View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by DOCS@RWU

Roger Williams University
DOCS@RWU

School of Justice Studies Faculty Papers

School of Justice Studies

1-28-2003

Academic identity : place, race, and gender in academia or is it really all academic?

Robert P. Engvall
Roger Williams University, rengvall@rwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://docs.rwu.edu/sjs_fp

Recommended Citation
Engvall, Robert P., "Academic identity : place, race, and gender in academia or is it really all academic?" (2003). *School of Justice Studies Faculty Papers.* Paper 1.
http://docs.rwu.edu/sjs_fp/1

This is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Justice Studies at DOCS@RWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Justice Studies Faculty Papers by an authorized administrator of DOCS@RWU. For more information, please contact mwu@rwu.edu.

"Academic Identity: Place, Race, and Gender in Academia"

Or

"Is It Really All Academic?"

Robert P. Engvall, J.D., Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Justice Studies
School of Justice Studies
Roger Williams University
One Old Ferry Road
Bristol, RI 02809-2921

Telephone (401) 254-3394
Fax (401) 254-3021
e-mail: rengvall@rwu.edu

Contents

Acknowledgments ..... *i*

Introduction ..... *ii*

Chapter One "Turf Wars: Academic Incivility" *1*

Long Ago in a Galaxy Not So Far Away (Why Me?)
Why Now?
The Importance of Being Earnest...Again
Audience for the Book
Overview of Contents
Acknowledgments

Chapter Two "The Important Things" *31*

Into the Academic Mainstream
With Friends Like These...or Surely You Joust
I'm Not Cranky Dammit...I'm Just Shamelessly Seeking Attention
Putting the Cart Before the Horse
We No Longer Have The Right to Remain Silent
We Have Met the Enemy...And It's (Usually) Not Us

Chapter Three "Across the Great Divide" *71*

A Whole New Meaning to the Term "Underclass-Person"

Chapter Four "It Only Hurts When I Think" *85*

Self-Esteem is a Many Splendored (and Multi-Faceted) Thing
Challenging the "Liberal Arts" Status Quo

Chapter Five "The Promise of Genuine Liberal Arts Education" *98*

Interdisciplinary Response to Education
Practical Advantages
The Role of Higher Education
Human Services as a Reflection of our Larger Society

Chapter Six "The Difficult Realities of the Entrenched University" *117*

It's the Curriculum, Stupid
Discipline is to Profession, As Artificial is to Genuine

Chapter Seven "Boundary Crossing in Teacher Education and Criminal Justice" *160*

Status Issues
Philosophical and Ethical Considerations
Goals of an Interdisciplinary Program

Chapter Eight "The Discipline of Criminal Justice" *172*

Respect versus Disrespect
What Fuels the Debate?

Chapter Nine "The Discipline of Ethnic Studies" *186*

Chapter Ten "The Discipline of Teacher Education" *202*

Chapter Eleven "The Discipline of Women's Studies" *217*

Chapter Twelve "The Impasse Between Militant Radicalism and .....

The Spark, The Ignition, and the Combustion
Sworn to Protect the Status Quo
It's a Mad, Mad, Mad, Mad World
The Crisis
The Incident (This was no Accident) Waiting to Happen
What We Have Here is a Failure to Communicate
Chapter Epilogue

Chapter Thirteen "Solution: Positive Interdisciplinary Interdependence" *272*

The Vitality of Interdependence

Chapter Fourteen "The Focus Should Be on Lessening Our Focus" *294*

Was It Murder or Suicide?

Afterward: "Administrators are from Jupiter, Faculty Members are from Saturn" *307*

We're No Longer Even the Masters of Our Own Domain

References *327*

Acknowledgments

As always, the inspiration for my work comes from my family who remain committed to my success, despite the long odds that my limitations place upon it. The emotional debts I owe to Janet, Andrew, and Benjamin cannot be repaid by mere mention, yet it is all I have. My intellectual debts are owed also to my students, both recent and more distant, who have challenged me, befriended me, and who have influenced my work far beyond my best-intended influences over them.

I also want to acknowledge the contributions made by my mother and my late father toward all of my endeavors. It is they, after all, who with their kindness, love, and support have enabled me to better understand the critical role that I play in the development of my own children.

Lastly, and even as my chances of winning any acting awards are slipping away...I'd like to thank the academy...for it is the academy for all of its good and all of its ill that creates in so many of us a desire to seek new solutions to both new and entrenched problems. Like any good professor, or in my case, any mediocre professor, our abilities to question far exceed our abilities to come to grips with possible solutions. For that I both apologize for my actions while I accept the gratitude of the larger academy, a paradoxical response, I grant, that nevertheless seems altogether appropriate.

Introduction

The best introductions I've read have usually been the simplest. Essentially, a reader should be able to determine from the introduction whether or not they should feel compelled to read further, or whether they should feel compelled to put the book back on the shelf and try another. In the case of the book you are holding, begin by reflecting upon your level of interest in the following questions: Is higher education part of the solution to the vexing problems facing the world today? How will higher education deliver on its promises in the 21st century? How will it respond to student needs and demands for a practical education at the same time it satisfies academia's lofty vision of learning for learning's sake? How might it reconcile these seemingly irreconciable beliefs? Who makes the decisions determining what subjects are "favored" and which are less favored, or even disfavored? These questions are at the root of curriculum decision-making, which itself lies at the heart of what goes on in the academy. Transferring the assumptions and conventions of traditional "liberal arts" education over to a more "practical" collegiate structure appropriate for today's more pragmatic times, is not for the faint of heart. Clearly, many of us would prefer that the majority of our students valued education and learning for their own sakes, and understood the intrinsic value of education. Unfortunately, such a wish may have no more basis in reality than our own individual wishes to be taller, better looking, and wittier. We are free to wish, but we'd best deal with our own lives from a realistic perspective. The same may be true of higher education in America today. At the same time we may be free to wish that our students never asked questions about the relevance of John Dewey, Henry James, William Shakespeare, or English or history more generally, to their own lives, we must be clear in the knowledge that such wishes are no longer realistic for most of us. Indeed the genie is out of the bottle, for, like it or not, we've all been asked questions pertaining

to the "value" of different disciplines generally, and different courses and different assignments particularly. We can bury our heads in the sand, or we can respond by making our 21st century curriculum as nearly ideal as we might.

How we make that new curriculum as close to ideal as we possibly can, is, of course, easier said than done. How we might achieve a more "democratic" curriculum is also easier to imagine than it is to accomplish. There have been books written about the "Democratic Curriculum," some of which even have that phrase in their titles (see, for example, Henderson & Kesson, 1999). Achieving a "democratic curriculum" is a lofty goal, and is, quite obviously, more favored than its opposite... the achievement of an "autocratic curriculum." Between the nightmare of an autocratic curriculum and the dream of a truly democratic curriculum lies the reality of a semi-autocratic, semi-democratic curriculum. This book is about that middle area that is the reality for most of us working in academia today. While most curriculum decisions are surely not autocratic, they too, are far less than truly democratic. Somewhere in the middle between autocracy and democracy lies most curriculum-making. It takes a certain persistence to continue to inquire about those things which don't have clear answers. Professors, should no doubt, be among the leaders asking questions that cannot be immediately answered. Sometimes, answers that are given fall far short of satisfactory. The need to continue asking and the effect that inquiry alone has upon changes within the curriculum may be reward enough for most.

Persistence in identifying one's place is not limited to questions that are put forth to members within the academy. Persistence also has its place in identifying the proper place that a manuscript belongs. All authors, whether they are relative novices, or more seasoned veterans of the publishing wars, know that it is much easier for a publishing house to reject a manuscript than it is to commit to one. Many publishing houses have safe and altogether valid reasons for

rejecting the vast majority of manuscripts from among the piles of manuscripts that they receive. Among those valid reasons lies the notice to the author that the proposed book simply does not fit that publisher's "list." While "new" thoughts are always welcomed, "too new" thoughts can be difficult to effectively pigeonhole. In essence, while difference, originality of thought, and uniqueness are celebrated in all of our rhetoric, too much difference can be difficult to market to previously identifiable market sources. There is a fine line between complex originality and simple lunacy, and it's not altogether clear when the line is crossed. Given the fact that identity and place are the base issues of this work, attempting to identify the place and identity of the work itself carries no small degree of irony.

Such a problem requires the author to convince a publisher that his/her book "belongs." Once that battle is won, the real war begins when the book's introduction and bookcover attempt to convince potential readers that the book "belongs" on their shelves, and, in an author's wildest dreams, in readers' conversations and thinking. The fact that you are reading this indicates that this author won the battle, and is attempting now to win the war.

The war that will be fought over the following pages will demonstrate that this book owes a great deal to the research of scholars in a variety of disciplines. My own perspective as a member of the department of "Justice Studies" within a small liberal arts university, necessarily shapes this work in a direction that is, no doubt, peculiar to some, common to others, and hopefully, worthwhile reading for all who encounter it. The writing of this book allowed me to gain the satisfaction of stating what I felt needed to be stated; the reader must judge, perhaps more objectively, whether or not it really needed to be said.

As you finish this preface, the logical question might be: Can this book truly be about higher education, women's studies, criminal justice, ethnic studies,

teacher education, curriculum innovation, and assessment,simultaneously? Can it really be about all of those seemingly disparate areas? What about increased corporatization of the university, and increasing rancor between administrators and faculty? Can it cover those areas too? This introduction is written in an attempt to assure you that this work does cover all of these seemingly disparate areas. While it undoubtedly covers some of them better than others, and others of them, barely adequately...it covers them all, because they all interconnect. Is this book about all of these things? Yes. Does it fit a previously defined niche that should comfort you into "knowing" the conclusions before the final chapter? Hopefully, not.

Chapter One

Turf Wars:
Academic Incivility & Institutional Marginalization

> **If one is going to adhere to convention and to well-worn truths, one should do so having carefully considered the alternatives (Botstein, 1997, p. 175).**

> **The voice of protest is vital to the health of every scholarly community. It supplies the questions and challenges that set the conditions for inquiry into the beliefs, values, experiences, techniques, and histories of a field. Protest, whether pedagogical or social in character, has long been fundamental to the curriculum literature (Hlebowitsh, 1993, p. 20).**

On college campuses today, student unrest is nearly non-existent. Burning social issues like the Viet Nam Conflict and the civil rights movement in which thousands of students took to the streets and expressed their views using both appropriate and inappropriate methods, have given way, on most campuses, to widespread complacency about global issues and focus upon more sedate individual pursuits. Protests, when they do exist, tend to be over significantly less global concerns, such as the dismissal of a popular professor or administrator (or a football or basketball coach), the elimination of a campus program, questionable food in the college cafeteria, or an increase in tuition. In some instances, it seems, issues which we should perhaps be protesting (or at least considering) go largely unnoticed amid a college community appearing to be a tranquil sea of green open spaces, brick buildings, and overcrowded parking lots.

This work intends to break through some of that tranquility by criticizing our "dispassionate culture." Criticism of a dispassionate culture is difficult when one is given the role of a "dispassionate academic;" that difficulty notwithstanding, this is an attempt to look both dispassionately and therefore critically, and passionately, and therefore emotionally, at a growing underground understanding of the inequity, unfairness, discrimination, and hostility that is bubbling just below the tranquil surface of our colleges and universities. Examining these issues

may rest on a rather slim empirical basis, but a rather extensive theoretical construct based on a careful and reasoned analysis of academic socialization. Socialization in academia has come to mean compliance and acceptance of increasingly wider gaps between the "haves" and the "have-nots," both outside of and within the academy. Growing disparity outside the academy has been well documented, and many works, both academic, and mainstream have addressed the issue. What to do about the disparity, and even whether a growing disparity is fundamentally negative, are issues that have not been satisfactorily resolved and as such, have not been a source of consensus. We have complacently, for the most part, acknowledged growing disparity while going about the business of our own day-to-day lives, largely unconcerned.

Growing disparities within the academy have not seen such a focus, despite the fact that complacency among the educators may go some distance toward instilling complacency within the students we attempt to educate. That educators really are "all academic" in the sense of having no genuine real world purpose or application, has, I fear, infected our own self-images, and thus, the image we project to our students. Dissent has gone the way of the typewriter; present in some offices, often kept under wraps, and seldom, if ever, actually used or heard. Those still using the typewriter, like those who occasionally dissent are viewed similarly: cute and long-ago necessary, but not relevant; traditional, but not practical.

Among the issues that tends to go largely unnoticed and wholly unprotested, is the issue of the treatment of the "marginalized" disciplines on campus. This work challenges the assumptions that have allowed for disciplinary constructions of knowledge, by exploring marginalization in academia in a new way. I hope that it engages the reader in a conversation about higher education and marginalization within higher education. By viewing certain disciplines within the academy we might all gain a better understanding of how academia assigns "place" just as surely as does larger society. Despite our best intentions, on campus and off, negative influences such as racism, sexism, and classicm exist and persist in the world around us.

Many of us have grown complacent in the face of these "isms" by assuring ourselves that we, individually, know that distinctions on the basis of skin color, for example, are wrong, and we, individually, do not make such distinctions. We have limited our own definitions of racism and often fail to include the institutional racism that tells us that it is more than merely our own individual actions that define the term. It is indeed the idea that our social structures themselves, create and maintain racial segregation, disadvantage, and a general social atmosphere that can make people of color feel uncomfortable, unwanted, and in a word, "marginalized." This work intends to transfer that understanding of institutional racism and our need to both recognize and overcome it, to a greater understanding of "institutional marginalization" that is present on college campuses across America today.

By examining institutional marginalization on the college campus, we may be assisted in our struggle to open our minds to the many instances in which our own institutional behavior and complicity rises to a level that we would find unacceptable if we were judging our own individual behavior. The purposes of this writing then, (aside from the cathartic affect the writing has had upon the author), are essentially three fold: first, to expose and discuss many of the ways in which universities make marginalizing decisions about curriculum; second, to present an analysis of the marginalization of some disciplines with regard to the liberal arts curriculum; and finally, to argue on behalf of an integrative interdisciplinary approach to the liberal arts curriculum, one in which previously marginalized disciplines are included. Any arguments must be framed within the context that allows us to understand a simple truth: intellectual traditions are made, not found, and are the result of selective interpretation. Intellectual traditions that include some disciplines while excluding others are fictions, based, no doubt, upon certain realities and certain needs...but fictions, nevertheless. Since it can be agreed that intellectual traditions are created and not inherent, it can easily be argued that reinterpretations are not only a possibility, but a continuing necessity.

The "protest privilege" that has historically been present on college campuses and that has played a significant role in the creation of new programs has largely given way to satisfaction, complacency, and/or resignation. Whether or not there are new "causes" worthy of protest is an arguable question. Making more of us aware of the rigid class structure present in higher education, and of the nature of "unrecognized privilege," may be a such a worthy cause. The worthiness of the cause lies in exposing our own hypocracy, given that a rigid class structure runs counter to the equality of educational opportunity that we profess to hold so dear.

This work is a protest against the rigid class structure present within academia. A protest that may very well be necessary in an academic environment in which many members often unknowingly participate in some of the most stifling forms of suppression existing in the workplace today. The class structure that exists within academia is largely ignored by those of us on the inside, just as it is by those less connected with higher education. The fact that such a class structure exists, and is every bit as rigid as it is in other environments will hopefully be more fully considered after one reads this work.

The tension between writing a scholarly work and one with a broader appeal is not just a tension that is felt in publishing houses where manuscripts are routinely rejected for being too much of one and not enough of the other; it is a tension that is felt by those of us within academia as well, as we write about scholarly and rather mundane topics that we hope and believe should and can have a much wider appeal. Inclusion and integration in higher education is, I believe, both an attempt at a scholarly work and an attempt to reach an audience less inclined to be willing to stand for rhetoric and argument alone, and more inclined to read something with an application to their own lives. In any event, it is a work that is intended to drive more and deeper conversation about inclusion and integration as it ponders exclusion and segregation.

This book began, like many do I suppose, with an obsession. I have long been obsessed with attempting to determine what accounts for the "differences" in standing among and between

the various disciplines within the academy. In other words, why are some disciplines granted so much respect, while others struggle to achieve higher standing or even to maintain their present standing within an academic environment rhetorically espousing equality of opportunity? My obsession, no doubt, has arisen because of a sense of my place within the academy. A sense of place that comes as a result of my status as a professor within a "marginalized" discipline. [I harbor no illusions that if my sense of place had been shaped as a member of a more accepted discipline, my sense of urgency to write this book would have been greatly diminished].

"Institutional Change"

There are times, both individually and institutionally, when change is the only course of action that will permit any form of real continuity. With that contradiction in thought begins this work in which many contrary opinions will be examined, and much academic blood will be shed. This work presupposes a sort of academic civil war, which, if we fail to exercise more caution than we are presently, may eventually see many of us choosing sides in internal and institutional battles between disciplines. These battles between disciplines, and ultimately colleges, might far exceed the expected and "natural" turf wars over limited resources, and greater administrative attention, and spill into civil wars over our historical, cultural, and academic differences with one another. One way, perhaps the only way to preempt such apocalyptic occurrences, is through preemptive strikes that question the legitimacy of existing status arrangements, and thereby prevent these rather minor academic struggles over "class" from becoming larger than they already are.

If the nature of this work examined only "institutional questions," few would care. Few should care. It is much more transcendent, however, as a work examining higher education more generally and how our institutions of higher education respond to our needs as we enter the new millennium. The need for greater emphasis upon and understanding of "interdisciplinarity" and its

implications upon general and/or "liberal" education curricula will be examined in the context of the professoriate and the academic environment. Close attention will be paid to several disciplines in particular and how individuals practicing within these disciplines, which I describe as "marginalized," might attempt to persuade their more established peers of both their individual and collective worth and subsequent need for inclusion within the larger (and more valued) general education curriculum. If colleges generally, and faculty members particularly, are serious about service, then aligning a genuine commitment to service with a realistic and service-oriented curriculum calls for a careful and considerate reassessment of the curriculum. Embedded within this work is an assessment of the nature of classism. That class structures exist within society can hardly be denied; that they exist within academia is often denied. This book hopes to focus the reader on some of the realities that exist in academia, in which class and classism play as vital a role inside the ivy walls as they do outside.

"Why Me?"

