

In the teacher education department where Katharine, Scott, and John work, pretenure teacher educators have absorbed much of the brunt of the cooperative schools' PDS work. What level of respect is given to a university program that is powered only by the untitled ranks of pretenure faculty and graduate student educators? Would the general public, funding sources, teachers and students give more consideration, pay more attention to, and work harder to assure the success of restructuring projects that involved experienced faculty who worked with their less experienced faculty colleagues?

As pretenure faculty work at tasks disdained by their tenured colleagues, they assume the lower tiers in a hierarchy of individuals. Where there is such hierarchy, is it possible to engage egalitarian collaborations? Will new faculty accept their lesser status? Or will they, like Katharine and Scott, try to break free of the system to work independently? Bowen and Schuster (1986) have observed a wide-spread trend toward segregation of faculty by seniority in universities. They argue further that faculty segregation results in "privatization" of junior faculty as newcomers attempt to meet the demands made on them for research productivity. I believe that Schuster and Bowen's description of privatization applies in the setting where Katharine, Scott, and John work. They face segregation on two fronts, however, both in their scramble to meet the demands for research productivity and as they assume responsibilities to service programs in K-12 schools. Katharine, Scott, and John work under the expectation that they will support institutional initiatives ahead of their own academic interests. As they tell it, once rewarded with tenure, the picture changes, and any individual faculty person is at liberty to pursue her or his own research agenda. It is a culture in which there are oppressors and there are oppressed.

Scott, for instance, is unable to pursue research in the paradigm that he chooses, and believes that he will not be able to return to the work of action research (even the highly service-oriented work that he previously performed), without the added benefit of outside financial support brought about by grant procurement. The scenario is strangely analogous to the system of indentured servitude where an investor would pay passage for an individual to have the right to live and work in this country at the sacrifice of many of the individual's freedoms, unless the indentured party was somehow able to secure enough outside funding to "buy" back their free status. Of course, the practice of indentured servitude was outlawed in the U.S. Constitution; thus, its skeleton should not be found in its systems of higher education. Perhaps the analogy is completed by taking into consideration the tendency of the department to overload the work expectations of beginning faculty. Katharine says, "I think the place really expects, down underneath, seven days, eight to ten hours a day. I really do. At the *least*, six days..."

### **Moving Up, Moving Out, Moving On**

"Publish or perish" is no more than a manifestation of a market mentality

---

toward education in which professors are valued for their productivity as if output of journal articles in universities somehow parallels output of automobiles in factory settings. American education runs the risk that the importance of the values of the market place will supersede the more fundamental notions of freedom of thought and action that underscores American culture and that define academic freedom for faculty. Attempts to encourage meaningful change by creating partnerships among universities and schools in underfunded school districts, or by opening the education professions to minority faculty points of view, or by embracing new conceptions of knowledge and new approaches to demonstrating ways that university research can contribute to understanding, all have fallen victim in this example institution to the demands of the publication agenda.

Where do these three careers stand two years after the conclusion of the intensive period of researching? John began his participation in our beginning faculty research project at a critical time in his career—construction of his life history of becoming a teacher educator coincided with the time of his tenure review. His tenure application, by his own admission and design, does not look a lot like other tenure applications. It is a self-reflective piece of writing that delves deeply into John's questions about the value of his work and his place in the academy, where his work load has been heavily weighted toward teaching and service, rather than toward writing and publication. As John ruminated about the ways in which he invested himself in the time before tenure, he mused:

I have not been as responsive to a set of rules about how you prepare for tenure as I should, so it has been necessary to make the case I made, but it's not as though I'm leading any charge.

In his fifth year as he prepared for tenure review, John detected new interest in his research and publication record from many of his colleagues. He tried hard not to worry over his publication record, but he relied instead on assurances that it is easier to argue for tenure when you have done precisely what you were hired to do. John, in fact, was hired specifically to work on the implementation of the Holmes initiatives, and that was what he had done best. "I don't think of myself as a researcher," John would say. Instead, he perceived himself as "an odd jobs man" whose work is to take care of the needs of the department. Support for his allocation of his time and verification of his service efforts were included in the tenure application, mostly in the form of letters from students, from faculty, and from teachers and administrators in a PDS school, all arguing that John's service should merit tenure.

John is now a tenured professor at the university. Happy to be released from the stresses of the tenure quest, he now feels more inclined to write for publication, and sees publication as the best way for him to pass on to other teacher educators his reflections and observations about the collaborative work experiences that have taken place with the teacher education department and their cooperating professional development school. Even so, the administrative tasks assigned to him tend

to dominate his time as the new program moves into the internship phase and he has had little time to devote to publishing his research about the program.

