists in the health sciences are more likely to be on soft money and are expected to fund their research through external resources. Typically their appointments are for twelve months. The ways in which positions are funded also impacts access to sabbaticals. Even though the university policy supports sabbaticals for all faculty, no funds are currently allocated for those with a primary soft money appointment. In addition, scientists with an extensive research operation often are unable to be absent for an extended period of time.

Funding in the sciences, both for basic and applied research, is obtained from federal agencies such as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Defense, as well as from private industry. Like those in the health sciences (discussed below), industry-funded

research poses unique challenges regarding ownership and publication of data. Additional support is available through internal programs such as the University Research Committee and the EmTech Bio Seed Grant Program, a joint venture between Emory University and the Georgia Institute of Technology that provides facilities management support for faculty members interested in forming start-up companies related to healthcare. The reliance on extramural funding impacts the daily life of faculty in the sciences. One Emory researcher reflects on the importance of external funding in order to survive: “If you’re not funded for any length of time, you’re dead in the water. Other people will pass you by. If you don’t have initial data, you can’t get grant money. And your whole lab has been laid off—they’ve gone elsewhere. So you have to start over from ground zero. It’s like going bankrupt. If you’re on tenure track, you’re not going to get tenure. If you’re senior faculty, you’ll be teaching every course under the sun.” More recently, income from patents and licensing has become part of research in the sciences, as has the emergence of start-up companies. From 1994 to 1999, Emory experienced an increase in the number of patents from seven to twenty-eight and the number of licenses from nine to thirty-five in the combined cultures of the sciences and health sciences. The number of start-up companies at Emory went from zero in 1996 to four in 1999.

HEALTH SCIENCES

The Woodruff Health Sciences Center encompasses three schools (medicine, nursing, and public health) and a national primate center (Yerkes). The culture of research in the health sciences is the most complex, containing components of the three previously described cultures (humanities, social sciences, and sciences). Many faculty from the health sciences hold joint or adjunct appointments in other schools of the university and, increasingly, faculty from other units are awarded appointments in the health sciences. The physical location of the schools in the health sciences on the main campus further enhances interactions and collaborations between the health sciences and others at the university. When including all types of appointments—tenure, research, and clinical track—the 1,400 faculty in the health sciences account for the largest proportion of Emory’s 2,700 faculty.

Clinical responsibilities, located in the schools of medicine and nursing, are unique to the culture of research in the health sciences. The clinical operation covers approximately 3,000 hospital beds and more than two million annual patient visits. Clinical research encompasses the translation of basic science research findings into clinical practice—for example, using findings from laboratory studies to diagnose and treat patients. Because animal studies can help clinicians treat humans, a number of health scientists conduct animal research. Translational research also incorporates basic research that is triggered by clinical findings. Finally, clinical research can focus on patient care and cover areas such as effective health communication or studies on the interactions between health care providers and patients.

One clinical researcher relates the pressures associated with patient care as follows: “This is a completely different kind of pressure than you will find anywhere else in the university. . . . I feel an undercurrent of anxiety every time I walk on the ward. Because of my choices, people live and die. And sometimes choices have to be made quickly, often in the middle of night.” Ongoing changes in the health care system and reimbursement policies pressure clinical faculty to increase their patient load, thereby decreasing research time. As summarized by a faculty member, clinical income can be more secure than that from research, not only to the researcher but also to the institution: “The hospital would prefer for me to see patients so they know how much I’m making, than doing research where they don’t know if I’ll get that grant.”

Health-related research, be it in the laboratory, clinic, or the community, assumes extensive collaborations. Hence, it frequently is conducted by teams consisting of scholars from within or across the units in the health sciences center and scholars from other parts of the university and beyond. A distinctive feature of the culture of research in the health sciences is the prevalence of collaborations with scholars from outside the university, most notably the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Other team members may include postdoctoral fellows—who make a significant contribution in the health sciences culture with approximately 430 postdoctoral fellows in the School of Medicine and approximately 120 postdocs elsewhere in the sciences, graduate students, and other research staff to assist with tasks such as data collection, storage, management, and analysis. Graduate students

*“We are so pushed, so hurried—
there is so much pressure to grow
bigger labs and bring in more
money, that we often forget to
think about the simple pleasures
of teaching students.”*”

and postdoctoral fellows are not only essential to research, but their careers often build on their mentor’s work. When the research is community-based, partners from the community, such as formal and informal local leaders and residents, join the team.

The most valued scholarly product in the health sciences is a peer-reviewed article, often written by multiple members of a research team. Next are published abstracts and book chapters. Less value is attached to books in general, especially when the work is a textbook. Some scholars view writing a textbook as a service of educational contribution rather than as research activity.