President Lincoln warned that a house divided against itself could not stand. While less dramatic, no doubt, this work warns that colleges and universities divided against themselves cannot flourish, and ultimately, many may indeed perish, just as the confederacy effectively ceased to exist after fighting a war which many believe was lost before it was begun. It was a war about clinging to beliefs and value systems that could not survive natural and progressive change, and as such it was a war that could not be won by those resisting that change. The warzone for me, was at a place in which I began this work, during a time in which I was beginning my career as a professor, teaching in the social sciences division at a small college in the midwest. I had arrived at that position after having moved there from teaching in the social sciences at an even smaller college. Through these experiences, most of the core concepts that are explored in this work were formed. Since change, of course, is our only constant, it is perhaps most appropriate

that during the course of writing this book I took still another position at a larger institution in a different geographical location. This change in my own academic life brought forth the sort of tribulation that all moves bring, from such mundane necessities as changing one's drivers license, and car insurance, to the not so mundane and extremely stressful happenings of buying a new home, adjusting to a new work environment, and meeting new people. The experiences that one has with "newness" parallel some of the apprehensions that accompany a professor within a marginalized discipline. The disruptive nature of a move generally passes with the passing of time; while the disruptive nature of existing on the margins of one's organization tends to take longer to accept and, in my case at least, even longer to understand.

"Why Now?"

"Higher education is a moving target" (Glassick, et al., 1997, p. x). Change within higher education is, on many fronts, so rapid that much of the research conducted is outdated before it reaches publication. Curricula might someday change so rapidly that studies such as this might meet the same fate. That someday, however, is not yet here, and entrenched curricula that exclude certain disciplines from the debate over what is necessary to know to be an educated human being makes this study both appropriate and timely.

The timeliness of an examination of marginalized disciplines and the full-scale academic "civil war" that may supplant the small skirmishes already in progress, still remains. Another war among the states may occur, this time, not between the north and the south, but between present states and future states; a war waged by those seeking a more inclusive future in academia, and those in the resistence movement, clinging to a past rich in historical and cultural significance, and fearful that with the changes will come a diminishment in the traditional academia they have spent their lives attempting to further enrich. It would be a war with noble soldiers on each side, and one which might rhetorically bloody even the best of friends and colleagues. The difficulty lies

in creating an understanding in which we all might come to terms with the fact that acknowledging the new is not the same as disparaging the old.

Surprisingly, or perhaps not surprisingly given the marginalized status of certain disciplines, little has been written about these certain disciplines and their "place" within the academy. As it has been in many of our distinguished professions, the integration of knowledge as a concept in higher edcuation curricula has been largely shunned in favor of specialization. The reality that surrounds us, however, is that the strong disciplinary boundaries that have played a critical role in the advancement of knowledge and the construction of the frameworks upon which our colleges and universities have been founded, are being eroded. Walls between and among scholars have crumbled, in some instances at least, where interdisciplinary studies have taken root and flourished. The successes notwithstanding, many more walls remain and the divides that separate scholars and disciplines from one another remain strong, and in some cases, grow stronger. This work is not an attempt to advance one or two or several disciplines at the expense of others. Choosing sides and attacking one another, however popular, achieves little. Instead, it is the goal of this work to advance the academy by recognizing the collaborative nature of learning, of scholars, and of the academy in its purest form.

In 1997, Bender and Schorske edited a work entitled *American Academic Culture in Transformation*, a study of four disciplines over the course of American academic history. Those four disciplines: economics, English, philosophy, and political science will only superficially be addressed here. Those four disciplines, along with many others, have already gained a "place" in the American academy that is now largely beyond dispute. That place is reflected, not only by our college catalogs, but by our own realities. Few of us would want to send our sons and daughters to a college that didn't have sound programs in each of those four disciplines, whether or not our own children were themselves going to major in any of them. The academic "soundness" of those disciplines has appeared and continues to appear vital to a college's overall vitality and integrity.

This work concerns "other" disciplines; disciplines which often exist not on all or even on most campuses, and disciplines whose vitality and academic soundness is not always, or even often seen as a correlate to that same vitality and integrity campus-wide. "No man is an island," we may agree, but it appears that some academic disciplines may be. This work explores the largely uncharted terrain present on some of those islands, islands which are inhabited more and more by genuine academically minded persons intent on integrating themselves into the larger body of the academy. Integration into this "liberal and open-minded" community of scholars has often been perilous, both personally and professionally, and has seldom thus far at least, been an unqualified success.

Higher education has been characterized, certainly in the last half of the twentieth century, as a bastion of liberalism, both in the political sense and in the capitalized "Political" sense. Bestowing upon the recipient of higher education an ability to become more open-minded has been paramount among the goals of academia. To a great extent, we have succeeded. One cannot deny the value of education upon all of us, even those, like me, who have become ever more cynical and subsequently, ever more closed minded. This book will argue that much of the "liberalism" and open-mindedness that higher education purports to exhibit, and which has often gone unchallenged, is often less real than it has been another triumph of style over substance. We have been preaching the gospel of inclusion, while we have been trumpeting the bible of the more traditional disciplines and the type of exclusiveness that membership within those select disciplines affords.

None of us, or at least few of us, are wholly without blame. We have marketed our programs to attract students in an ever more competitive market-driven economy, while we have simultaneously held firmly onto the concept that some of these newly marketed majors are "lesser" and don't fully belong within academia. Put simply, we have attempted to have our cake and eat it too, by bringing in students interested in "careerism"...whatever that entails...while we

assure those among us who have built distinguished reputations disdaining careerism that those on the margins will remain on the margins and will not taint the otherwise "intellectually based" university. This work will argue that we cannot, as of yet anyway, have it both ways. Those on the margins will quite appropriately want full access, and those seeking to keep them out will spend countless hours plotting ways to keep others out instead of keeping proper, and eminently more valuable focus upon the value of their individual work efforts. Returning to the "sincerity" of a by-gone era may be impossible (assuming of course that by-gone eras were indeed more sincere). Returning to high-minded academic discourse and the genuine full inclusion of those with differences (both real and perceived) may also be only a dream, lauded in our rhetoric, ignored in our practices. In sum, we may need to develop new and more resilient methods of assessing our higher education systems in a meaningful way that cuts beyond reputation and bluster and actually considers the delivery of services to students and the ability of those students to act as genuine receivers of and participants in the product that universities put forth.

Among the many influences that have shaped this work, and that shape my thinking about higher education, have been various works by Cary Nelson. Nelson's 1999 work (with Stephen Watt) entitled *Academic Keywords*, mentions in its preface the goal of "speaking the truth in an academic culture of self-deception." That too, is the goal of this work. A goal that will hopefully be attainable through a combination of the use of literature review and anecdotes that illustrate both the accuracies and the inaccuracies of much of what is considered and written concerning higher education in today's world. To quote Jack Nicholson's famous and oft-parodied line from the movie "*A Few Good Men*," our concern should perhaps be that we, like Demi Moore's character, "may not be able to handle the truth."

Part of my recommitment to this writing occurred during my acclimation to a new place, new people, and new and differing viewpoints. Much of what I had supposed and presumed to have been true about academia had been shaped by far different academic experiences than the

one in which I now found myself. Whether it was my newness or some type of spiritual and/or intellectual rebirth that I could not even begin to comprehend, I viewed my new institution and my new colleagues as genuinely committed to the success of our students. It was a view that I had not fully known previously in academia, and it had come as a welcome change. My heightened cynicism led me to wonder what I must surely be missing? My previous experiences could not have been so negative, nor could this present one be so positive...could it? I wondered (both silently and aloud among my colleagues) if my own attachments and biases had unfairly clouded my previous judgments. I pondered whether my previous conclusions about what was ailing higher education generally and the curriculum specifically might be too narrowly appropriate for a different time and a different place. Upon reflection, I was convinced that the worth of this writing, rather than having been diminished, was indeed heightened by my new sense of differing academic environments and my disengagement from the personalities that surrounded so much of what had occurred in my previous experiences.

While there have been scores of articles and books that have considered curriculum reforms within higher education, none have genuinely torn away the shroud of complexity and silence that has hamstrung the practitioners of marginalized disciplines and the disciplines themselves from attaining their fullest potentials within the academy. To begin the tearing away of the fabric that has clouded our vision, we might begin with this simple and none too profound realization: Institutions in which certain disciplines are valued tend to have practitioners of those disciplines who thrive, and likewise institutions in which certain disciplines are marginalized tend to have practitioners of those disciplines who, however much they might try to thrive, are instead stifled in their creativity, their ability to command resources, and their general abilities to move forward. Which brings me to perhaps the most important point of this introduction, and the point which might assist you to make the always difficult decision when contemplating whether to buy, borrow, or ultimately, read a given book. The decision hinges on whether you choose to read on

from the introduction, or simply move on with your life. To assist you in making the appropriate choice that best suits your needs, I must answer the questions that are, no doubt, front and center in your mind's present contemplation: Who is he?; What might he know about marginalization in the collegiate environment?; And, perhaps most importantly of all, Who cares? My answer to these questions centers upon my "objectivity." I have no objectivity. While, as a scholar, I always attempt to give the appearance of objectivity, even my best efforts seldom achieve complete objectivity. My saving grace may be that I am objective enough to realize my lack of objectivity. Among my failings may be my own subjective belief that I am objective enough to recognize even that.

Having said all that, my teaching lends itself to a certain objectivity...I can after all, present two sides to an argument. Writing, on the other hand, is much more difficult as it seems so much more personal. If teaching is performing, writing is a cathartic venting. Cartharsis cannot and does not come from objectivity.

Perhaps my mind is simply too subjective and my thoughts too much shaped by my personal tastes and distastes to present an objective view of the world. Such subjectivity is seen every day through conversations with other persons who seemingly at least, are every bit as subjective as me. Works that I read and consider "brilliant," others sometimes see as significantly less valuable. Movies that I simply love, others often view as less endearing (The movie “The Last Supper” comes to mind). The music that I choose, ranges in others' perceptions from "outstanding" to "scary" and from "eclectic" to "strange." I simply don't know anymore where I stand. It seems quite dependant upon whom I'm standing next to, and with whom I happen to be discussing where I might stand. What makes this work different, then, is not my subjective nature...but rather my admission of my subjective nature. I may be wrong. I may be right. Only by reading further can you make your own subjective (don't presume to be particularly objective) determination of this work's merits or demerits. I wish you well. I have been wavering between my

own disparate notions that this is either a brilliant piece of informative, eminently useful and readable scholarship or that it is a whining, egocentric, overindulgent cesspool of crap. Either way, in my own defense, I think it is worthy of being read.

Objectivity mostly aside then, the primary focus of this work as it began was as a criticism of the dominant theories in higher education, and the failure to "include" marginalized fields into the debate about curriculum, resources, and the collegiate mission. The very concept of curriculum reform, while not new, has been a concept that has faced numerous obstacles on the road toward creating a new reality for college students and professors alike. Undoubtedly, many scholars in the social sciences particularly, have struggled in recent decades with dramatic changes that have surrounded their disciplines as a consequence of internal institutional forces, many of which have been provoked by the larger external realities of social, economic, and political forces. This writing puts into words many of the social things, on campus and off, that we all know about, but are reluctant to say aloud. Teaching must come from talking in public even if some of what is said has always previously been shared only in private conversations while having been simultaneously and publicly denied. Just as Postman referred to the best teaching as "subversive," so too can be the best writing.

Organizational realities, of which I will write about at length, have largely frustrated real curricular reforms that may have gone some distance toward rejuvenating undergraduate education. Schneider & Shoenberg (1999) wrote of the 1990s in higher education:

> **"during this decade, a sense has emerged that hands-on, inquiry oriented strategies for learning, built around professor created, often collaborative materials, may be the approach we need" (p. 30).**

While the rejuvenation of the curriculum and hands-on, inquiry oriented strategies sound as American as motherhood and apple pie, the realities that face a professor in an environment in which curriculum decisions are often seen as sacred text, rather than evolving strategies, greatly hinder any genuine changes, let alone any genuine rejuvenation. One person's rejuvenation, it

seems, can be another person's meddlesome tinkering with a tried and true formula, better left undisturbed. Changes can be met with the resistance that met new Coke in the 1980s, an initiative that ultimately led the Coca-Cola corporation into assuring us, societally, that "Classic Coke" would never be taken from us, and radical change of that type would never again be attempted.

Menand (1997) described the debate between utilitarian and anti-utilitarian philosophies as having developed a "certain staleness" (p. 11) because of the familiarity of the issues (professional, vocational versus liberal arts) and the smallness of the stakes (should we require students to devote 2 or 3 hours to philosophy or other requirements outside of the major). Genuine change within the academy, as opposed to small tinkerings on or outside of the margins, like genuine change in any social organization, means to some extent at least, a reallocation of certain resources. Taking a stand concerning the allocation of resources generally, and the equity of budgets more specifically, is perhaps not the best way to ingratiate one's self with one's peers. Assailing the social order and social conformity that exists at many colleges and, I trust, most colleges, while commenting upon the juxtaposition between that order and that conformity with the "openness" commonly proclaimed in higher education can be not only controversial, but career endangering. Fortunately for me, and perhaps unfortunately for the academic profession, I have been able to move on from my prior experiences, both professionally and geographically, as I have been able to channel these writings into a work less shrouded in the personalities and happenings of the times, and more focused upon the larger curriculum issues of inclusion that marginalized disciplines inherently continue to bring with them.

Writing about higher education generally, and the curriculum within higher education specifically, is a bit like describing abstract art to the uninitiated. While we know what we like, we cannot always explain why we like it, or indeed, even why anyone else should agree with our own subjective interpretations and measures. The general education curriculum, for all of its abstract virtue, is often equally difficult to justify in terms of specific inclusions and specific exclusions.

Still, our ability to know and confidently proclaim what a "good" general education curriculum must be, without the guidance of objective standards, means that our own interpretations of that "goodness" can be stated boldly and largely without risk. This work examines some of these bold proclamations that have survived historical upheavals, both within and outside of academia, and that have become an accepted part of the conventional wisdom that both shapes and represses higher education curriculum development.

Different people define general education differently; different people view the general education curriculum as relating to the college mission in different ways; different people conceive of what a curricular structure should be and what it should do in radically divergent ways. Because of these differences, and our corresponding inability to precisely define the general education concept that all of us rather blindly follow and favor, this work seeks to look at the higher education curriculum and the importance of the actors involved in creating, maintaining, and altering it. Such a curriculum that is so central to the importance of any college and yet so very open to the discretionary viewpoints of the actors within the college seems fertile ground for further consideration. The very first of the many further considerations that are possible must be to reemphasize and better acknowledge the essentially "political" nature of making curriculum choices. Only after such an acknowledgement (however obvious that may seem) might we move toward greater integration of more "contemporary" disciplines into the higher education curriculum. If, in contrast, we cannot acknowledge collectively that curriculum choices are at base political, and instead we believe that they are made for much grander and more rationally based reasons, then integration of different disciplines becomes largely an academic debate with little practical purpose, other than to further disenchant those on and outside of the margins looking in. Beyer & Apple (1998) emphasized that facts about proper curriculum choices are simply not to be found, and instead any facts are in reality mere constructions made by those with vastly differing agendas. That persons with a common mission of educating students should have differing

agendas should no longer be a surprise, even among those with the most grandiose visions of higher education. How it is that we deal with differing agendas, how much credence we allow certain persons with certain agendas, and how much value we place on certain goals of certain agendas, are the questions that lie at the heart of higher education analysis, and are the significant questions that are central to most higher education reform proposals.

The Importance of Being Earnest...Again

The importance of the discussion can hardly be overstated. The importance of understanding the parameters of the discussion likewise cannot be diminished.

> "Unless we have a clear and realistic conception of what this thing is, which is at once a focus for dispute and a vehicle for idealism, our arguments, proposals, and policies risk being poorly targeted, and the bright hopes of visionary aims risk ending in disillusionment" (Reid, 1999, p. 1).

To place such a curriculum discussion in its proper place, we must also look at the larger context, and the larger "place" in which curriculum decisions are made. That context and that place is within colleges and universities, long lauded by those outside as "equitable workplaces." Places that those of us on the inside would seldom any longer contemplate as any more equitable than other workplaces. Kelley et al., (1998) expressed these sentiments quite ably in citing their "labor-oriented" academic concerns:

> "The job system reflects (and enables) a corporate mindset in academic administration: a vision of the university as just one more entity to be judged by the bottom line. In such an atmosphere, faculty salaries appear to be one of the least painful places to cut costs. The system is circular: Administrators wish to cut costs, while our academic culture keeps churning out a steady supply of exploitable, part-time laborers" (p. B5).

An education, any formalized education, is deeply infused with ideological assumptions pertaining to the nature of everyday life. If our students perceive of the higher education

environment as anything even resembling a perverse exaggeration of corporate culture, we have failed them miserably by promoting within them the notion that equity is not an assumption that might all but be taken for granted within the academic workplace. If we have even vague notions of assisting our students toward achieving their fullest potential as thinking and caring citizens, we must surely provide for them a place in academia in which thinking and caring and encouraging thinking and caring, is institutionally recognized as the primary mission of the entire academic endeavor. The citizens who comprise our "cynical society" as Goldfarb labeled it, surely do not need any assistance through formal education in replicating already existing and inequitable social structures. Franfield (1992) recognized the power that formal education has over the meanings which students construct. "Schools are cultural and ideological institutions that construct social realities from which students actively attempt to derive meaningfulness" (p. 4). The importance, then, of how we construct these social realities cannot be overstated.

Much of this writing then, consists of three separate yet interrelated points that have been given shortshrift, if indeed any shrift, in the higher education literature. First, it is my goal to expose and discuss the ways in which universities make decisions about curriculum, in an effort to allow for a better recognition of the artificiality of disciplinary barriers that may be high and wide, but structurally unsound. An artificiality that should present itself in the almost universal futility of attempting to ascertain any one way of teaching any one thing as being superior to other ways. Second, to present an analysis of the marginalization of selected disciplines--especially women's studies, ethnic studies, teacher education and criminal justice--with regard to the liberal arts curriculum. Third, and perhaps most important, to argue for a more inclusive and integrative interdisciplinary approach to the liberal arts curriculum and its design. These goals, I hope, will not be impeded by my own tendencies to lapse into a stream of consciousness style of writing that tends to play upon the numerous interconnections between and among seemingly disparate entities; interconnections that, again I hope, are not only interconnections in my mind alone

reflective more of gaps in my own synapses rather than legitimate connections that have largely gone unnnoticed in the literature. I am also cognizant of my tendency to become a fan of faculty, and particularly marginalized faculty; a tendency that might appropriately make the reader wonder whether one could be an advocate, a critic, and a professor all at the same time.

Once long ago, in a college setting so rife with problems that calling it a "college setting" might be stretching the reasonable limits of that rather generous description, I was in constant contact with an administrator who endlessly referred to himself as "wearing many hats." He was, of course, describing his many duties, none of which it seemed to me he was doing particularly well. In fact, his many "hats" as it were, seemed to be pulled over his eyes a rather disconcerting percentage of the time. Remembering this and relaying this anecdote makes me cautious when I proclaim that this work will allow me to wear many hats, nevertheless, I can think of no better description of what I am attempting to do. This work allows me to be a critic of the status quo, an advocate for faculty doing the best they can in often "marginalized" circumstances, and a professor assessing the implications of change and the only slightly lesser implications of standing pat. As such a work, I am mindful that it will be paradoxical in many regards, particularly in its role as both a bracing warning of what often appears to be inevitable doom, and a reaffirmation of the faith of reason in overcoming "unreason."