John's situation stands out as an important exception to the "publish or perish" rule of living. John chose to emphasize teaching and service over research and publication, yet he was granted tenure, even in an institution where the rhetoric inspired both Scott and Katharine to redirect their efforts in ways that would increase their publication output. In our conversations John stressed, however, that his was a "special case," rather than a trend. What made his a special case was that he was hired for the specific purpose of building university to school partnerships, and he was rewarded for having done so. Perhaps herein lies the secret to forming positive work environments for other new faculty: Departments should define clear expectations of the tasks of new hires; they should evaluate their job expectations to determine whether overloading is a problem; they should reflect as to whether they demand services of a new hire that they would not do themselves; and they should analyze the position in relation to departmental practices to determine whether any of their practices are subversive to thoughts and actions of new hires.

Katharine also stayed with the university. We talked during "tenure push" and she commented that more than ever before, she believed that "publication, publication" is the bottom line for tenure acceptance. She mused that the majority of our interviews were collected at a very difficult phase in her adjustment to faculty life. Although she readily agreed that the statements she had made reflected exactly how she felt then, she believed that if the research were done today, she would seem like a different person—especially where it concerns her identity as a researcher and the relative value she has assigned to her researching. Weeks later I received a communication from Katharine stating that she had been denied tenure.

After one more year in residence, Scott left the university where this study took place. He is now a pretenure faculty member at a different large, research university. He reports being happier now and more "in balance" both spiritually and professionally. He also says that his new setting is much more supportive of his action research projects pertaining to multiculturalism and inclusion. One day, while reading the transcripts of his conversations with Rosebud (my research colleague) and me, Scott came upon a story he had told us about chopping down a Christmas tree when he was a small boy, the family impoverished and his mother ill. Today, he has an agent and a publisher and he plans to publish children's books, beginning with his Christmas remembrance. Happier now, Scott foresees a long career in the professoriate.

## **Notes**

1. This research project is based in multiple collaborations. Interviews and archival materials for the life histories were collected with Rosebud Elijah; the project itself is further embedded in the longer-term collaboration of our research group—J. Gary Knowles, Ardra L. Cole, Elijah, and myself—whose members are committed to researching the experiences of beginning teacher educators, especially as those experiences relate to

issues of educational reform. Participants in the research, Scott, Katharine, and John, each contributed over 25 hours of interviews across a span of eight months, although follow-up conversations have ensued over two years.

The research participants allowed observations of classrooms and student meetings and provided archival data (e.g., videotapes of classes, appointment books, annual performance evaluations, syllabi, dissertations, research papers presented and articles published, including working drafts, and tenure review materials). Information also included archival data about the university, school of education, and teacher education department in which Katharine, Scott, and John worked, and included visits to homes and interviews with family members, as appropriate.

2. The Holmes Group is a national consortium of American research universities dedicated to improving the quality of schooling through research, improved teacher education, and school restructuring.

## References

- 1940 Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure. Reprinted in William W. Van Alstyne (Ed.), *Freedom and tenure in the academy*, (pp. 407-411). Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
- Bowen, H.R., & Schuster, J.H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, R.S., & Kurland, J.E. (1993). In (William W. Van Alstyne, Ed.) *Academic tenure and academic freedom. Freedom and tenure in the academy*, (pp. 325-356). Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
- Camus, A. (1955). The artist and his time. In (Justin O'Brien, Ed. translator). *The myth of Sisyphus and other essays*. (Original work published, 1942.) New York: Knopf.
- Finley, S. (1996). Professional lives in context: Becoming teacher educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23 (3), 91-108. Reprinted in Cole, A.L., Elijah, R., Knowles, J.G. (Eds.) 1998. *The heart of the matter: Teacher educators and teacher education reform*. San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.
- General Report on the committee on academic freedom and academic tenure (1915). Reprinted in William W. Van Alstyne (Ed.), *Freedom and tenure in the academy*, (pp. 393-406). Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
- Rabban, D.M. (1993). A functional analysis of "individual" and "institutional" academic freedom under the first amendment. In (William W. Van Alstyne, Ed.) *Freedom and tenure in the academy*, (pp. 227-302). Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
- Reinharz, S. (1991). *On becoming a social scientist*. (Reprint of 1975 Jossey-Bass edition, with revised introduction). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, Rutgers-The State University.
- Thomson, J.J. (1993). Ideology and faculty selection. In (William W. Van Alstyne, Ed.) *Freedom and tenure in the academy*, pp. 155-176. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
- Van Alstyne, W.W. (1993). Academic freedom and the first amendment in the supreme court of the United States: An unhurried historical review. In (William W. Van Alstyne, Ed.) *Freedom and tenure in the academy*, pp. 155-176. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.