Underlying scholarly efforts in the health sciences is the potential to acquire external funding. The majority of faculty in the health sciences holds—either partial or complete—soft money positions. Altogether, these faculty bring in close to 90 percent of the externally funded research at Emory, with most of this being concentrated in the School of Medicine. Many scholars in the culture of research in the health sciences face what they describe as a vicious circle: while funding is needed to conduct the research to produce publications, preliminary studies and publications are required to get funding. In the words of one researcher: “I feel like I am on a treadmill of grant writing to raise funds for my salary and research staff. I never have time to dive into one project without being worried about the next one. As a result, there’s seldom enough time to work with the data to the extent you wish you could.”

The reliance on external funding also creates an atmosphere in which inquiries tend to focus on topics for which funding is most available, thereby restricting engagement in more controversial, but potentially cutting-edge investigations. As one scholar notes: “Sometimes I can’t follow my intellectual desires because I have to worry about the money part. The money game is an added pressure in our environment that I wish we didn’t have to encounter.”

Internal funding sources in the health sciences are available through a variety of sources, for example, the University Research Committee, or specific centers such as the Center for AIDS Research. In the School of Medicine, the dean’s Clinical Research

“*I feel an undercurrent of anxiety every time I walk on the ward. Because of my choices, people live and die.*”

Investigator Award program allows faculty to buy out of clinical responsibilities in order to engage in research. External funding comes from foundations

such as Ford, Soros, and Gates, federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and international sources such as the World Health Organization. Funding from private industry also is common. As in the sciences, income from patents and licenses have increased, along with the establishment of start-up companies (see data in the sciences culture).

Depending on the nature of the faculty appointment, there is great variation in the balance between research and teaching—or between research and clinical responsibilities in the case of clinical faculty in medicine and nursing. Sabbaticals are almost nonexistent in the health sciences. Although university policies encourage sabbaticals, the financial resources to support them are lacking. In addition, the continuous research-intensive environment prevents scholars from seeking a release for an extended period of time. Scholars indicated they prefer to participate in the intellectual life of the university by engaging in less time-consuming activities such as seminars and talks, which require only a few hours. The challenge of allocating time effectively, especially when a significant proportion of time is assigned to clinical duties, was expressed by one faculty member this way: “I came into academic medicine wanting to be a faculty member first and a physician second. But we [clinicians] have forgotten what it’s like to be truly part of academics. We are so pushed, so hurried—there is so much pressure to grow bigger labs and bring in more money, that we often forget to think about the simple pleasures of teaching students.”

As in the sciences, the recruitment of new faculty is driven by the size of start-up packages, access to and funding for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and being surrounded by colleagues who share similar interests and a desire for collaboration. Other incentives include salary increases, endowed positions, and even specialized computer resources. Despite an enormous expansion of research space over the last few years, the lack of adequate space remains a concern. The Research Space Management

Program in the School of Medicine is designed as an incentive to departments to encourage efficient use of space by returning a proportion of the indirect cost recovery money to departments.

The culture of research in the health sciences can be affected by the role of department chairs, whose appointments are permanent as opposed to rotating. Permanent appointments allow for continuity, but also can provide chairs with more control over resources, such as space, start-up, and other research support, as well as departmental priority setting. While some faculty view the power associated with a permanent appointment as a negative, others point out that it allows for long-term planning of a research vision.

Another facet of the culture of research in the health sciences, and in other cultures in which federally funded research is conducted, is the extent to which regulations affect the conduct of research. Federal regulations regarding the protection of study subjects, both humans and animals, have resulted in increased monitoring. In addition, federal restrictions on allowable expenditures form a barrier to research. For example, faculty cannot purchase office supplies and equipment or pay administrative staff out of direct costs. While exemptions can be requested, the preparation of those requests requires time, and final institutional approval is not guaranteed. Indirect cost recovery to individual principal investigators is uncommon, except in some departments in the School of Public Health where a minimal amount is returned. The reliance on external funding in the health sciences culture as compared to other cultures highlights disparities in the “economies of research.”

BUSINESS

The culture of research in business includes scholarship that resembles the social sciences, with an emphasis on accounting, finance, organization, and management. Multiple modes of inquiry are used, applying quantitative as well as qualitative research paradigms. Similar to the cultures of research described above, empirical research is expected to make theoretical contributions. Analogous to the culture of research in the health sciences, the business culture also has a significant applied component.