I make no claims that others haven't already tried to come to grips with the complicated manner in which we determine curriculum issues. In fact, a few, notably Stark & Lattuca (1997), sought to remedy the lack of a comprehensive definition of curriculum, by defining the curriculum as an "academic plan" (p. 9). Such a definition allows for an open and honest inquiry about what "plans" might be most important at a given institution, who should be involved in that planning process, and how those plans might ultimately meet both stated and unstated institutional needs. Such recognition also allows for proactive planning to meet projected needs, rather than merely reactive responses to determined needs. Leadership, among administrators and faculty alike, that

is proactive and that addresses entirely new sets of problems in a forthright and thoughtful manner is difficult to come by, despite nearly universal recognition of its value.

Like William Tierney (1989), and no doubt many others before him, and countless others before me, I am of the belief that most if not all knowledge is socially constructed. That being the case, how our socially constructed knowledge shapes our subjective viewpoints which in turn shapes the college curriculum is worthy of review, if for no other reason than to consider what alternative social constructions might be possible. For those of us who perceive of ourselves as marginalized in academia, and who believe that our curricular structures tend to be based upon value-laden "choices," both rational and irrational, a greater and more open consideration of how majority academic values shape our social constructions might allow us (and everyone not presently favored) an increased voice. While it may seem rather straight-forward to request that those making decisions understand that the decisions are based on their own senses of "right," and seldom upon some sort of universal "right," such a realization is not always present. Such a realization and a subsequent admission of the subjective nature of the curriculum might take us forward giant strides toward full inclusion in both the curriculum process and ultimately the curriculum itself.

> **"If the academy, the classroom, and other educational contexts are not mere instructional sites, but are fundamentally political and cultural sites that represent accommodations and contestations over knowledge by differently empowered social constituencies, then the processes and practices of education lead to profoundly significant notions of self, identity, and community" (Mohanty, 1997, p. xvi).**

Our notions of self, identity, and community, as having been shaped by accommodations and contestations, have a major impact upon our teaching, our research, and our ability to appropriately interact with our students. Our sense of belonging or not belonging within our own "communities of scholars" plays a significant role in how students perceive of their professors and of their prospective professions. Hinchey (1998) wrote of the "complicity" on the part of

teachers in accepting their own powerlessness. However difficult it may be to accept, professors, like so many other groups, have frequently cooperated quite willingly in their own oppression by uncritically accepting ideas that have permeated our culture, both outside and inside the halls of academia.

Like the philosophical question..."if a tree falls in a forest and no one hears it, does it make a sound," I cannot ignore the troubling philosophical question concerning this work: "can a discipline be oppressed without many of its members realizing it," or its corollary: "if certain marginalized disciplines fall from the face of the curriculum, will they make a sound?" Like Ellison's "invisible man," it seems as though certain disciplines can exist while being all but invisible and/or at least transparent to academic colleagues practicing their crafts often only a precious few steps away.

Rowley et al., (1998) described the academy as "a prized and comfortable place for many to reside, to build careers, develop roles in their chosen disciplines, establish friendships and mamily roots, forge bases of power, and contribute to society" (p. 127). Given the status of the academy as a "comfortable place," it is wholly understandable that one common response to the forces for change is a response of resistance or even indignation and offense. Perhaps resistance to change is made even easier by the ability on the part of many to view marginalized disciplines as "invisible" and not as something to be of concern to them. The thought of being made uncomfortable by colleagues that have always been largely invisible must certainly be beyond disconcerting and in fact it must come perilously close to being downright threatening. Noticing this discomfort in some of my own colleagues whenever the general education curriculum is discussed, and particularly when fuller inclusion is mentioned, I have tried to assess the situation from others' perspectives and imagine how it must feel to be "threatened" by "invisible people." No doubt it is disconcerting to say the least. It often follows, quite logically I believe, that those who make others feel uncomfortable in their academic worlds develop a reputation as insolent,

non-compliant, and disruptive. Consequently, "blame" can be placed upon individuals, and proposals can be dismissed as the rantings of embittered and disenfranchised individuals. Such dismissals can stifle full discussion and retard debate that might lead to genuine reform. Ritzer (1995) referred to this type of situation as endemic in America, a society in which the individual is often blamed for larger social problems. Individual weaknesses, after all, are vastly easier to deal with than are institutional deficiencies.

Colleges, like other social institutions, tend to respond to pressures placed upon them. In recent years, these pressures have included voices both internal and external to the college, seeking rationales for particular curricular inclusions and exclusions. Faculties struggle to reach agreement about not only what an educated person is, but what must be included in a general education curriculum that might have a decent chance at producing such an educated person. A knowledge about history, language, culture, science, and society must surely be included. Skills such as critical thinking (no one favors uncritical thinking), effective written and oral communication, and awareness of diversity issues and greater global interdependence seem equally necessary to the formation of an educated person. Despite these worthy pursuits, often what actually occurs in these curricular discussion is no more complex than a basic understanding of the concept that "might makes right." Whichever is stronger, forces of resistance, or forces advocating change, and whichever side can muster enough troops to fight for its proposals, is the side that tends most to effect the ultimate shape of the curriculum. Such power plays effect change every bit as much as might more intellectually honest and appropriate discussions focusing upon the merits and demerits of certain disciplines, courses, and preferred outcomes.

Discussions of the "outcomes" of general education tends to lead to even more problematic discussions of what curriculum might best achieve the desired ends of a given institution. Clewett (1998) considered the tendency among those discussing the future of higher

education and of the curriculum, to focus on the question of what should be taught, and what skills or competencies should be "mastered" (p. 271). The problem with this approach, as Clewitt ably points out, is that discussion must then necessarily focus upon the competing and often contentious demands of different subject areas and different academic departments. "One quickly confronts a seemingly infinite list of all the things an educated person 'must' know and a similarly daunting list of all the competencies, skills, or literacies she must acquire" (p. 272). The ensuing turf battles that arise over such lists are neither productive or even particularly enlightening, and serve little purpose beyond their role in exacerbating existing tensions within an academic environment hard-pressed to build all "valuable" constructions of knowledge into a compacted college curriculum.

Like everyone else who muses about change, or most anything else, my views about curricular changes and other collegiate issues cannot be insulated from my own "real world." The world in which this writing is set is that which I encountered each day in the writing of this work, as a professor in a small "liberal arts" college. The setting then was a small college, that, like other colleges, small and large alike, faced and faces the pressures of reconciliation between the high-minded utopian visions of education that faculty members often crave, and the "real world" practicality that students entering the new millennium demand. Allan (1997) ably frames this debate as between those who view small colleges as the paradigm for higher education in this country and those who view the liberal arts as out-of-date. This book attempts to focus the debate in order that we might eventually reconcile these conflicting pressures. By focusing upon selected disciplines that have traditionally been marginalized, we might gain more insight into where the margins ought to be, or if there ought to be margins at all. I cannot be certain if the level or intent of this discourse rises to the level of paradigm-shifting, but it does rise to the level of an attempt to at least reconsider, if not entirely displace, the dominant academic cultures. These dominant cultures have led us to academia's present state, which seems to be a conglomeration of various

disciplines competing for, rather than working with, scarce (and growing more scarce) resources.

Audience for the Book

Many of us know of the problems that beset higher education, both externally and internally. These problems have been chronicled by journalists and serious scholars alike. Why then should the reader have an interest in this work? My answer, like the work itself, is complicated and many layered. While many of the problems besetting the academy have been reported upon, seldom, if ever, have these problems been linked together to create a web of structural deficiencies that might be examined more fully. Put more simply, who determines how much and why, or how we view the curriculum from the inside, foretells the manner in which certain disciplines are treated which foretells the responses that certain disciplines take. This book hopes to link together the many disciplines, not only in its conclusions and hopes for greater integrative interdisciplinary study, but through examination of the natural "evolution" of the disciplines. After reading this book, it should not be any wonder that some marginalized disciplines seek "minimum standards" and national accrediting bodies as a means of self-protection, nor should it be any wonder why the reverse is also true, that non-marginalized disciplines feel no such need.

The way in which we view colleges and professors has necessarily been shaped by our own individual experiences and by the images of popular culture that sweep over us in various media forms. Some of these many images and perceptions are quite accurate, others are less true and many are simply wrong. This work attempts to reconcile our perceived images with the realities of one professor's academic life. In so doing, this work should be helpful to academic administrators and trustees interested in "how the other half lives," if only to better ensure their own and their institutions' continued "non-violent" survival. All of us interested in improving higher education, including professors, parents, alumnae, and students themselves, might gain a

better understanding of some of the complicated questions that both drive and continually stall many curriculum debates. A reasoned debate might lead to a more thorough understanding which might then evolve into a more genuinely inclusive curriculum adhering to high standards of traditional academia as well as career, and most importantly, life preparation.

Overview of Contents

This work assesses general education curricular changes by first charting the territory in which present curricular changes exist, and the landscape which new proposals must cross. To this end, the first three chapters illustrate the vast chasm that exists between administration and faculty while focusing upon the ever growing chasm between faculty members themselves who have become ever more divided (both willingly and unwittingly) into separate disciplines competing for scarce resources. Those of us who grew up in small towns might remember the condescending phrase "on the wrong side of the tracks," that was often used to describe the supposed undesirable elements often residing on the "wrong" side of town. A side quite often literally divided from the rest of the town by the railroad tracks that traversed many middle American villages. Having grown and become a resident of the wrong side of the academic tracks, one gains an entirely different perspective: from oppressor to oppressed, from reviler to reviled, and from empowered to powerless. Reconciling these two perspectives may take more ability than I possess. Contemplating that reconciliation, however, has led me to write this book and has given me the hope that your contemplation, if not your reconciliation, might be enhanced by reading it.

Chapters five and six concentrate on the deeply entrenched status quo that hinders genuine curriculum revision, and that nearly suffocates true reform. By exposing much of the artificiality of disciplinary boundaries we might be better enabled to consider changes proposed by those presently outside traditionally imposed boundaries.

Chapter seven specifically focuses upon boundary crossing between the marginalized

disciplines of teacher education and criminal justice. Given the "unfavored" and "underprivileged" status of these two popular disciplines, practitioners in both fields seem to be likely candidates for espousing changes within the curriculum. Advocating change, after all, comes more easily to those not entirely enamored with the status quo, and practitioners of these disciplines should have an excellent understanding of the power that "place" has within the general education curriculum and subsequently, the influence that a lack of place has upon our students and ourselves. Changes that tend toward greater inclusion might enhance the diversity of options available to our students and allow better career choices to ultimately be made. Students who make more appropriate and better informed career choices should stand a far greater chance for both professional sucess and personal contentment.

Chapters eight, nine, ten, and eleven look at the marginalized disciplines of criminal justice, ethnic studies, teacher education, and women's studies individually as emerging disciplines within the academy. These chapters begin to address the emergence of each of these disciplines as an attempt to focus the reader on the credibility with which each might lobby for more attention and more status within higher education.

Chapter twelve focuses anecdotally upon events that vividly illustrate the increasing polarization between faculty and administration and the subsequent alienation, disenchantment, and resentment that such polarization must surely create in all sides. This chapter's negative tone is meant to portray the despair that often triggers the inaction and silent resentment that so often accompanies those on the margins; such feelings being the natural course for those who perceive of themselves as outside of the decision-making process. One's perceptions of his or her value to an organization tends to have a tremendous effect upon professional productivity, as well as the mental health and well-being of the perceiver.

Chapters thirteen, fourteen, and the afterward attempt to wrap-up the work with a more positive and proactive tone, emphasizing the virtue of collaboration and interdependence in which

all parties might be valued. Marginalization, as an issue, will necessarily be lessened in an environment in which genuine inclusion and interdependence exist.

Chapter Two

"The Important Things"

> *"Universities have a distinctive task. It is the methodical discovery and the teaching of truths about serious and important things" (Shils, 1983, p. 3).*
>
> *"A page of history is worth a volume of logic" -- Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes*

The curriculum of any college or university determines the way in which that college or university is organized and defines the manner in which instruction is delivered. Despite the importance and lasting impact that the shape of the curriculum carries with it, curriculum is often portrayed merely as a benign list of educational objectives or skills that make up a course of study (Kronick & Hargis, 1998). What may be less benign is the nature of the decision-making process that ultimately creates that curriculum. Something that may be benign as a concept in and of itself, such as a curriculum, can be made somewhat malignant if it is shaped in such a way as to disfavor those on the margins while it favors those squarely on the "inside" of academia.

It is about those on the margins, and who it is that defines those "important things," as Shils refers to them, that are the primary interests of this work. The social construction of identity within academia has been largely ignored by those studying identity within other contexts such as class, race, gender, and ethnicity. While those other social constructions have surely been more significant, at least in global and community terms, other social constructions such as those which define our "place" and thereby our identity within our academic work environments are also worthy of our consideration. Like Lewis and Clark, I suppose, mapping the terrain of North America using whatever resources and guides were available to them, this book attempts to map the terrain of higher education, in which the various disciplines are populated by diverse and often eclectic

individuals all, ostensibly at least, sharing a common mission of education. Where these individuals fit within the larger academy has a tremendous impact upon the very nature of the academy and how those who come into contact with the academy learn to view themselves and others.

> "We all have a number of social identities which organize our relationships to other individuals and groups within our social world" (Craib, 1998, p. 4).

Those toiling in the marginalized disciplines have social identities within academia that have long been the product of powerful histories and perceptions not easily overcome. "Marginalized" in this work, refers to patterns of social and political inequality that are structured along the lines of group membership. In other words and for our purposes, membership within certain less well established disciplines on college campuses has created for the members of those disciplines, patterns of social and political inequality based on group membership alone.

Even the definition of marginalized groups is subject to interpretation. I make no claims that my belief that certain disciplines have been marginalized and thus render those who teach in those disciplines as marginalized within the academy is, or even should be the *only* interpretation of that word. Williams (1998) in her work concerning marginalization within the political structures of society, included in her definition of marginalized the belief that membership within marginalized groups is usually involuntary and non-mutable. Her work, which focused upon African-Americans and women, and the political marginalization that has historically befallen them, quite correctly defined her version of marginalization as including such qualities. Obviously, membership in the less established disciplines is both voluntary (at least initially) and mutable (again at least initially). The argument here, however, is that over time and with the credibility that history allows established groups to enjoy, those of us practicing within the less established (marginalized) disciplines are also relegated to a certain

status from which our escape is impossible.

Our identities as a part and parcel of our standing in relationship to our peers are, in many cases at least, in need of serious reevaluation and, given time perhaps, serious revision. The histories of the standing of those within women's studies, ethnic studies, teacher education, and criminal justice, among others, are histories replete with the type of bias and stereotyping that have long plagued numerous marginalized groups. There is beginning to be more interest in "identity politics" and the social constructions that assign identities and "places" both to individuals and groups; while the beginnings of the conversation are being mapped out, further inquiry is needed so that we might better understand not just our own places, but the places we've wittingly and unwittingly assigned others.

The standing of those disciplines which are able to be fully integrated into core curricula is sometimes self-evident, and sometimes a wonderment. The manner in which certain disciplines have attained or have failed to attain status is likewise a series of logical and illogical events. The manner in which boundaries are marked is no less than the way in which our entire social order is defined. Zerubavel (1991) wrote an important and somewhat overlooked book, *The Fine Line: Making Distinctions in Everyday Life*, in which he described the tremendous importance that we have societally placed upon distinguishing ourselves from others. To deny that we separate ourselves from others is to deny ourselves and the basis upon which most of our social organizations have been founded.

The appropriate nature of boundaries is sometimes self-evident. The inappropriate nature of some boundaries might also be equally self-evident, if we were to bother to take the time to properly assess those boundaries. We have historically come to realize (if not correct) artificial boundaries based upon race, ethnicity, and gender. We might begin to realize the need to more closely

examine other, less noticeable distinctions, like those that separate the "worthy" from the "unworthy;" distinctions generally made by the worthy themselves in an effort to keep their numbers manageable, and their benefits significant.

As we understand the importance placed upon boundaries in all of our social institutions; we might appropriately turn to an assessment of those boundaries within academia. Boundaries that become recognized and accepted as appropriate designations of place can be as harmful to the academic world as they are necessary. Sanders (1998) described boundaries as "essential for keeping things and people in their proper places. Without boundaries, there can be no definitions" (p. 32). Truer words have seldom been spoken, yet difficulty often arises when the boundaries are wholly artificial rather than based on some more rational basis, and/or when boundaries are used not to harmlessly define, but rather to harmfully exclude. bell hooks (1994, p. 177) wrote of the "intense silence about the reality of class differences" in educational settings. While hooks was not talking about differences in class between academics in differing disciplines, her point can be transferred to the class differences lamented in this work. The "intense silence" concerning class differences among the disciplines themselves and consequently among the practitioners of those disciplines has only contributed to tremendous misunderstandings about the role each of us plays in the academy.

Minow (1997), while acknowledging the legitimacy of some group-based identities, laments the labeling that allows some to regulate or even dominate others while benefitting themselves. Social identities are often formed based upon artificial distinctions that separate us from others. These social identities exist in academia, just as they do in the "real world," and, sometimes at least, the identities that others give to us are not the identities that we might choose for ourselves. Bercovitch (1998) cautions us against too much self-congratulation as we come to terms with the recognition of artificiality in established boundaries:

"to recognize that disciplines are artificial is not to transcend them" (p. 69). Still, as recognition is the first step toward the lessening of any "crisis," so too might recognition of the arbitrary nature of boundaries allow us to make strides toward a more inclusive curriculum and thus a more inclusive setting for all of us in higher education.

Boundaries that seem to have little relationship to reason can be an extremely powerful tool in the hands of curriculum directors and a faculty intent on retaining present "power" relationships. Boundaries within education can have a tremendous impact upon further reinforcing already dominant ideologies and further excluding the thoughts and contributions of those outside the dominant groups. Kronick & Hargis (1998), in a study of "dropouts," argued, I think persuasively, that most dropouts are "curriculum casualties rather than...casualties of personal, family, or financial problems" (p. 5). Despite the fact that curriculum casualities may be a lesser problem, and the concept of dropouts is surely a lesser problem in post-secondary education than it is in secondary education, casualties of courses of study too closely aligned with the past and reluctant to embrace the future remain a cause, if not the cause of many students' failures at all levels of the educational process. Artificial boundaries that make up many of the "reasons" for inclusions and exclusions within post-secondary education should not be dismissed when assessing student performance, and even student retention.

While boundaries between disciplines are surely not the only reason for higher education's failings (both perceived and real), they do play a role in constricting the growth of some disciplines and enhancing the status of others, despite what may be "natural" scholarly and, dare I say, market tendencies that might dictate that other directions be pursued. There is a cacophony of blame that has engendered a great many (often conflicting) suggestions for improvement.

George Bernard Shaw once said that all professions are conspiracies against

the public. Gaining control over services that the public needs has been a basic tenet of successful capitalists for centuries. More and more, unfortunately, the lines that had previously separated true capitalism in all its glory and all its faults from academia in all its glory and all its faults, are becoming obliterated by a bottom-line culture that often views short-term results as the only results that can be appropriately measured and hence, as the only results that matter. This mentality is vividly illustrated in the language of our culture in which people of my generation now all too often conclude their arguments with the phrase "at the end of the day." This phrase is meant to express this need and convey the speaker's ability to understand the bottom-line (that which matters), however strained the logic may be in finding that bottom line. Conspiring against the public in coming to that bottom-line may be the provence of commentators, and of corporate leaders, but it may not be in the best interests of academia to seek such a common and "undisputed" bottom-line. There are, after all, a minimum of two sides to every argument; sides, or positions, which need genuine assessment in order for us to fully understand the entire argument and come forth with the best of a series of possible actions.

Our ability to disagree as scholars is fundamental to the academic health and well-being of our institutions and needs to be applauded; our ability to shut out those with whom we disagree and/or perceive of as thinking "differently" must be equally lamented. Only, it seems, by understanding the depths of our ignorance about one another, might we inch forward toward the as of yet unattainable ideal of full inclusion and complete understanding, even in the face of passionate disagreement. We should not and cannot, I think, continue to conspire against the public in academia, and the alliances (conspiracies?) that we form with certain others to the exclusion of still others cannot be altogether healthy in the open environment that academia aspires to achieve. Gardner (1999) touts the virtue

known as compromise as we work together to achieve our mutual goals. "Even in a curriculum that focuses on understanding, there will continually be pressures to cover more topics, or to cover existing topics in different ways. Compromise has to be the order of the day" (p. 209). Should criminal justice, ethnic studies, women's studies, and teacher education play as vital a part in the education of all of us as should history, English, and science? Most of us would say...if pressed anyway...probably not. Should they play a larger role than they presently do? Most of us in those disciplines might likely say yes. How much larger their role should be must be a function of compromise in its most appropriate and positive sense.

Jeffrey Reiman, in his classic *The Rich Get Richer, and The Poor Get_Prison*, describes the criminal justice system as a "mirror in which a whole society can see the darker outlines of its face" (p. 1). Continuing with the image of that mirror, we might do well to consider our higher education system as a mirror in which our society has historically seen our best features, while effectively ignoring our worst. Whether this mirror has been largely a magical and distorted one in which we are unable to see our age lines, wrinkles, and "bad hair days" is a matter that warrants our increased consideration. By examining marginalized disciplines we might look critically at the reflections that we see in our higher education mirror. Such a critical look might allow us to determine whether, some disciplines, sadly, like the vampires of myth and legend, look into the mirror and see no reflection whatsoever of their existence. If a tree falls in the forest and no one hears it...does it make a sound? If a discipline is marginalized to the point where even colleagues are unsure of where it belongs, or if, more dramatically, a discipline falls within the academy and nobody notices...did it ever make a difference?

Levine (1996) wrote about the "small growth industry" (p. 3) that has evolved from a series of apocalyptic books, written by those on the inside and on the

outside of traditional academia. Books that have severely chastised American universities generally, and the American professoriate particularly. Nisbet (1971) seems to have foretold the most recent spate of books condemning higher education and those who practice within the realm of higher education.

> "That the university has suffered, during the past decade or two, a lowering of office in American society, a diminution of the esteem in which it was held almost universally until recently, seems to me no more than obvious" (p. 4).

Among these works most critical of those of us within higher education, Kimball's *Tenured Radicals* perhaps received the most attention, in part, no doubt, due to its attention grabbing title. While the book received significant attention and much acclaim, at least on some fronts, the premise seems entirely at odds with the realities of life in academia. Rorty (1995) believed that despite the claims of largely conservative groups that the academy was over populated with radicals from the left, and advocates of "extreme multiculturalism," such individuals actually comprised only an estimated 2% of the professoriate. Like the myth of the "liberal media," the myth of the "liberal academy" seems to have been commonly accepted merely because it is so often repeated as a commonly accepted or known "fact."

> "The assumption that large parts of the academy are now controlled by radicals has led to the conviction that the objective search for truth, which once characterized the university, has been eclipsed by conscious partisan advocacy" (Levine, 1996, p. 8).

Levine ably disputes the works by Kimball and others, and asserts that those works are quite contrary to his lifetime of experiences from within an academia which he views as:

> "doing a more thorough and cosmopolitan job of educating a greater diversity of students in a broader and sounder array of courses covering the past and present of the worlds they inhabit than ever before in its history" (p. 17).

Like Kimball, and so many others, I too am concerned by "partisan advocacy." In contrast, however, it is the partisanship that leans toward corporatization which I fear, and the "liberalization" so feared by popular writers seemed completely absent as I practiced my craft of teaching at a small private college, and less than popular as I presently practice my craft at a medium-sized private university. This "conservatism" extends beyond any and all political implications into the pervasive protections of existing institutions, like curriculum. Miller (1998) wrote truthfully, if cynically, in citing the findings of Tyack and Cuban in their book *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*.

> "For those interested in radically reshaping educational practice in order to address the gross inequities in the extant system, these findings are bound to be disappointing, since they confirm the notion that the institution is fundamentally conservative and suggest the impossibility of 'meaningful' change, however that might be construed" (p. 23).

That complex social organizations, like those comprising the higher education establishment, have an inherent structural resistance to all but the most incremental changes, cannot be rationally disputed and I will not attempt to do so here. Nevertheless, there is value in pointing out the glaring differences between outside perceptions and inside realities, and as more and more persons might be made aware of these paradoxes, more and more persons might be compelled to work for genuine change.

As I ponder the "liberal" nature of academia, I feel much like I do attempting to tune in a radio station in the afternoon, when I can choose between Rush Limbaugh, G. Gordan Liddy, Oliver North, and Michael Reagan bashing the "uncontrolled, and unassailable liberal" media, so all-pervasive to them, but a media that I cannot seem to find anywhere on my AM dial. Scheuer (1999) cites a similar disbelief in the existence of a "liberal media" in his work *The Sound Bite Society*, in which, among other things, he assails the widespread and sorely mistaken perception that

"liberals" somehow control the airwaves. The prevalence of "right-wing fireworks, with their sparks of extremism, bigotry, and invective, are what sell audiences, not moderate or progressive arguments" (p. 48). Still, no matter how many scholars cite the evidence that most newspapers and most TV commentators, and nearly all talk-radio commentators lean significantly to the right, the perception that there exists a liberal bias in the media is pervasive and far-reaching. Whether it is a "conservative" media that shapes public opinion, or whether it is a powerful and conservative elite, is less a question for debate (at least in my left-leaning mind), than it is an explanation for class dominance at every level of society...even in academia.

Domhoff (1996) in his work *State Autonomy or Class Dominance?*, cites his belief that, contrary to the Limbaughs of the world assailing the "control" of government and the "liberal" media, it is actually class dominance that controls public policy in this country. The very class of which the members of the media, and certainly the ones listed above, belong to and celebrate with intensity. The government, in Domhoff's view, is not nearly so powerful, nor nearly as prevalent in our lives, as is corporate interest and upper class influence. Smiley (1996), another talk-radio host, albeit with a significantly different political leaning than those cited above, seems to agree with Domhoff's assertion that the "real power" is no longer in government, when he states that "the real power in this country today is in the media. You can arguably do more with one sixty-second commentary than with several bills" (p. 16). Sanders (1998) laments the continuing turn away from reasoned discourse toward the easy alternatives presented by Rush Limbaugh and his brethren; talk show hosts that instruct millions of us how to think about complicated political and social issues. While in academia the talking heads are less well known, and certainly better educated, their influence is often similarly based upon their ability to have us accept their thinking as our own.

However bizarre this dichotomy between reality and perception seems to be in assessing many of the tenets of our popular culture, the dichotomy is at its most bizarre when we consider the current plight of academia in a social, political, and economic environment which continually assails the academy both in spirit and in words. Even when I recall my days within the small college environment, it seems ever more clear that those expressing support for, or at least those silently and complacently witnessing the administration's ongoing "corporatization," had become a strong majority displacing any sort of "radical" fringe objecting to a diminishment in the liberal arts and any subsequent diminishment in faculty autonomy. Fox & Sakolsky (1998) described the opposition to changes at their own institution as "depressingly sporadic." "Many of the older faculty look forward to escape through early retirement, while many of the untenured faculty are either wary of making waves or supportive of the university's move into mainstream affiliation" (p. 14). In my view, opposition in the form of open debate and through advocating open and rational decision-making need not be deemed radical, but merely "collegiate." While discipline and blind obedience to administrative initiatives may carry some merit in the primary and secondary schools, it should have no place among college faculty members.

It is with an understanding of this background that we might consider what could be called the postmodern higher education environment. According to Woller (1997), postmodernism is a "questioning of the beliefs of modernism, not necessarily by rejecting them but with at least the intent of refining or reinterpreting them" (p. 9). A postmodern look at academia and the higher education curriculum specifically, requires that we open our minds to a refinement or even a reinterpretation of previously deeply held values and beliefs. Bloland (1995) defined postmodernism as a "perspective" (p. 525). A perspective, however, that "renders as questionable the major assumptions and assertions of our modern culture" (p. 525). Rosenau

(1992) makes the assertion that "post-modern social scientists support a re-focusing on what has been taken for granted...the repressed...the peripheral, the excluded, the silenced..." (p. 8). If Rosenau, and the others cited are correct, then let me be a member of this group, and let this work be a reflection of my desire to join in the attack on the major assumptions that have enveloped higher education in a sheath of armor largely impenetrable to influence from outside of the mainstream.

Problematic in any attack upon "modernism" and its assumptions, are the assumptions inherent in post-modernism itself. Postmodernism is often poorly and/or inadequately defined, and as such has come to mean so much to so many, that it may actually mean very little to anyone. When espousing any theory it seems inevitable that some assumptions must be made, and it is troubling, on some levels, to attack assumptions of modernism while making new assumptions based on new theories. If much of postmodernism is about rejecting the absolute notions of "truth" that modernism has proclaimed, then our new desire to understand the greater complexity of issues and get away from absolute truths and generalizations requires an acceptance on our part of our own truths, even if these truths are seemingly innocuous ones such as "there are no absolute truths or absolute generalizations."

Allan (1997) refers to the "master narratives" which we have accepted as true, when in fact these narratives are merely "stories concocted to legitimate the authority of those currently in positions of power" (p. 87). Since these stories are not objective structures, they can be changed...if we want them changed. Our acceptance of curriculum paradigms as some sort of truth rather than merely as a series of decisions made by those who've gone before us, has limited our abilities to separate legitimate challenges from some sort of perceived treason against the throne of college history.

> "It's simply not the case that we have been approaching Truth by slow and measured steps along an upward sloping avenue. Nor has our history been marked by the progressive spread of Liberty, of

> parliamentary democracy and economic justice" (p. 87).

Just as we have accepted the Truths of democracy in wider society, despite voluminous evidence against democracy's genuine implementation, we have also accepted that our colleges are open truth-seeking venues, despite contrary values that rule our often quite secretive echelons of leadership. A study of the curriculum is a study of power, at least insofar as it tells us how different constituencies construct their individual social realities, and how willingly or unwillingly these constituencies might adapt to changes in long accepted socially constructed realities. Unfortunately, all too often our criticisms are seen not as our own attempts to seek truth, but rather as affronts to loyalty that our institutions have commanded despite their rhetorical willingness to tolerate difference. Hinchey (1998) would have us consider our own place in the hierarchical scheme of things: "trying to determine patterns of constructed consciousness and hegemony, as well as their cause and effect" (p. 33). Surely, as professors, we want our students to consider their places within our collective constructed consciousness and how it is they've been either relegated or advanced to that place largely aside from any individual merits or demerits that they might have exhibited.

Into the Academic Mainstream

> "The goals of the education system--to enhance the competitiveness of nations and the self-fulfillment of citizens--are supposed to justify the immense investment of money and energy" (Egan, 1997, p. 9).

The goals of education, at any level, seem constant, whether or not we are able to describe them using different terms. Sharing common goals, if indeed we all do, should make progress toward their attainment much more realistic. Stark & Lattuca (1997) suggested that while we recognize the differences between more narrow subject matter goals and more expansive educational goals, we remain cognizant

of their necessary interdependence. Progress toward common goals, however, and recognition of our interdependence are concepts that are not always as simple as they might seem to be. Progress toward any goal in a higher education environment is never as simple as it might seem to be.

As this work considers entry into the mainstream, it is valuable to assess what the mainstream is. More directly to the point, before certain marginalized disciplines dip their toes into the academic waters, it may be prudent to assess the current, lest we all be swept away. My experience leads me to believe that the mainstream of the liberal arts curriculum is one of conceptual conservatism in which that which has always been is clung to and, in many cases, even revered. At the same time, our substantial and growing dependence upon corporate funds and our ties to business require us to view colleges as we view other businesses, despite obvious and glaring differences that perhaps should make them impossible to compare. Howley et al., (1995) in their work on American schooling, wrote more eloquently than I might, about their belief that most schemes for "reform" belie the bureaucrats and politicians desire to make schooling more and more supportive of "economic dominion." In their view, such a desire is "undemocratic, anti-intellectual, and an affront to human potential" (p. xv). While I cannot be certain as to whether the encroachment of business and business interests is all of these things in higher education as well, it is cause for concern that boards of trustees continue to be dominated by businesspersons to the exclusion, no doubt purposefully, of academics and/or intellectuals.

When we combine conceptual conservatism with the political conservatism that tends to be pervasive in business, we have an atmosphere that is far short of "radical." Karabell (1998) described the university as an "institutionally conservative" place. "It asks both students and faculty to conform to behavior that has been sanctified over time" (p. 94). Professors, both tenured and untenured,

seem utterly complacent to go about their own business somewhat oblivious to the world around them; it seems, to me anyway, that this makes them less radical than it makes them "conservative," at least in the sense that conservatism conserves the present and tends not to embrace change. Even those among us, who view themselves as anything but "conservative" are often so busy expressing their "ironic detachment" from their surroundings that their existance among us is little more than physical. To do anything, for or against change, might be seen by others as an acceptance of the mainstream point of view, and so complacence and inaction becomes some sort of defense against the structure. I guess. Choosing not to do anything becomes so very much more intellectually agreeable...except to those of us actively fighting for forward movement who often view those who do nothing as even more disagreeable than those who actively oppose change.

All of this makes for a mainstream in which the current, while slowly flowing, is extremly powerful, and one that threatens the well-being of those who dare to enter the academic "mainstream" with anything other than the reverance and fear that might allow one to dip one's toes and nothing more into an unknown body of water. Faculty, like staff, and other members of the college community often face tremendous pressures to "conform," lest they be swept away by the powerful currents. The more dissident and perhaps acid-tongued among us, might even view many of these moves toward "conformity" as simple and transparent attempts at "bootlicking" or "sucking up to the bosses," or perhaps more eloquently, as sheer survival through "spiritual drowning." Loeb (1994), more eloquently and less vehemently, viewed basic career and self-preservation as the motivating influence behind this conformity. In his view there is a quite distinct need for professors who have strong career incentives to distance themselves from public controversies given the "traditionally conservative culture of the academy"(p. 90).

> "Subtle pressures are offered today when a professor moves too far toward social reform, institutional

> reform, or even when he or she tries to reform a professional endeavor. The boards of trustees in most institutions...govern who gets the rewards of acclaim and eventual renumeration for their efforts. Usually, conservative ideas--those that accept the institution or the canon of the profession as it is--prevail" (Young, 1997, p. 134).

Despite the pressures to conform, there still exist opportunities for alternative thoughts to prevail. Just as we might hope for on our college campuses, the diversity of opinion as represented by so many recent works speaks of the continued presence of both the American university and the American professoriate as a force to be reckoned with in American society. Whether our "force" has been historically too great and is appropriately fading, or whether it has been not great enough and needs to be expanded is a matter of much contentious debate. The voices of those who believe we've been too loud and radical have tended to drown out the voices of those who are beginning to question such a characterization as flawed at best, and wholly untrue at worst.

Christopher Jencks' and David Reisman's *The Academic Revolution*, widely praised and oft-cited, both shortly after it appeared in 1968 and still today, focused upon the issue of "faculty domination" within academia. Later, in 1980, Reisman chronicled the changes on campus in his book *On Higher Education*, in which he saw a diminishing of faculty influence and what he then perceived to be the new supremacy of the student market. While the nature of these works has allowed and will allow them continuing relevance, today's higher education focus is most often upon the issue of outside control over academia. Again, Fox & Sakolsky's (1998) descriptions of change on their own campus ably describe many of the changes on campuses throughout America: "what was once an intimate community of scholars and activists has become, like so many other campuses, simply a human resource training and allocation platform for business and state government interests" (p. 16).

Outside control touches upon sacred concepts such as academic freedom, and the First Amendment, and the less sacred, though no less real issue of the ever increasing encroachment of business and corporate interests into the academic sphere. Neither the issue of "inside domination" nor "outside control" has been resolved to the satisfaction of all. These and other less general issues, even formerly "mystical" issues such as the amount of time professors actually spend in class have many legislators as well as interested citizens increasing their voices of "concern" over the quality of higher education in America today. Despite an increasing awareness of mounting public scrutiny and even hostility, academics have been slow to respond adequately either in their own defense or as agents of reform. Criticisms from the inside toward these "outsiders," mostly valid in my view, have been barely sufficient to at least temporarily stem the flow from what could ultimately become a tidal wave of support for increased outside governance and a genuine lessening in autonomy (and likely quality as well) within and among college faculties. Those of us not unionized (which, in academia, means most of us) must fear the onslaught of "preemptive union-busting."

Cary Nelson's 1997 *Manifesto of a Tenured Radical*, continued and expanded upon the theme of the diminishment of faculty influence. It is a theme that this work attempts to tie together, not only with life within academia, but with regard to how a diminishing faculty (in every sense of the word diminishing, including both positive and negative connotations, as well as in sheer full-time numbers) will impact society as a whole and the way in which society addresses the needs of its citizens. *Manifesto of a Tenured Radical* was highly influential, and would serve as a very valuable companion for anyone reading this work who remains interested in higher education issues. It is my hope that the readers both on the margins and within the accepted mainstream allow this work to give them food for thought as they reflect upon the changing face of higher education in America.