Collaborations include those with colleagues from different parts of the university. For example, partnerships exist with colleagues in economics, health management, and law. Graduate students are

“*The recent establishment of a PhD program in business is viewed as an important step toward attracting new faculty, retaining current faculty, and expanding the intellectual capital in the business culture of research.*”

required to develop applied skills and form an integral part of the research team. Postdoctoral fellows are not common.

A significant measure of success is application of scholarship in practice. Therefore, scholarly collaborations expand beyond those with university colleagues and include external partners from local profit and nonprofit businesses and corporations. The close proximity

of a large number of outside associates, many of whom represent prestigious institutions with a global representation, is essential to the business culture of research.

Peer-reviewed articles in the top scholarly journals in the field are the most valued scholarly product. Book chapters are assigned less merit, as are nonscholarly publications. A feature of applied research is that the investigator often is required to deliver nonacademic progress or final reports. For the work to be viewed as research, however, such reports have to be translated into peer-reviewed scholarship. Within the business culture of research, books are reserved for senior scholars, typically those who want to take a more reflective stance.

The balance between research and teaching is similar to that of other faculty who hold a hard money line. Recruitment of faculty tends to be driven by programmatic priorities. The school's reputation further enhances the recruitment of excellent faculty. These same factors apply to retaining scholars. Additional contributing factors that keep scholars at Emory include funds for up-to-date computer hardware and software, and research travel—attending conferences are important so that scholars stay abreast of new and emerging research themes (because of the lead times associated with the peer-review process, journals often lag behind conferences in this regard). The recent establishment of a PhD program in business is viewed as an important step toward attracting new faculty, retaining current faculty, and expanding the intellectual capital in the business culture of research. The lack of sabbatical opportunities is viewed as a major weakness. Several scholars com-

mented on the need for time to stay informed of new developments in the field as well as time for reflection on their research.

Internal funding through sources such as the University Research Committee is available. As is true in the previously described cultures of research, however, external funding for applied projects is viewed as more prestigious. In terms of external funding, the business culture of research differs from others in that paid consultancies are the main external funding source, thereby further highlighting the significance of applied research.

LAW

The law culture of research embraces components of those in the humanities and social sciences. In addition, there is an extensive focus on topics related to the practice of law. Those legal scholars who conduct research that mainly involves primary legal materials such as law cases or secondary sources frequently work alone. Their need for external funding is limited as is the need for research space. Access to electronic databases and to archives is much more important. Other legal scholars are more likely to engage in collaborations with other legal researchers, faculty in other cultures of research, and those who practice law. Those engaged in international law need access to distant libraries, which is similar to the experience of some scholars in the humanities. As law becomes more complex, modeling increasingly is integrated as an important research technique.

As in the previously discussed cultures of research with an applied dimension, legal scholarship often assumes the integration of theory and practice. Outstanding legal research is expected to affect public policy, maybe even result in cultural change. In the words of one legal scholar: “What is most relevant for law schools is not how research is conducted, but what legal research is, and why it is conducted. Yale, Chicago, Stanford, Virginia, New York University, and Harvard do not brag that they produce better technicians—better clerks—than other law schools. They stress their cultures of research for faculty and students, and what it means to produce great lawyers, all of whom see themselves not as clerks but as professionals and scholars and social critics and activists.”

Legal scholarship is primarily single-authored lengthy articles and monographs, with the latter tending to appear later in a scholar’s career. Law reviews are a prestigious outlet for scholarly

“*What is most relevant for law schools is not how research is conducted, but what legal research is, and why it is conducted.*”

products, with those of nationally ranked law schools being the most prestigious. Compared to peer-reviewed journals in other cultures of research, legal jour-

nals differ in that most are edited by students and do not require blind submission. Compared to valued accomplishments in other cultures of research, the law culture puts a larger emphasis on the direct societal impact of its scholarship.

There is a strong connection between teaching and research. The practice of law is a research-intensive profession, and much of the teaching focuses on providing students with the skills to conduct research. Law faculty do have access to sabbaticals. Important factors for attracting and retaining new faculty are financial resources, time for research, and research support in the form of student assistants.

Internal funding sources are the same as those for the other cultures of research. External funding is not a must in the law culture of research, although many scholars are paid as consultants for their applied contributions.

THEOLOGY

A central focus in the theological culture of research is on ministry, including liturgy, church administration, and pastoral care. The modes of inquiry overlap with those in the humanities and social sciences, and collaborations with colleagues from those cultures are common, although solitary scholarship is most typical. Nevertheless, interactions with other scholars are essential, either in formal ways through seminars and presentations or through informal interactions. As in the other professional schools, the theological culture of research also has a significant applied component. A key characteristic of the scholarship involves a reciprocal relationship with societal religious institutions. This is highlighted by the requirement that faculty and students, as part of their training as theological scholars, are required to serve in a local religious institution, including services such as soup kitchens, homeless shelters, or youth programs. Whereas theological scholars work collaboratively with graduate students, postdoctoral fellowships are uncommon.