With Friends Like These...or Surely You Joust

> "Some of the worst things said about the American university have been said by university people" (Oakley, 1992, p. 268).

Those of us inside academia, often realize that it is a far less docile and benevolent place than myth has afforded it. Turf battles, paranoia, deception, as well as genuine meanness, exist every bit as much, if not more, in academia as they do outside. Egos that often accompany advanced degrees have been known to impact otherwise civilized and rational debate concerning curriculum issues and other "threats" to individual faculty members and individual disciplines. Egos among long-term faculty without the most advanced degrees can be even more fragile, as they sometimes feel compelled to protect their tenuous (real or perceived) standing against assault from highly credentialed interlopers. To say that "we're all in this together" is, sadly, less true than it should be in an environment that only exists because of and for openness and education. "Anyone who has spent any time at all in a University knows that it is not a model community, that few communities are more petty and vicious than University faculties" (Readings, 1996, p. 180). Matthews (1997) describes academia as "strongly territorial, but not very social" (p. 36). Boudreau (1998) eloquently compares academia to the rugged middle ages.

> "The typical university is a pedagogical pasticcio of highly specialized academic departments that exist like feuding fiefdoms ruled over by a dean who acts more like the ruling don of a medieval city-state consisting of quarrelsome families" (p.2).

Nisbet (1971) writes: "it would be a gross disservice, false indeed, to imply that the academic community was free of internal conflict or that it was surcharged with feelings of radiant good will" (p. 46). If our society has grown meaner since 1971, so too has academia. Garger (1995) describes his experiences making a presentation to his fellow professors this way: "I felt I was being attacked

and forced to defend myself from people I thought were on my side" (p. 41). Katz (1997) writes that academe, like other places, "is no longer a meeting place, but a battleground on which the most pressing issues never get resolved" (p. 129). Our divisiveness lies at the root of our inability to grant "full inclusion" to so many entities that aren't exactly like those we most trust, be they our own race, ethnic heritage, religion, political affiliation, or, in this case, academic specialty. However oxymoronic it may seem, we are a "community founded upon disunity." Richard Russo's fictional work *Straight Man* allows the lead character (a professor) to muse that his university's failings have been less a matter of policy than of the faculty's "epic failures of imagination and goodwill" (p. 66). Blurring the lines between fiction and non-fiction, however dangerous, seems altogether appropriate in a world in which what often occurs relates much more closely to fiction, than to anything having any real world benefit or even consequence.

"I am not just Cranky...Dammit... I'm Just Shamelessly Seeking Attention!"

> "It's extraordinary how easily one can become a pariah in an academic community, where everyone is supposed to be so broad-minded" (Alcorn, 1997, p. 22).

This work's already ample lamentations suggest that the tenor of this work may be combative; I do not intend it to be so (at least entirely). Still, there seems to be little need for sugarcoating the realities that surround exclusive practices and policies. I have been urged, even by scholars in my own "marginalized" field to "tone down" the manner in which I negatively portray the conservativism and elitism that has, in my view, plagued many traditional disciplines, and continues to plague college campuses today. The trouble with toning down the rhetoric and "respectfully requesting," rather than "demanding" equality seems to be that same trouble that stifled debate about civil rights for decades. African-Americans

who drank from separate fountains and sat in the back of the bus, did so for practical reasons: the genuine and reasonable fear of the majority and the vengeance of the unenlightened. Academia, however rhetorically violent, poses few such physical threats to our security. It seems then, that after years of politely seeking inclusion, largely to no avail, we might up the ante and provoke more debate, through whatever methods that debate must be provoked. Like so many things, there is a fine line between "aggressiveness" on the part of those seeking inclusion and defensiveness on the part of those blocking that inclusion. Which side is more at fault for the potential contentiousness of the debate, is, in my view at least, not always clear.

The topic of change within the curriculum and full inclusion of heretofore "lesser" disciplines, seems to attach itself to great controversy and a profound sense of defensiveness on the part of many of those more fully entrenched within the academic establishment. I was once anonymously criticized by a colleague at another institution for the "polemical" tone of my writing and the polemical tone of this entire inclusion/exclusion debate. My "reasoned" (or so I want to believe) response to this assertion and my reasoned response to those who want to silence this debate as too difficult to consider and too divisive to allow serious attention, has been and continues to be: "polemical...my ass!" Such attempts, however lame, to find humor in tense situations may be our only hope of survival in an academic environment that continues to oppress so many with so much to offer, even if those offerings are not entirely mainstream. Hass (1998) in one of the recent spate of books that focus upon "moral intelligence" wrote: "we judge others harshly in order to obliterate our insecurities. Truly confident people are not critical people. They don't need to be" (p. 138). It is indeed often true that truly confident people need not be critical...of themselves, of others, of anything. The truth of such an assertion, however, does not end the debate, nor does it lessen the

need for us to examine why some are so confident and others less so. Is this confidence borne out of their virtue, moral or otherwise, or is it merely because of their rather comfortable lot in life? Casting aside the individual differences among and between members of certain disciplines, is the collective "confidence" on display in some disciplines, present because of their inherent individual and/or colletive virtue or because of their historically powerful place within the academy? It seems as though those people most comfortable in our society, whether that comfort comes from high socio-economic standing, educational standing, or past reputation, have self-evident reasons that readily explain their complacency and/or their lack of complaint and criticism. In most accessible terms, "what's not to like," about the "place" that many in the "non-marginalized" disciplines and the "non-marginalized" sectors of our society have found themselves? Further research is not needed to determine why it is that persons who find themselves in good standing tend not to complain. Research may be needed to determine why anyone might equate that contentedness with achievement and criticism with a lack of self-confidence.

Thinking people, whether confident or not, need to be critical, both of themselves and, constructively of course, of others. When I read the collected works of psychologists who concern themselves with the faults of others, I am struck by how such an assessment of my work might lead to the conclusion that I am polemical, hypercritical, lacking in self-confidence, and a generally reprehensible colleague and person. I cannot combat such a perception, in fact, given the personality traits I've listed above combined with the egomania that writing a book, any book, at least implies, I may perceive of myself as being above a need to challenge it. Still, with due seriousness, can the status quo be challenged...nicely? Can complacency, academic or otherwise, be challenged...in a purely positive manner? While I have begged the answer to many of those questions,

it is surely important to make certain that the standards that I apply to other disciplines, and to others generally, I have applied to myself and to my discipline. If criminal justice, teacher education, women's studies, ethnic studies, and/or other "fringe" disciplines seek to be incorporated more effectively into the mainstream of academia, surely we must take a look at ourselves, just as we expect those more "accepted" to take a hard and critical look at themselves and what they offer the academy. Taking a hard and critical look at all the disciplines and of the purposes of the academy in a changing world may sometimes require us to be uncomfortable and even to admit to some things of which we are less than proud. Whatever pain is caused, however, only emphasizes how genuinely necessary reflective examination is.

To borrow a concept espoused by many Hollywood agents' perceptions concerning publicity: even negative publicity may prove superior to no publicity whatsoever. On our campuses, we need not seek publicity for its own sake or for our individual aggrandizement, but, as academics in marginalized disciplines, we do need greater attention in the form of more substantial consideration of our ideas, and a postmodern look at the curriculum that might be genuinely more inclusive.

There are times when seeking inclusion politely seems no more effective for academics than it was for civil rights activists. Rosa Parks, after all, refused to go to the back of the bus...she was, however, asked to go and expected to go. Her "insolence" in the face of "polite society" was a key factor in a movement that led to profound (if unfinished) changes in society. It is my hope that my insolence will lead at a minimum to the granting of greater attention to this issue; attention that previous "polite requests for consideration" tended not to garner. I know that such a tone makes this work vulnerable to charges that it is too personal and thereby is subject to my own petulance and simple tendency toward "whining." Would that it were. While much of what is written is, of course,

based upon my own personal observations, the reader, whether inside or outside of academia, should have little trouble recognizing him or herself both within the author and within the characters portrayed within the anecdotal portions of the work. Insolence as a means of seeking attention (not unlike the actions of any self-respecting teen-ager) comes with a price. Colleagues who need to be "on board" may be instead affronted by challenges to the status quo into which they have become rather comfortable participants. Woodrow Wilson said, among other profound things, "if you want to make enemies, try to change something." Whether that statement was induced by his Presidency of the United States, or of Princeton University, or by both, his affirmation of the difficulty in seeking change without discomfort should not be lost upon those of us seeking consideration of new alternatives within academia.

Whatever attention is gained, through insolence or other means, and after seemingly intractible issues are reconsidered, relationships may need rebuilding. It is my hope that these relationships might be more meaningful and genuinely collaborative after the storm of controversy has passed and the calm of the workplace is restored. The key is that the issues be fairly and rationally considered, and that tradition be respected rather than worshipped. Genuine persuasion requires that those persuaded understand the points made well enough to be able to sensibly weigh proposals against alternatives and then for good reasons either agree or disagree with the persuader. Understanding, common sense, and good judgment all require the ability to listen to the points of view of others, even those "alternative" points of view that are not necessarily given great attention in the mainstream.

While we may not need to carry on lasting friendships with one another in order to create a positive environment, we most certainly need to collaborate with one another and support one another in a much more community oriented workplace than that to which most of us have now become accustomed. Blackburn & Lawrence

(1995) among others, write about the need and value of a positive intellectual climate, in which professors can float ideas and receive considered responses that urge them to press on. Advanced degrees, it seems, make one no less dependent upon positive reinforcement, and no less stifled by negative reinforcement.

The stifling effects of negative reinforcement, and the fear that many of us have that such reinforcement might come our way, often chills debate. To whatever degree we may encourage our students to "question everything," we often act ourselves as though we "question nothing" (particularly until we might get tenure). Certainly it appears as colleges become ever more corporatized, many faculty members are less and less able and willing to question administrative initiatives. Change requires a faculty that is comprised of individuals willing to subject themselves to questioning, and one that collectively takes risks. Rosenzweig (1998) asserted:

> "there is no avoiding the plain fact that what happens in any university is often led by, and always limited by, the willingness of faculty to accept change" (p. xv).

Risk-taking in an environment in which classes are continually enlarged and teaching loads increased becomes ever more difficult, even as it becomes ever more necessary. Lewis (1996) alluded to increased corporatization in citing statistics from the years 1975 to 1990 during which time faculty member positions increased 21%, while administrative positions increased 42% (p. 139). Just as has been the case in much of corporate America, cost-cutting and increased workloads seems to have its greatest urgency in lower levels of organizations. Greater inequality between pay structures for collegiate "executives" and faculty members has also widened, lending further support to the ongoing corporatization of the collegiate workplace. Perhaps it is only justice that professors who have (usually) silently witnessed the decrease in unionization and increase in wage inequality in more traditional workplaces, should now be so victimized in their own environments.

Putting the Cart Before the Horse

Acknowledging that outside governance issues are troubling, and they no doubt are, there are also the crucial issues concerning what might be called "inside governance." The issue is how we govern ourselves, and how we work with our colleagues. How we govern ourselves must be a primary issue that supercedes any worry about how others govern us, for if we cannot form effective and meaningful collective coalitions on the inside, outside critics are the least of our worries. To worry about outside governance may be, at least to some degree, a case of "putting the cart before the horse," or in more traditional (and perhaps even outdated) academic terms: "putting the chariot before the horse."

Addressing the problems inside and outside of college campuses requires a greater mutual understanding and trust among and between various "disciplines." Disciplines that I argue are often based more upon archaic and outdated tradition than upon necessary distinctions. These distinctions have occasionally cut off academics from practitioners who might greatly benefit from collaboration rather than mutual distrust and/or indifference. Sullivan (1995) suggested "replacing the relative isolation of the university with new relationships between it and education in its many dimensions, health provision, and business and the workforce" (p. 161).

The paranoia that we now exhibit with greater frequency, usually in the form of distrust of other disciplines, runs counter to the openness and acceptance that genuine mutual cooperation requires. How might we achieve more openness and trust in an environment that has administrations seeking more and more to replace tenured faculty with part-time low-wage instructors? Pratt (1997) lamented the "abusive situation" she called part-time employment that "is just too convenient for institutions to give up if they don't have to" (p. 264). Veysey (1965) pointed out a trend becoming apparent and troublesome more than three decades ago: "Like

shrewd businessmen, university presidents and trustees sought to pay their faculties as little as the 'market price' demanded" (p. 311). Young (1997) echoed such sentiments in his acknowledgement that "all colleges and universities have been affected by the corporate realities of institutional life" (p. 128). These corporate realities should have already created an environment in which faculty (workers) are distrusting of administrators (management), and because of such an atmosphere, the workers should be looking to unite in an effort to preserve themselves, if not the institutions themselves. Unfortunately, our propensities tend toward individualism and reflective inaction, rather than community and collective action. The more we fight one another in order to protect our self-defined and largely self-valued "turf," the less we might work together to improve our collective lot. The more divisions among us, the more we play into the hands of administrators and trustees who seek to make us "independent contractors" who might be let go largely at will, and who are wholly dependent upon market rather than academic forces. The continual erosion of the boundaries between the university and the marketplace has been a fact of higher education for decades, and by now, the erosion into one indistinguishable "university-marketplace mass" has become nearly complete.

Today, the "radicals" upon our campuses are not the students or even the faculty, but members of the administration who tend to look for creative ways in which to increase our ties to corporate America and lessen the pay, status, and influence of faculty. The 1997 UPS strike (one of the very few at least partially "successful" strikes in recent years) was fought, at least in significant part, over the increasingly widespread trend within industry generally, and that industry in particular, of using part-time and temporary employees, rather than full-time, fully pensioned, and well benefitted employees. Security that American workers once may have had, continues to be opposed by many in management, who are increasingly bent on a lean and largely disposable workforce. At the same time as we seek to

include our respective disciplines into the mainstream, the mainstream itself is being threatened. While I recognize the potential hypocracy of my challenge to administrative changes to the mainstream, while I lament faculty adherence to the liberal arts mainstream, I am confident that the body of this work will ably reconcile these two very real and very diverse positions.

In *Will Teach for Food*, several contributors consider the possibility of greater unionization. Increasing the influence of collective bargaining and union influence is seen as a necessary response, if not for faculties generally, at least for graduate students, part-time staff and faculty, and the most exploited among us. Unionizing faculties would mean "change," and change within and among faculties is often a much dirtier word and a much harder sell than anything management could and has proposed and/or unilaterally initiated. Reversing, or at a minimum, slowing down the trend in recent years that has seen a growing imbalance of power between workers and employers may mean greater organization, at least in some form, on the part of collegiate faculties. Greater organization doesn't necessarily mean unionization; it may, however, mean that grandiose yet proper goals such as community building and collaborative decision-making cannot be fully realized until the power structures themselves are changed.

Much has changed on college campuses since the late 1960s. "Radicals" are less and less present and "conservatives" (in every sense of that word) are becoming more and more prevalent. Whatever impact this has had upon the dynamics of given institutions, it has contributed to a reluctance on the part of entrenched interests within and outside of colleges and universities to consider real changes, which has accordingly decreased the dynamic nature of the higher education enterprise. It may be time to suggest changes which might increase the dynamic nature of higher education, and return us to a more enlightened time, or better yet move us forward into a time in which new ideas are welcomed, assessed, and positive changes can

be made furthering the interests of students, faculty, and communities alike. Weinbaum (1999) suggests that workers must do a better job of convincing entire communities of the interdependence between good and well-paying jobs and widespread community benefits. "Entire communities are affected when plants close, when workers have less purchasing power, or when good jobs are converted to unpredictable jobs with poverty-level wages" (p. 52). The effect upon communities when colleges eliminate tenure, increase the use of part-time instructors, and depend entirely upon the market to dictate the wages of professors needs to be assessed community wide, not merely campus wide. Russo & Corbin (1999) seek a greater understanding of what they describe as the "covenant" between employer and worker that expresses itself in terms of "basic justice in the work relationship that goes beyond wages at market rates" (p. 102).

Issues of basic justice in the workplace do indeed extend themselves into this larger debate over inclusion. Anecdotes abound about workplace inequities, and college campuses include their fair share of these discussions, both in the open, and perhaps more often in the shadows. Bringing these issues into the open may mean that profitable or successful workplaces might need to consider their workers as something more than fungible entities that must be employed at no more than market rates. On my former campus, there had been limited discussion of the inequities that existed when new hires were brought in at salaries more competitive with "going market rates," which often meant that newly hired assistant professors might be paid more than their department heads who were hired years before at significantly inferior rates. When confronted with evidence of these inequities, that administration, at that time, had simply chosen to tell the affronted (and often long loyal faculty) that "market rates" dictated their policies, and adjustments for those who have remained would not be in the cards. Loyalty to an institution, while perhaps noble, seems at times to lead to a slow and painful personal financial

suicide.

Discussion of equity issues again rise when workers (in this case professors) begin to realize that administrators are rewarded for "successes," while professors are warned of the competition that exists for academic jobs and their self-protective complacency is therefore mandated. The interesting dichotomy, so often found in business, raises its head in academia as well, in so far as those at the top are given "incentives" to achieve, while those at the bottom have virtually no organizational incentive to reach beyond mediocrity. Fortunately in the case of those who choose teaching as a profession, at all levels, there appears to be a frequent and inherent altruistic desire to better the organization.

Grossberg (1992) described his work *We Gotta Get Out of This Place*, as a book with "too many arguments and not enough evidence." His self-criticism was tempered by his view that emphasis upon argument alone was appropriate and valuable in a world with "too much evidence and not enough argument" (p. 1). Like Grossberg, I believe that there is a need for greater emphasis upon discourse in our society, academic and otherwise. As for a "lack of evidence," it is always difficult to bring forth concrete evidence as to how proposed but unimplemented changes might impact society. Without real progress toward change, it is nearly impossible to transcend mere rhetoric and effectively speculate on how a given change might ultimately alter the course of any social institution. All we might do is make our best educated guesses as to how changes might turn out, and if reasoned and passionate arguments can be made in favor of changing even the most entrenched and accepted structures, these arguments at least deserve our consideration. This book is a plea for that consideration.

We No Longer Have the Right to Remain Silent

"It's hard to act when dissenting movements are remote or

> invisible" (Loeb, 1994, p. 28).

Paulo Freire (1970) in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* spoke of the "culture of silence." Spring (1994) interprets and expands upon Freire's characterization of dehumanization as a persistent theme of the oppressed.

> "Living in a culture of silence, people do not make their lives an object of reflection. They just act without reflecting on the reasons for their actions...They are objects of history as opposed to being subjects of history. They do not make history; history makes them" (pp. 160-61).

Carolyn Law (1995) in referring to autobiographical work by academic women, asserts that such work "teaches us that when one has no voice one is as good as invisible, and invisibility is, in the long run, intolerable" (p. 5). Scholars practicing in such fields as women's studies and ethnic studies, in particular, know only too well, I presume, their status within an insulated academic world in which class consciousness, unfortunately, is every bit as prevalent as it is outside the walls of academia.

The golden hue of silence is often undeniable, particularly in contexts and settings like faculty meetings famous for verbosity, pomposity, and ineffectuality, where rhetoric often passes for its own reality quite apart from any more objective vision of reality. The reality for those of us on the margins of academia, who have already been silent for far too long, must be one in which we step forward and speak out effectively on our own behalfs. Failure to do so will necessarily subject us to lives as mere complacent objects of history absent the necessary reflection that might make us contributing members of an academic and a larger culture. Just as student "radicals" called for greater "relevance" of the curriculum in the 1960s, I propose that we consider increasing the relevance of the curriculum for professors as well and for society generally as we enter the new century. To do so, to increase the relevance, requires that those of us already on the inside be freed, or more likely, we free ourselves from the shackles

that bind us to a system of general education that, at many colleges, is more exclusive than inclusive, and from a divisive system far too entrenched in the traditional disciplines. When and if we are able to free ourselves from these chains, we will be able to greatly increase the frequency of genuine interactive dialogue and genuine interactive problem-solving in a world with an increasingly difficult and interactive set of problems. Even those things which sound, on their face, uncontroversial, tend to evoke controversy in the academy.

> "Although most people take for granted that universities should help society address important issues, there are some who sharply disagree and even feel that such efforts have led to higher education's disorientation and decline" (Bok, 1990, p. 7).

Some scholars are profoundly troubled by what they believe to be the tendency of modern colleges to become instruments for careerism or social change at the expense of the classic ideal of the college as a place where truth is sought as an end in itself. Much of this concern is quite legitimate, but some of it is merely another semantic turn on the old "practical versus theoretical" debate, often couched as a battle between the competing forces advocating vocational training on the one hand versus those protecting the traditional liberal arts on the other. Much of the blame has been placed upon students themselves who:

> "seem to have become passive participants in the educational enterprise, concerned primarily with the occupational advantages derived from a college education rather than focused on the intrinsic and intellectual benefits to be obtained from such learning" (Katchadourian & Boli, 1985, p. xiii).

Blame has also been foisted upon institutional leaders who, in responding to market demands, spurn the liberal arts and refocus their priorities and their spending toward the applied programs that many students seem to prefer (See Kantor et al., 1997). Faculties that have been both unable to sell the value of the traditional liberal arts and who have been complacent in defending their own programs have

also suffered the slings and arrows of sometimes outrageous criticism.

Separating legitimate curriculum concerns that are undeniably appropriate from less constructive and often self-interested "turf battles" has become increasingly problematic. Placing blame upon society, upon faculty, or upon the students themselves seems to be an equally problematic and ineffective response.

Graham (1992) viewed the curriculum battles of the 1960s, 70s, 80s, and early 90s, as battles over interpretation, rather than new knowledge. The questions have been "what has distinction" and "what is important?" (p. 107). Whether these battles are waged over inclusion of African-American, Hispanic, or Feminist literature into the curriculum, or whether they are waged over the importance of a given discipline, the battles remain about interpretation. Who it is that determines "what is important" and "what has distinction" tends often to be more crucial for curriculum inclusion than the merits or demerits of a given subject. The old adage "it's not what you know, but who you know" seems again to show its truthfulness when considered in the context of what is important. How you and your discipline stand historically and traditionally seems altogether more important than where you might stand currently. Kaplan (1998) quotes Nobel laureate Czeslaw Milosz who said "any civilization, if one looks at it from an assumption of naive simplicity, will present a number of bizarre features which men accept as perfectly natural because they are familiar" (p. 155). Some of the most bizarre decisions that we have historically made within our colleges and universities are now viewed as perfectly natural. Perhaps even more troubling, many of these decisions are no longer even viewed as decisions, but as the natural order of things.

Curricular changes tend to bring forth opinions, with some viewing the addition of subjects positively as "enrichment," and with others viewing the same changes negatively as proliferation. The general education curriculum is, in many ways, our collegiate royalty, given preference on the basis of birth and history

rather than merit and currency. The tradition that keeps our entrenched curriculum in place has been assisted not only by the credibility that accrues naturally from time and seniority, but by other more "sociological" factors as well. Applebee (1996) viewed debates about the curriculum as involving the nature of the communities in which we live, every bit as much as about the traditions from which we come.

> "The choices we make define the nature of our common culture--they institutionalize sets of values, codify social and political heirachies, define the center and periphery" (p. 119).

In this sense, then, the communities of learning of which we are a part, have defined us as belonging within the center or around the periphery, based upon our inclusion or exclusion from the common curriculum. Bringing the periphery closer to the center is a natural result of greater interdisciplinarity. It is a result that should be sought.

We Have Met the Enemy...And It's (Usually) Not Us

Depending upon how one performs the role of teacher or college professor, it can be either among the noblest or most corrupt of professions. Likewise, it can be either one of the most difficult or one of the easiest jobs in the world (Sowell, 1993). The participants in education are not the enemy. Like Hirsch (1996), usually a frequent and vocal critic of our educational systems generally, and thus not usually someone with whom I share a great many opinions, I do believe that teachers are among "the most dedicated and sympathetic members of our society" (p. 15). Still, it is a given that not all teachers nor all professors are good, or even competent. Anecdotal tales of woe that describe the less favorable experiences students and their parents have had with individual teachers and individual professors, have begun to fall ever more upon attentive ears, and have made inroads toward

diminishing the public status of an entire profession. Rather than condemn the profession because of this reality, it should be noted that these shortcomings perhaps merely align us with all other professions, in which not all practitioners are performing at a high level of competency, and relatively few might be considered "masters" at what they do.

To expect our profession to be distinguished from all others in order that no deficient practitioners exist would, in fairness, seem to require a correlate purge of other professions as well. As is the case with other professions, good and bad practitioners exist at all levels, and however obvious or self-evident such a statement is, it seems to be lost on us as we tend to be guilty of overgeneralizations and unfounded accusations on an increasingly frequent basis. Equally obvious, though seldom offered, is that we might consider "good" practitioners in any vocation as those who tend to be fairly compensated or even underpaid at any salary, while we understand implicitly that poor practitioners are surely overpaid at any salary. To condemn the profession of higher education because of anecdotes (however genuine they may be) about "lazy and unresponsive" professors is no more meaningful than condemning a class, gender, or nationality of people based on anecdotal experiences and little more. Attacking the professoriate, however politically popular, lacks sound reasoning. However inefficient the professoriate may be, and despite obvious incantations such as those that recognize that all professions may be made better, attacking that which has been and continues to be among our most successful professions seems somewhat at odds with logic.

Defending that which is roundly criticized can be arduous. Steinberg (1995) wrote, in his work concerning race relations in America: "going against the prevailing wind, is both challenging and mentally exhausting. It is easier, as every airborne creature knows, to have the wind at your back" (p. x). The wind is not at the back of those who applaud education and lament the ever greater encroachment of

corporate interests, nor is the push to reevaluate the curriculum and reconsider marginalized disciplines wind-aided. The difficulty that exists in heading into the wind, and the necessary deliberateness which is required, makes any advances seem extremely incremental. The difficulties those of us on the margins face, and the slowness of our progress (at least at times) merely makes the race longer; it does not eliminate us from the competition. Only when we give up the race ourselves, are we eliminated. Sadly, many of us who have been cast aside on the fringes for too long, have indeed given up the race and have become complacent to live as we have.

The enemy, for my purposes here, is not the practitioners, or at least the vast majority of practitioners, but rather the enemy is "the controlling system of ideas that currently prevents needed changes from being contemplated or understood" (Hirsch, 1996, p. 15). In this sense, "controlling ideas" prevent education from being the truly "subversive force" (Freire, 1970), that it could be. Postman & Weingartner (1969) like Freire, recognized the value of the "subversive" nature of education. If we view the word subversive as it is commonly interpreted, then the underground nature of any subversive movement applies to this work insofar as the building of consensus that seeks to overthrow the status quo must begin as an underground or subversive movement.

Whether this book or others like it might make a difference toward achieving either a greater inclusion of "lesser" disciplines or a reassessment of today's conventional higher education wisdom, is highly suspect. Those who read the gospel, however, of greater use of interdisciplinary study and thought, and greater collaboration among and between disciplines, as this work advocates, might eventually propel changes in conventional structures and conventional thinking. It is hoped that the readers will go forth and spread the gospel through both words and deeds. Change, however difficult, may best be considered by convincing those in all

disciplines, not merely the "marginalized" disciplines to reflect upon their place within the college curriculum. It is through this examination of my own place and my own discipline that I have come to believe in the words of Kaplan, who in 1998 published a wonderful examination of America entitled *An Empire Wilderness*, in which he said, among other profound things, "self-absorption also encourages fantasy" (p. 97). My own self-absorption has indeed encouraged my fantasy of a redefined and more fluid higher education curriculum in which our all inclusive rhetoric more closely resembles a more inclusive reality.

Chapter Three

Across the Great Divide

> ***"The curriculum is not an end in itself, but a manipulative tool, like any other device, used to attain educational goals" (Sharpes, 1988, p. 9).***

At its base, and by way of informing the larger issue of greater inclusion into the liberal arts curriculum, this work explores a conundrum. Put simply, how might the "lesser" disciplines, such as teacher education, women's studies, ethnic studies, and criminal justice, gain the requisite credibility to become wholly incorporated into the academic liberal arts mainstream...without presently being members of that liberal arts mainstream. Such a dilemma is exacerbated by the powerful forces of tradition that make "high quality" departments able to use their status on campus in order to command greater resources, thus further solidifying their reputation and that of their members (Baldi, 1997; 1994). A case, within academia, of the "rich getting richer" while the poor struggle to make ends meet, that, like so much of what goes on in academia, closely parallels larger society. As the Sharpes quote sets forth at the beginning of this chapter, curriculum has too often been seen as an end in itself and not merely as the means of attaining desirable ends. The difference goes far beyond semantics. If curriculum is seen as an end in itself...there can be little hope of alteration, revision, or even addition. If, in contrast, it is merely a means to an end...then we must continually revisit it, revise it, and amend it, to reflect our best guess as to how we might reach the ultimate goal of a far-reaching and worthwhile liberal education.

The conundrum those of us on the margins face is not unlike the lament of many college graduates as they enter the workforce. "How does one get a good job without experience...and how does one get experience if one cannot get a good job?" As professors, we might lament "How can we get included within the traditionally entrenched general education curriculum specifically and more generally within the larger sphere of academia without having such tradition to back

us?"

In today's marketplace, many new graduates add a second lament and wonder if good jobs actually exist at all. I suppose the more cynical among us, in today's academic world, also wonder if "good education" really exists at all. The most cynical (realistic?) of us in addressing curriculum changes might lament the apparent randomness, if not utter meaninglessness of it all.

> "While we may attempt to structure the experience of 'reform,' of 'implementation,' of 'restructuring' in education by demanding educational objectives and plans, we cannot predict the outcomes in terms of personal knowledge. On the profoundly deepest level, learning and change are dynamic and personal and unpredictable" (Schmidt, 1997, p. 5).

A lack of experience as a stumbling block is not only the bane of job-hunting college graduates, it is symbolic of the very institutions from which they come. Institutions in which experience in the form of academic tradition have largely shut out new ideas and innovations and that have severely hampered, if not entirely stunted, the growth of curriculum and other program changes.

> "Academic work is institutionally arranged in a patterned isolation of disciplines, and then of specialized fields within disciplines. This patterning is not something inherent in the material; it stems from decisions made a century ago when the American university assumed its modern form. Those decisions reflected political and economic assumptions then current, and although conditions have changed in society at large, our academic structures have remained relatively constant, and the old assumptions built into our institutions continue to have largely unseen but pervasive effects. The result to this day is a heady mix of scholarly alienation and disciplinary nationalism that shape the questions we ask and the ways in which we ask them. These scholarly values in turn foster -- and reward -- alienation and aggression at all levels of academic life. Little meaningful reform can be achieved until this situation is changed" (Damrosch, 1995, p. 6).

Whatever our individual level of cynicism (and how does a truly educated person escape at

least a certain level) and whether we feel undergraduate education is good, bad, or indifferent, it can be made better. Unlike many of the corporate heads chairing our boards of trustees, who by and large, may not be comfortable with facing criticism, and who often label those who criticize as unloyal or ingrates or both; we should acknowledge that criticizing our most valued institutions does not mean we seek to destroy these institutions, but rather to better these institutions. Criticizing our government does not make one anti-democracy. Disciplining our children does not mean we do not love them. Criticizing our colleges should not label one as disloyal or anti-higher education.

In the course of this sometimes sharp criticism, I am not seeking a return to the days of campus unrest and militant dissent. I am, however, advocating perhaps a bit more debate than is currently present in academia. Commenting in 1986 about the spreading popularity of pre-business programs on his campus, and the subsequent support for the "establishment," New York University President, John Brademas, humorously described his campus atmosphere as a "hotbed of student rest." Such complacency is not among the best ways to search for knowledge either in the form of that which is existing or that which may be discovered.

Weingartner (1992) is among those who have noted that undergraduate education as a topic has been receiving increasingly louder and livelier discussion. He has identified three camps of persons debating the merits and demerits of undergraduate education. First, there are those unhappy with the status quo; second, are those who feel that the difficulty of the task has escalated intellectually, institutionally, and economically; and third, are those who speak out of a heightened belief in the social importance of the cluster of issues belonging to the topic of undergraduate education (p. 1). I have, in my rather cowardly fashion, set up my tent firmly to straddle all of these camps.

Would You Like Fries With That?

All of these camps are impacted, in my view, by our society's ever increasing disparity between the haves and have-nots. The growing nature of the disparity is now seldom even refuted by those who used to vigorously deny it, and is indeed part of the conventional economic wisdom of the late 20th century and early 21st century in the United States. [See, inter alia, R.H. Frank & P.J. Cook (1995). *The Winner-Take-All Society*. New York: The Free Press]. What impact does increased income inequality have upon higher education? The question, yet another conundrum, lies in the reflection shared between higher education and the larger society. Does higher education simply reflect what is happening in the larger society, or does the larger society merely reflect what our educational system brings forth? Whichever the cause, the fear I have, and share with many, is that as we near the new century the United States is increasingly reverting back to the economics of the 19th century, in which a servant-class serves a well-to-do class, with perilously few outside of these two growing populations. In a society that rewards specialists and, in effect, "punishes" general practitioners, it should perhaps be of little surprise that we seem to ever more divide ourselves into well-paid experts and lowly paid servants. Given such divisions, it should not be surprising that more and more students entering higher education look upon it as the route to specialized and lucrative jobs, more an end in itself, than a means toward achieving productive citizenship and/or a well rounded educational experience. Neely (1999) describes the utilitarian terms that students and their families have now increasingly come to use when assessing what they want from the colleges that they attend.

> **"Young people do not go to college to become fuller persons, better citizens, or more lively intellects. In postwar America, college education is justified by the additional lifetime income it will produce" (pp. 36-37).**

It should also not be surprising that the "haves" view the world somewhat differently than the "have-nots." Steinberg (1995) addressed the differing perspectives concerning racism. I have adapted some of his words to address, not institutional racism, but "institutional marginalization."

It cannot be denied that marginalized groups must surely feel differently toward discussion of marginalization than do non-marginalized groups. These disparate views based on one's angle of viewing are represented as ably in academia as they are anywhere. Different perspectives based on differing viewing angles is a concept, however simple, that has often been lost on many faculty members. I have been in meetings in which faculty members comfortably ensconced within non-marginalized disciplines have displayed an arrogance that can only come with a lack of understanding about how it feels to be marginalized. "It's really no big deal, we do accept your discipline on campus, if not in the general education curriculum, so why all the fuss?" Despite any "we feel your pain" rhetoric, only the unaccepted can truly understand the feelings that accompany marginalization. Likewise, only the non-marginalized would presume that marginalization doesn't really matter.

A long time ago, during my first teaching job, in an academic galaxy far away, I once described my tiny, windowless office (formerly a storage closet) to a colleague as "academically inappropriate." He, a full professor accustomed to spending significantly less than 8 hours a week in his office (which was approximately three times larger than mine) brushed aside my comments as some type of embittered lunacy. He (which only makes the anecdote more worthy) was a professor of psychology. I no longer "burdened" him with my problems. Privilege and class is, apparently, invisible to those who enjoy it (Howard & Hollander, 1997). The natural state of affairs that those on the margins view as privilege is viewed by most non-marginalized persons simply as the "natural state of affairs," hardly worthy of discussion. My bewilderment and embitterment only grew the day that another colleague chastised me after a divisional meeting for my "tone" when addressing the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Apparently I had not been sufficiently deferential to satisfy his perception of how I should relate to such a distinguished superior. The tightrope on which all faculty members, at one time or another, have perilously tiptoed between the valley of the embittered and disenchanted on one side and the contented and complacent on

the other had claimed another victim. The line between appropriate respect for my administrators and inappropriate and annoying to a fault "sucking up," was much too precarious for me to negotiate...and so, after a time, I had fallen in with those whose respect was questioned. I had, in essence, fallen in with the "wrong crowd" and my days of sucking up to administrators who continually brushed aside the legitimate concerns of my colleagues and myself were over. As God, and perhaps Scarlett O'Hara as my witnesses, I would not suck up again! (At least at that institution). Perhaps a lesson for young academics might lie in the ability to understand that when others don't respect you, you must somehow heighten your sense of self-respect in order to survive emotionally in an ever more hostile academic environment (and it may be time to renew your subscription to *Psychology Today*).

Watt (1997) wrote of the plight of the marginalized, by sharing the story of a student from India lamenting her $10,000 salary as a Yale graduate assistant. When Yale graduate assistants went on strike, papers from the heartland, including the *Omaha World-Herald*, offered editorials that portrayed the students as "whiners." "After all," wrote one editorialist: "a salary of $10,000 is 'probably' some '25 times the average annual income in India" (p. 231). Upon reflection, I guess my office then, in the worst of my academic times, was indeed probably larger than that of the average poverty stricken Calcuttan, and thus my complaints should have been kept to an ungrateful minimum. The reasons continue to escape my grasp, although they are altogether obvious I am sure, as to why professors and students who "have it so good" should be compared to those living in poverty; while administrators and trustees (perhaps even some journalists) compare their plights to extravagantly paid CEOs and others in managerial roles.