“ *Compared to other cultures of research, theological scholarly products tend to reach a more general audience.* ”

The scholarly products include book-length manuscripts, peer-reviewed articles, and book chapters—all of which are valued highly. Also,

compared to other cultures of research, theological scholarly products tend to reach a more general audience. This emphasis on reaching a larger audience outside of the academy appears most prominent in the theological culture of research.

In the theological culture of research, sabbaticals are expected to result in publications. Consequently, there is a tendency to focus on research that can be completed within a relatively brief time rather than more extensive, long-term projects. However, most projects are fairly time consuming. As one scholar explains: “When you’re going out into the field to observe things, you can’t make it happen if it is not happening. It just takes a longer time. For this reason, you do not do a lot of projects simultaneously or produce different kinds of journal articles all the time. You do a project that may take a couple of years.” Similar comments were heard from scholars in the humanities.

MERGING AND EMERGING CULTURES OF RESEARCH

As society continues to become more complex, so do scholarly inquiries. Interdisciplinary scholarship has emerged as a means to address multifaceted questions by interacting across traditional areas to advance knowledge. An early example of such a program at Emory is the Graduate Institute of Liberal Arts (ILA), established in 1952. Even though its emphasis is on interdisciplinary education across the humanities and the social sciences, it has also brought faculty from different cultures of research together. Subsequently, the program has triggered the development of new departments in African American studies, comparative literature, and women’s studies. Whereas these new areas are absorbed in the existing cultures of research, they have also changed those cultures and allowed for additional bridges between cultures. For example, with the emergence of research in the applied history of medicine in the ILA, collaborations are emerging between historians, basic researchers in the sciences and health sciences, and public health, thereby linking multiple cultures of research.

Another example is the Graduate Division of Biological and Biomedical Sciences (GDBBS), formed in 1989 to foster interdisciplinary scholarship between the cultures of the natural sciences, social sciences, and the health sciences (specifically, medicine). The GDBBS links researchers from biochemistry, genetics, immunology, psychology, anthropology, and biology. In addition, the Center for the Study of Health, Culture, and Society, created in 1993, involves researchers from public health, arts and sciences, nursing, and medicine, and it functions as a center that enables interdisciplinary research involving faculty from Emory and elsewhere, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students.

In the last five years, mostly as a result of faculty initiatives, other cross-disciplinary centers have grown and increased in size. The Claus M. Halle Institute for Global Learning supports scholarship in international studies in the context of globalization, while the Institute for Comparative and International Studies initiates and coordinates area studies and international programs. The Center for Myth and Ritual in American Life sponsors seminars and research projects across the social sciences and humanities. Scholars from law, business, and theology—cultures that may not seem like obvious candidates for joint research—come together with the support of the Center for the Interdisciplinary Study of Religion. The goal of the Office of University-Community Partnerships is to encourage collaboration between Emory researchers and faculty at other Atlanta universities and with public, private, nonprofit, and community leaders in the greater-Atlanta region. In an unusual degree-granting collaboration between a private and a public university, Emory and Georgia Tech offer a PhD in biomedical engineering research. Most recently, in 2002, the Center for Humanistic Inquiry began offering four senior fellowships to Emory professors and three junior/postdoctoral fellowships across the humanities, social sciences, and professional schools.

Scholars who work in such “intellectual neighborhoods” often face barriers while crossing various administrative divides. For example, the scholarship may take place in an interdisciplinary context, but the primary appointments are made in traditional departments. Consequently, researchers have to balance their research role with departmental criteria for review—a subject of concern especially among untenured faculty and those at a rank below the professor level. Building intellectual neighborhoods

that allow for newly emerging cultures of research also requires having a critical mass of scholars in a given area. The latter assumes that the university has set research priorities. In the recommendation section of this report, we include specific means of addressing these and related issues.

A scholar who bridges multiple cultures of research describes Emory as “an institution that is trying hard to define its own identity. With that comes an excitement about what the frontiers are . . . and enthusiasm about what the future can be. . . . Because of that enthusiasm, there is an excitement about collaboration, about interfacing, about working together.”

“*[Emory is] an institution that is trying hard to define its own identity. With that comes an excitement about what the frontiers are . . . and enthusiasm about what the future can be.*”