Many college professors, particularly the most marginalized among us, are beginning to feel coopted by a society in which we are becoming merely "servants" of business, and/or the well-to-do class as represented by boards of trustees. "Faculty members will be under increasing pressure to adapt to the fundamental changes affecting American society and, more specifically,

to those which are transforming higher education" (Austensen, 1997, p. 31). As tenure and other academic "protections" become ever more endangered, more and more professors fearing for their jobs tend to lapse into periods (sometimes lifetimes) of passivity. The passivity sometimes leads to the type of diminished humanity that comes from perceiving of themselves as entirely replaceable parts of an infinitely larger structure. Austensen (1997) considers the "extraordinary challenge" that exists for administrators who seek to maintain high faculty morale in such an era of retrenchment and downsizing (p. 31).

The retrenchment and downsizing that has characterized business in recent years seems to me to be reason enough to doubt the success of emulating such "failure." Kolodny (1998) wondered aloud about the wisdom of adhering to business practices that only the most optimistic (and/or the most unrealistic) among us might view as positive. Results which Kolodny described as those in which business and manufacturing sectors have pursued policies over decades of withdrawing investment from their own infrastructures, in order to exchange long-term growth for short-term profits. Such policies ultimately rendered business unable to compete abroad, which then led to attempts to curb losses in profitability by shipping manufacturing jobs overseas while deskilling and downsizing the labor force remaining in the United States. While such policies may have been a boon to a select few CEO's, trustees, and shareholders, they have hardly been the stuff from which dreams are made for average Americans. Colleges and universities that seek to emulate such downsizing practices through a lessening of tenure's importance, and through increasing the "flexibility" of workforces, may be taking similar steps toward seeking the type of "third world" workplace that many manufacturing industries have done. While Americans may collectively shrug at policies which mean our automobile components are increasingly made in Mexico and Brazil, our concern might raise if our educational systems begin to do business in a similar fashion. The great "successes" of business in recent decades must surely rank among the greatest myths of modern times, and it is our universities that need to do their best to "debunk"

those myths before we reach a point of no return in our hurried efforts to copy highly questionable business practices. If we cannot debunk the myth of relative corporate productivity perhaps we might at least follow the lead of a select few corporations (albeit in a somewhat different direction) of committing more institutional resources to the development of workers. We must not sit idly by and allow "selective corporatization" to bring to colleges downsizing and greater "workforce flexibility" without a commitment of greater resources toward the workers remaining.

A Whole New Meaning to the Term "Underclass-persons"

Giroux (2000) wrote: "the increasing isolation of academics and intellectuals from the world around them reflects corporate culture's power to define teaching as a technical and instrumental practice rather than as a moral and political act" (p. 3). Academics who see themselves positively as "disinterested scholars" play into the hands of many societal "leaders" who view them, negatively, but in the same way.

What remains of the ties that bind together boards of trustees with university faculty members are, at many institutions, becoming frayed. It seems more and more that the common goal of "betterment of the university community" is not a strong and/or meaningful enough bond to keep trustees' and professors' interests genuinely mutual. The "great divide" as I will continually discuss at greater length in succeeding chapters, has given us an "overclass" that while self-righteously proclaiming its own virtue and lauding individualism and volunteerism, recoils at the thought of a raise in the minimum wage and/or other benefits that might disproportionately accrue to the "underclass."

The "overclass" seems not to want to pay its service workers more than it is "forced" to by the free market, be these workers daycare professionals, household help, or, for the purposes of this work, college professors. Persons toiling in the "underclass" often supplement their tenuous existences by taking on more than one job. "Professionalism" becomes increasingly difficult to

achieve in a work world where ones' profession fails to allow for a middle class standard of living. And so yet another conundrum, how do professors, increasingly part-time and untenured, increase their stature and/or their market value while they struggle to make ends meet in an ever more oppressive workplace?

> **"Fifty or sixty years ago, while professors often made little money, they generally lived in the same neighborhoods as physicians or lawyers, whose incomes were a bit higher but whose life styles, life space, and life chances were approximately equal to the professors.' But this situation changed as the physicians, lawyers and other professionals began to make big bucks and moved out to more lavish houses, bought a Mercedes Benz and a Lamborghini, and summered in Europe. University professors, however, were not so rewarded. They were and remain in society's financial backwater" (Sawyer, et al., 1992, pp. 222-223).**

As the "profession" of college teaching inches closer to aligning itself firmly with the "underclass" rather than the "overclass" we will undoubtedly see a continued expansion toward faculty unionism as an effort, futile or not, to maintain, if not improve, our shrinking status in the workplace. As boards of trustees and other "powers" that control colleges increase their positions within the "overclass," and decrease their "commonality" with those of us in academic roles, professors may be more and more relegated to the "underclass." Like many other workers in our increasingly "Wal-Martized" economy, we can bitterly complain as our wages, benefits, and working conditions diminish, and as our retiring colleagues are ever more frequently replaced by part-timers; or in the alternative, we might consider "radical" changes that might at least inform those present members of the "overclass" that "we are mad as hell and we aren't going to take it any more." Rosenzweig (1998) fears that it may already be much too late to alter the corporate encroachment into academia:

> **"The emphasis on marketing, the search for institutional image, and the pathetic concern about where the institution stands in the latest *U.S. News and World Report* rankings suggest that corporate styles are already embedded in the academic culture"**

(p. 170).

If Rosenzweig is correct, and life in academia has become one big Nike commercial where "image is everything" and substance is significantly less important, then altering substantive aspects of academic life, such as the curriculum and the working conditions of faculty become progressively more difficult. Convincing administrators and trustees ever more concerned with marketing that "image is not everything" will require far more power in the form of collective action on the part of faculty than the occasional dissenting voice can muster. Ritzer (1996) wrote about the "McDonaldization of society" which he defined as "the process by which the principles of the fast-food restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society as well as of the rest of the world" (p. 1). Higher education, according to Ritzer, is becoming more and more dehumanized. As a result of less contact between students and professors, and the greater emphasis upon "efficiency," a section within Ritzer's book is entitled "Higher Education: It's Like Processing Meat" (p. 138). If we complacently allow the increasing "McDonaldization" of higher education, we as professors shall soon be no more valued than processors and any attempts at creativity might necessarily be stifled as non-robotic and inefficient responses to the market.

It is as if assumptions that were once widely held and deeply valued, such as the assumption that there existed a fundamental difference between academia and corporate America, are being steadily eroded when they are not abandoned altogether. Perhaps a return to some of the most fundamental assumptions about higher education and its "place" might be a useful starting point for further discussion. As scholars ourselves, we might begin by heeding the advice of scholarly colleagues like Tierney (1989) who bases much of his analysis of higher education upon the "assumption that postsecondary organizations are unique entities that have goals and concerns that extend far beyond measures of effectiveness and efficiency" (p. 143).

Administering academic settings differs from business administration in numerous

respects. Perhaps most fundamentally, faculty members are highly educated, independent professionals who are trained to challenge, question, criticize, and search for alternative solutions. They value autonomy and, to a degree at least, participatory management. Trustees who might be accustomed to loyal and unquestioning "employees" furthering what are usually fairly "simple and straightforward" aims of a corporation, may be appalled at the lack of unity and "purpose" within the faculty upon a college campus. While "different" is neither necessarily better or worse, it may behoove college trustees and administrators to acknowledge the differences rather than attempting to recreate colleges in the image of businesses.

If it is in fact true that colleges are becoming more and more like traditional "businesses," then it should concern us as academics, both professionally and personally, that, like in the business world, the division between "management" and "workers" continues to grow. According to Hacker (1997), 1995 statistics showed that corporate chairmen averaged 190 times more pay than that of a typical worker, up from a ratio of 40 times twenty years earlier. As more and more "corporate chairmen" become intimately involved with our colleges and universities, it is no great leap toward a future in which less equality will not only be accepted, but actually encouraged. A future in which the "evil tandem" of "incentive pay" for those at the top is viewed as a necessary corollary to "wage control" for those at the bottom. Domhoff (1998) in his work entitled *Who Rules America?*, wrote about the "policy formulation network" consisting of members of the upper class and the corporate community who in doing such things as serving on college boards of trustees, are allowed tremendous influence into who manages our colleges and how colleges are operated on a day-to-day basis. If education is to be the great equalizer, many of us within education are going to have to overcome tremendous inequality and inequity even in how our own boards of trustees are selected so that a greater diversity of opinion and background, economic and otherwise, might be represented.

We, societally, seem slow to heed the advice of many of our greatest thinkers who have

long lamented increasing divisions among and between us. Long ago, Thomas Jefferson worried about societal class divisions (albeit while he enjoyed privileged status himself): "I am conscious that an equal division of property is impracticable" but because "enormous inequality produces so much misery, legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property" (Hacker, 1997, p. 52). While it is an overstatement to equate college professors salaries' with "misery" in the common usage of that term, the future environment upon college campuses is worth pondering if we continue down the road to greater and greater divisions of income, both societally and on-campus. The "overclass" of administrators is aided by the existence of almost absolute power in their hands coupled with the lack of power among faculty and their students. This imbalance is referred to by Solomon & Solomon (1993) as "one of the most elemental problems facing contemporary American education in institutions of higher learning" (p. 259). It is hoped that these first chapters have illustrated the depth of the problem, and have addressed the need to consider more purposefully, the imbalance of power that is among our most elemental problems. Only after we begin to address our most basic problems, might we truly begin to consider ways in which to address our more intractible ones.

Chapter Four

"It Only Hurts When I Think"

> ***"Higher education in America faces a future that is far from uncertain. For if faculty members and administrators continue as they are, we can predict with unwelcome confidence the basic shape of the educational environment of the next millennium--increased class sizes, decreased academic freedom, fewer tenure-track faculty, more part-time teachers,...and universities, meanwhile, will be increasingly exploitive employers" (Nelson, 1997, p. 137).***
>
> ***"From the faculty's vantage point, several developments underscore the proposition that for faculty this has not been the best of times" (Finkelstein, et al., 1998, p. 1).***

I have taken the liberty of presuming that part of my job as a professor of criminal justice is to examine ways in which I think the "system" might be improved. As a college professor more generally, part of my role is to examine ways in which the delivery of undergraduate education might be improved. Improvement often requires that our own intellectual and creative boundaries are more expansive than are our institutional boundaries.

A willingness to consider concepts presently "outside the boundaries" of academic consideration and the fact that something, like a curriculum, might be "improved" is not to be taken as a condemnation of its present state. Indeed such willingness is mere recognition of the fact that social systems such as undergraduate education programs must continually seek ways in which to meet the changing demands of an ever more complicated society. We must adapt or die, to be, no doubt, overly Darwinian about it. Existence on or outside of the margins of academia is and continues to be accepted (albeit to varying degrees) by many in such disciplines as criminal justice and teacher education as well as even newer and emerging disciplines such African-American studies and women's studies. Our existence there requires little heavy lifting and, for some, might be seen as an optimum way in which to deliver educational services only to those who truly "seek us out." Still, there is something missing. What is missing is our acceptance

into the mainstream of academia, and while we go about our business day to day without much concern about the perceptions we engender in others, when we think about our place,...it hurts.

Lincoln (1996) described universities, properly conceived anyway, as the "midwives for the delivery of ideas." (P. 43). He continues his idealism with references to the university as "a place where no dogma is sacred except the dogma that rejects all dogmas, but where the recognition of the right to question, to challenge, and to disagree is itself the clearest index of the commitment to reason this society is likely to produce" (p. 43). Exchanging ideas and testing those ideas through rigorous self and "other" examination is at the base of the purposes of the university. What is troubling, is that our "other" examinations seem much more probing than do our "self" evaluations. Looking at universities as places where learning takes place is, of course, indisputable. Looking at them as places where learning can benefit from more detailed self-examination could lead to the birth of significantly greater and more inclusive ideas.

As a professor, one is subjected to endless hours of ruminative discussion about a myriad of academic issues, as well as discussion about concerns that don't or cannot rise to the level necessary to validly warrant the label "issues." Blackburn & Lawrence (1995) summarize faculty responses to committee assignments as ranging from expletive filled opinions concerning countless hours of commitment to bring about minimum results to those that view their committee assignments as among the most rewarding and worthwhile aspects of their professional lives. Perhaps not surprisingly, given the range of views that faculty members hold toward committee work, discussion often breaks down into dialogue between the few and boredom among the many and which usually tends to fail either to enlighten us or convince us that change, in any form, is warranted.

Curriculum issue discussions often are examples of discourse in which strongly held opinions aren't swayed despite what may seem to be overwhelming evidence that they should be. As a further inhibitor of change, those who don't remain utterly unconvinced that changes are

necessary, often fail to share the passion of those seeking change. Fighting the good fight for curriculum reform becomes increasingly hard against the pressures exerted both overtly by those against change, and "covertly" by those who simply don't care. Unfortunately, the longer we remain entrenched "disciplinarians," the longer it will be until we are collectively able to address any issues, whether the issues are increasing societal poverty, homelessness, youth violence, or such "mundane" concerns as the increased exploitation of academicians. "Most faculty are far from articulate or thoughtful when confronting policy issues outside their disciplinary expertise" (Nelson, 1997, p. 138). It is as if we are complacently going about our business believing that our little piece of the world is fine, while around us swirls the evidence, in human form, of the totally disenfranchised and the merely marginalized workers struggling in their own little worlds. While such denial may be a perfectly logical way in which to practice the necessary self-preservation that comes with a highly competitive, market-driven, and individualistic society, it moves us no closer to finding solutions to problems that people talk about, but fail to address. Alcorn (1997) humorously wrote of the lack of any correlation between what an “academic advocates and what an academic practices” (p. 19). The safety we have found in academia allows for us to be advocates for the “open-minded,” as we live our lives in a fashion every bit as closed-minded as those we so pity and lament.

Martin (1982) wrote that the proper rationale for a college was to exist as a place in which the "synoptic function" could be promoted (p. 46). He defined this "synoptic function" as the cross-fertilization of ideas and methodologies. This type of college, in Martin's view at least, addresses the whole person and includes a curriculum of general education, arts and sciences, professional education and career training simultaneously. He would replace the common description of "liberal arts college" with that of "comprehensive college" (p. 48). Bruffee (1993), in his work lauding the virtues of collaborative learning writes: "for collaborative learning to work, college and university teachers have to examine and revise longstanding assumptions that we all

hold about what teachers do and why they do it" (p. vii). The revision of longstanding assumptions is less a goal of this work, than a more humble plea to assess longstanding assumptions. It is my fear that many of the most dearly held assumptions upon college campuses have little chance of being assessed, let alone revised. Our first step towards revision, must be our own acknowledgment of the fact that many of our assumptions are indeed merely assumptions that if properly assessed might be properly revised.

While considering myself an ardent supporter of faculty and faculty issues, we are, like so many groups, our own worst enemy.

> "Faculty members are often more willing to demand power than to invest the time necessary to exercise it well. They complain bitterly about the number of committees they serve on and the length of deliberations, but respond even more bitterly if the administration threatens to relieve them of these onerous duties" (Koerner, 1970, p. 147).

Self-Esteem is a Many Splendored (and Multifaceted) Thing

According to both their most ardent supporters (e.g. Weaver, 1991), and their most vocal detractors (e.g., Sykes, 1988; Kimball, 1990), college and university faculty members share a common propensity toward self-pity. Whether or not this self-pity is justified, it presents ample opportunity to reflect upon one's place within the college curricula and consequently, within the larger college environment. The effects of feeling "marginalized" in any vocation impact one's self-esteem and may thereby increase one's propensity toward self-pity. While this effort is not meant to diminish any person's individual feelings of "marginalization," the focus of this work lies upon two disciplines within higher education in which the participants share what this author perceives to be legitimate feelings of marginalization within the larger academic environment.

It is not my purpose to proclaim that the self-esteem of those of us in higher education is

among the most critical issues facing Americans, or even American educators today. The commercial success of books such as Sykes' *A Nation of Victims*, as well as the growing realities of poverty, child abuse, and inequality within our society, properly preclude any serious consideration of professors as "victims." Instead, it is hoped that gaining a greater understanding of how some of us in two disciplines "feel," might be a useful means of inquiry toward establishing a more appropriate liberal arts curriculum for the new millennium. Stewart & Spence (1996) conducted a study of faculty morale at Tennessee State University. Their findings were rather disturbing insofar as they discovered that fully 60% of those who responded to the survey described their morale as either "low or very low" (p. 29). Downs-Lombardi (1997) cited studies that show a direct correlation between a teacher's self-esteem and student learning: "the higher the teacher's self-esteem, the more students learn" (p. 62).

If indeed we need to be concerned about faculty morale, we might do our best to assess why indeed it seems to headed south. Stewart & Spence, among others, viewed declining working conditions, declining income, unfavorable labor markets, and concern for the public outcry over the diminishment in value of a college education, as among the reasons for poor morale. While there must be a middle ground here somewhere that should prevent us all from becoming egomaniacs in the classroom, there is certainly a place for the type of self-assuredness that comes with having value placed upon you and upon the role that you perform. Having value placed upon one, one's discipline, and one's students will go far toward improving the community of scholarship within any college or university.

Improving the academic community will move us toward the establishment of our most effective curriculum that is inclusive rather than exclusive. Establishing our most effective curriculum is a critical issue that will impact students and the workplace for years to come, and is the more valuable purpose of this or any assessment concerning the "esteem" of two disciplines and/or the consequent "self-esteem" of those who practice within these disciplines.

That said, the "crisis" of liberal education so prevalent in popular books by Bloom, and others, is, as Carnochan (1993) points out, the type of "crisis" that largely appeals to those of us writing to each other within the confines of academic circles: "seldom has a 'crisis' so badly needed the protective embrace of quotation marks" (Carnochan, 1993, p. 3). Implementing changes within college curriculums, even those I espouse, such as widening the scope of what we consider the "liberal arts," will not go far toward lessening world hunger, poverty, or other vastly more important and more damaging social ills. The use of words such as "crisis," when we refer to higher education curricula, greatly inflate, it seems to me, our importance within the grand scheme of things. If it is more emphasis upon "reality" that I seek, that is perhaps the most important reality to keep in mind.

Veysey (1965) described the university in the early twentieth century as a place that "offered a convenient intermediate pattern of behavior, somewhere between a business career and exile" (p. 443). As this is written (and as the preface to this work illustrates), I continue to try to reconcile my place within an increasingly business-dominated "real world" and my own need for "exile" from "the real world." My own academic schizophrenia is symbolic of the schizophrenia present within the academic culture as it tries to blend the market desires of the "real world" with the romantic visions of the true university as a place for reflection, contemplation, and intellectual enrichment. Miller (1998), in his excellent work *As If Learning Mattered*, seems to share this personal and professional torment that waivers between idealism and despairing realism, between what he longs for when he dreams and what he has experienced in waking:

> "A learning community in which collaboration reigns supreme and teachers think along with, rather than over or against, their students...is an attractive vision...but it is a vision that does not, and I now think cannot, engage with the bureaucratic realities of teaching in an institutional context" (p. 18).

Miller's words present a reality quite apart from the utopian vision that many academic

writers and would be "reformers" seek. He refers to such writings as "trafficking in utopian visions...a time honored academic pastime" (p. 22). These utopian visions are ably summed up by Verdugo, et al., (1997) who wrote about K-12 education, but whose espoused principles can be properly applied to higher education.

> "In response to the issues of alienation, frustration, and heavy-handed practices by administrators, which fettered rather than facilitated teaching and learning, researchers began to notice that quality schools could be characterized as communities" (p. 41).

"Quality schools," like "quality colleges" require a sense of community among faculty, staff, and students alike. Actively involving a wide variety of persons in decision-making is an important step toward becoming a genuine community. Interaction among colleagues and greater collaboration among and between differing "levels" within the community is an important step toward becoming and remaining a "quality college." Achieving community will be no small task in an atmosphere where bubbling beneath a varying surface of complacencies and discontents, is what Oakley (1992) described as a "veritable geology of alienation" (p. 268).

Challenging the "Liberal Arts" Status Quo

> "I strongly believe that one does not need to be a towering genius to be willing and able to challenge a commonly held assumption, to think it through rigorously, and to gather evidence supporting or negating the thesis" (Colman, 1991, p. 170).

Any real hope for "reform," of course, must come tempered with the knowledge that institutions, like colleges, are difficult to reform, since their very function is to assist a human work to endure over time. "Indeed, the first task of an institution is to perpetuate itself" (Farley, 1997, p. 133). Any real curricula changes, therefore, must be suggested and ultimately created within this "anti-reform" context. Woodrow Wilson once noted that it is easier to move a graveyard than to change the curriculum, and Rhodes (1998) uses that statement as a preface to his

proclamation concerning curriculum committees which he describes as "black holes of academic life that absorb an enormous amount of matter and energy without anything ever coming back out" (p. 10).

Challenging something as firmly held to be good, noble, and true, as the "liberal arts" requires the readers' patience and acceptance of a modest goal. It is not that I claim to be in any way gifted, but instead merely a challenger who has as his primary goal, the contemplation of my peers who are most directly in the business of challenging commonly held assumptions, both true and untrue. Lanham (1992) viewed the liberal arts, like higher education as a whole, as beneficiaries of the longstanding "General Motors Rule" (What's good for General Motors is good for the country"). To openly doubt, or even question the nature of the liberal arts, proves you a "philistine" (p. 36).

> "Change in general education is organizational change, and the consequences for faculty--both symbolic and tangible--can be significant. To start, there are philosophical and political implications of what is or not included in a general education program. Declaring what all students must know, after all, reveals much about what an institution collectively thinks about the world" (Arnold & Civian, 1997, p. 20).

Changes in the liberal arts curriculum may or may not be in the long-term best interests of higher education and the people we serve. Still, challenging commonly held assumptions in order to either make changes or strengthen the rationale behind already existing ways of doing things should only improve our understanding and increase public support for either a "time-tested" liberal arts curriculum or a "changed and vital" liberal arts curriculum.

Weaver (1991) proclaims the "need" for teacher educators "to be free from the myth that the administrative forms prevalent in higher education have genuine substantive and educational rationales" (p. 87). In essence, administrative forms long taken for granted, have sometimes been based upon rather tenuous substantive and educational rationales.

To take liberties with Justice Stewart's definition of pornography, many "liberal" educators

"know the liberal arts when they see them." However comforting that may be to a given individual secure in what they view, it is extremely discomforting to those of us who either see something else entirely, or at least an expanded horizon. Challenging the recognized horizons of knowledge in contrast to accepting all that lies before one as unchangeable is the essence of education in its most pure form, and is certainly the undeniable essence of education at the collegiate level. Couching higher education as a "religion," Phipps (1995) notes the irony of the unchanging nature of the academy:

> "Adherence to the faith compels the academy to reject one of its own underlying principles of rational inquiry, commonly known as the scientific method, when tenets of faith are questioned by outsiders" (p. 23).

Sanchez & Fried (1997) bemoan the domination of one system of meaning that most disciplines and many universities allow, as they simultaneously deny credibility to diverse interpretations. Allowing only one system of meaning necessarily locks in historical belief systems and historical precedent to the exclusion of diverse systems and, for lack of a better phrase, "new ideas." Berger (1995) writes of "the more or less strict rules and conventions that govern every genre in which 'creative' people work, and they usually work within and around those rules and conventions" (p. 143). He also cites Galbraith's use of the phrase "permissible originality." Permissible originality seems profoundly appropriate in describing the constraints placed upon any potential advances and/or alterations that might intrude upon the sanctity of liberal arts curriculums. Walzer (1983) cited the importance of "membership" within a group as among his "spheres of justice." He cites the reality, prevalent in all societies and certainly present within academia, of those already belonging having control over how membership is distributed. In that sense then, Berger's and Walzer's work overlaps as they both recognize that membership is determined by those who are already members and these members determine if originality, or whose originality, or which originality is permissible, and which might be granted entry and which

might be denied. The liberal arts curriculum, from this viewpoint then, is much more like an exclusive country club and/or fraternity in which the members gather together and either reject or accept new members. However much such entities are embedded within our culture, it is extremely questionable whether or not our college campuses in general, and our faculties in particular, should both reflect and exhibit such exclusionary tendencies. Loeb (1994) summarizes the resistance toward change quite ably:

> "Faculty resist the opening of academic traditions for varied reasons. Some are simply ignorant of the subjects on which they pontificate. Some resent the complications produced by new faces and new questions in the classrooms. Most act for reasons as experiential as political--reasons having to do with training and credentialing, careers and identities, the initiation rituals of their academic guilds. Professors defend turf they have become accustomed to exploring, defend their status within their departments against challenges from new methodological approaches or new voices not part of their experience (p. 357).

Baiocco & DeWaters (1998) provide us with a more positive spin upon faculty resistance to change: "we contend that what appears to be, and is often labeled as, resistance on the part of the faculty is actually our traditionally cautious response to unfamiliar conditions" (p. 6). Obviously, as is usually the case, it appears that a person's personal and historical perspective matters most, as one person's resistance is another person's cautious response.

When considering a title for this chapter, I was looking for a way in which to describe the frustrations certain to ensue when one attempts to persuade people to consider changes in sacred traditions. "It Only Hurts When I Think" is intended to convey the "rote" acceptance that our "liberal arts" have engendered, both good and bad, and my heartfelt belief that it is always best to maintain one's sense of humor, however developed or undeveloped it may be, when "negotiating" with those in power from a position of little to no strength. As we continue our descent into a more fully "corporatized" world of higher education, faculty members are sadly

staring into a future in which their already limited "strength" is dwindling.

When attempting to incorporate "lesser" disciplines into the traditional liberal arts curriculum, one might be well advised to maintain a sense of humor, for the value of your discipline will surely be questioned, often openly and loudly, and, in the right circumstances the quality and value of your character may be questioned as well. Taking oneself too seriously can be cause for the type of depression and feelings of hopelessness that might lead toward a lessening, or at least a silencing, of one's convictions. Don't be silenced, for someday we'll all look back on this and laugh, especially given the abundance of easy targets in academia. Indeed, maybe we'll all look back and laugh together as we contemplate the close relationship between tragedy and comedy, both inside and outside of academia. All of this is possible, I trust, provided we don't think about it too much.

Chapter Five

The Promise of Genuine "Liberal Arts Education"

> ***"The failure of the modern university is its unwillingness to consider "holistic" thinking that cuts across disciplinary barriers. To conceive of a mind separate from a body is to misunderstand the inter-dependence of all the elements within the self" (London, 1993, p. xxii).***
>
> ***"Sometimes a university can suffer from hardening of the categories. This happens when certified scholars resolve, against all reason, to defend their customary view of knowledge from encroachment by more novel perspectives" (Postman, 1988, p. 4).***

Much of this work centers upon curriculum and general education within the liberal arts setting. However important such things are to those of us comfortably (or not) ensconced in academia, curriculum changes are often seen as peripheral to the real world. As matters on the periphery, they don't receive a great deal of attention in the mainstream of society, nor do they probably warrant it. Still, while the world keeps on spinning, what colleges and universities do and what those within these institutions decide is worthy of being taught is at the center of any debate over the "virtue" or "decline" of higher education in America.

What does warrant mainstream attention are the implications that the general education curriculum (regardless of its specific content) have upon our delivery of education, and ultimately, upon our receipt of human services as consumers and members of society. How students are taught to view the world will directly impact the manner in which they convey services to society once they are freed from the "ivory tower" and let loose upon the "real world." The level of collaboration and cooperation that these new workers will bring to their workplaces, and to our society, will be heavily dependant upon what they viewed as valuable and what was reinforced as having value, upon the campuses that shaped their professionally formative years.

The majority of people engaged in interdisciplinary work lack a common identity. As a

result, they often find themselves homeless, in a state of social and intellectual marginality (Klein, 1990). It is the hope of interdisciplinarians that we can find homes for the homeless among us that might be beneficial centers of learning for all of us.

At a most fundamental level, theorists in many fields need to begin to reject the standard assumption that objects are isolated and individuals are separate. Instead we need to consider that connections between objects, between concepts, and between people are and should be central to study and to prescription (Levins & Lewontin, 1985, p. 287). Interdisciplinarity, then, is neither a subject matter nor a body of content, it is a process for achieving an integrative synthesis, a process that usually begins with a problem, question, topic, or issue (Klein, 1990). Though there can be no single model of the interdisciplinary process, there seem to be two general levels of problem solving from an interdisciplinary point of view: 1) clarification, and 2) resolution.

Both the perceptions and the reality of crises in the human services are often the direct result of the rigid and focused training of "professionals." Focused training, while no doubt preparing persons for professional roles within our society, also aligns individuals with narrow theoretical constructs and practices that both perpetuate and are perpetuated by, singular disciplines. Among the harmful implications of such rigidity and focus, are the lack of vision that necessarily accompanies such disciplinary adherence. The sparsity of dynamic intercourse between professionals impacts numerous participants within the various human services systems, and tends to promote the fragmentation of services. Further implications involve the less effective use of ever more finite resources through the duplication of services, and the tendency to become both professionally and personally complacent rather than creative. Such complacency tends to promote "lockstep interventions," and a plethora of "reform" literature and proposals with a dearth of real reform.

The term "interdisciplinary" has, at one time or another, labeled such things as

collaborative research, team teaching, comparative studies, and other "unified perspectives" (Klein, 1990). Today, it has become to a degree an accepted form of the rhetoric of higher education, if less in practice, than as a theory brimming with merit, virtue, and unfulfilled promise.

Despite the fact that "interdisciplinary" covers a remarkably broad plane, the underlying concept is rooted in the ideas of unity and synthesis. Rosenzweig (1998) believed that the way in which to revitalize the undergraduate curriculum is to organize multidisciplinary programs whose focus is on areas of society, and sets of social issues that cannot adequately be addressed by a single discipline. Educators, researchers, and practitioners have all turned to interdisciplinary work in order to accomplish such objectives as: answering complex questions; addressing broad issues; exploring disciplinary and professional relations; solving problems that are beyond the scope of any one discipline; and achieving unity of knowledge. If the problems are beyond any one discipline, then perhaps our teaching methods need to likewise consider transcending any one discipline. Lanham (1992) considered the "conceptual dislocations" that students must surely feel as they change classes from "one disciplinary universe to another" (p. 37). There seems to be merit in allowing our students the comfort of remaining within a "common universe" in which interdisciplinary thought and preparation is the norm.

According to Curry and Wergin (1993) "real change begins with the professional faculty and its leadership" (p. xiii). Whereas most students will practice in problem-oriented environments, addressing situations that cannot be neatly packaged by subject area, they study in discipline-oriented environments (Carter, 1983). Getting faculty on board the interdisciplinary movement ties in nicely with attempting to improve human services by addressing ever more complex problems that face people today. Searching for "distinctiveness" on college campuses also becomes ever more important in an increasingly competitive environment in which colleges compete with one another not only for the best students, but for enough students. Townsend, et al., (1992), caution of the difference between "distinctiveness" and mere "difference." "Institutional

distinctiveness is a phenomenon resulting from a common set of values that shape institutional activities and unite key constituencies, both internal and external" (Townsend, et al., 1992, p. 10). Genuine interdisciplinarity within an entire academic institution requires a common set of values and a unity among faculty that seldom occurs in the real world. Were it to occur, however, the distinctiveness of that faculty could be rightly proclaimed.

In the helping professions (and surely college professing is a helping profession) there is a long-standing belief in the necessity of engaging in preventative activity where possible, in addition to helping people in crisis. The ability to be "proactive" has been a favorite buzzword within the mission statements of many professionals and professions in recent years. Our correlating negative perceptions concerning one who is only "reactive" only reaffirm our need to address problems "proactively." Few professions offer a better opportunity to address issues in a proactive manner than does college teaching. How we address the opportunities that are presented to us distinguish both "successful" programs and "successful" teaching from more typical programs and more typical teaching.

Preventive action is sometimes referred to as "upstream work" from the metaphor of rescuing drowning people (Egan & Cowan, 1979). The life guard jumps into the river to rescue first one person, then another, and then another. When the fourth appears they realize that somebody has to go upstream to try to stop these people getting into the water or to find a way for them to get out before they are exhausted. To adhere to strict disciplinary boundaries, brings to mind a rather different picture. That of a row of life guards lined up on the river bank, each with a different color hat. Each is able to enter the water only if the drowning person wears a matching color. People without clothing that matches a colored hat go on down the river. Because they get paid only when they enter the water, none of the lifeguards goes upstream. Upstream work becomes truly heroic. First, it will probably be impossible to prove that you saved any lives; second, you will not get paid; and third, you will lose the friendship of your colleagues downstream, deprived

not only of some or all of their income, but also of their more obvious heroism (Smale, 1995, p. 59). There should be a growing action to overcome these problems, to promote collaboration between agencies, and to develop community-centered services, all of which may initiate upstream work without sacrificing those already in the water.

According to Armstrong (1980), the ideal person for interdisciplinary work is someone with a high degree of ego strength, a tolerance for ambiguity, considerable initiative and assertiveness, a broad education, and a sense of dissatisfaction with monodisciplinary constraints. Certain abilities have also been associated with interdisciplinary individuals: not only the general capacity to look at things from different perspectives but also the skills of differentiating, comparing, contrasting, relating, clarifying, reconciling, and synthesizing (Klein, 1990). Curry (1991) writes of his own long-standing scholarly collaborations with Lawrence Goodheart, as a difficult "art form" to practice effectively. "In addition to having compatible interests and mutual respect, successful collaboration also requires enthusiasm, commitment, persistence, and, at times, forbearance" (p. ix).

McGuire (1993) couched the true interdisciplinarian in terms of the "renaissance scholar" or the "general practitioner" in professional practice. She believes such a shift was due to the "inexorable, cumulative expansion in our knowledge base and the consequent specialization that inevitably demands" (p.8).

Interdisciplinary Response to Education

Social problems are the malfunctioning of a network of people. Networks are typically composed of family, friends, or neighbors and other members of the wider community. The "problem" may be that there are no, or too few, significant people in the system. The vast majority of people's needs are met by caregivers in the community without professional intervention. People's needs only become a "social problem" when they are not being met. Being old is not a

serious problem any more than is being a baby. Only without appropriate relationships with others is either a "social problem" (Smale, 1995, p.66). Our goal is to find and create these appropriate relationships when they are lacking.

Interdisciplinary curriculum is distinguished by its ability to invite student inquiry for the discovery of big ideas that link several areas of knowledge. For too long, teachers have been bounded by the objectives and expectations set by others. Glickman (1998) suggests that we acknowledge that "a discipline is a human conception that becomes rigidly defined over time" (pp. 44-45). Decisions that people make are seldom rooted in one single discipline. Schools (at all levels) must develop people with the abilities and attitudes needed to understand the complexity of quality decision-making while simultaneously taking responsibility for their own learning throughout their lives -- lives in which they are likely to change occupations several times. Schneider & Shoenberg (1999) view these realities as clear and convincing evidence that undergraduate education must be seen as a whole, rather than as a split between general and specialized learning.

My concept (though not mine alone) of interdisciplinary study acknowledges the richness of the separate disciplines, their interrelationships, and their modes of inquiry. In this view, sound learning centers on the deep themes that underlie the content in the subject areas: principles, theories, and major generalizations. I believe that this is best advanced through inquiry that formulates questions from the perspectives of many disciplines of study, organized around universal concepts and generalizations (Martinello & Cook, 1994). Collegiality, according to Giamatti (1988) is "the shared belief, regardless of field or discipline, in a generalized, coherent, communal set of attitudes that are collaborative and intellectual..it is the most precious asset in any institution of higher learning" (p.39). This most precious asset, however, is eroded by the integration of knowledge having evolved into growing particularizations and ultimately, "professionalizations" of knowledge. As liberal arts colleges were becoming dominated by

disciplinary structure and the proliferation of specialities continued, it was becoming increasingly more difficult to educate the "whole person" (Klein, 1990).

Schaefer (1990) believed that our attempts to provide undergraduate students a "meaningful education" has, for the vast majority, failed (p. 123). He asserted that a "viable college education in the twenty-first century demands a complete rethinking of what an educated person could and should know" (p. 124). "The greatest challenge is ... to ensure that the pieces are connected, that after four...years the puzzle is complete enough to enable students to see it -- whatever 'it' might be -- in all its complexity, diversity, and ...beauty" (p. 125). Education should be less a series of "unrelated snapshots" and more a discernible picture of a larger reality. Lanham (1992) echoes these sentiments through his use of the term "systemic" thinking.

> "Education by discipline provides every discouragement possible, for both the student and teacher, to any kind of systemic thinking...to try to take a large view of anything is automatically suspect" (p. 54).

Egan (1997) refers to the "old disciplines idea... as involving the belief that the accumulation of particular forms of knowledge, in sufficient breadth and depth, shapes the mind in desirable ways" (p. 25). Returning to the beginning of this work, the question again becomes: who decides how much breadth and how much depth is adequate, and even more basically, who decides what's adequate? Beane (1997), with help from Bloom (1987) and Hirsch (1987), perhaps answers these questions as well as anyone:

> "separate subjects, and the disciplines of knowledge they are meant to represent, are territories carved out by academicians for their own interests and purposes. Imposed on schools, the subject approach thus suggests that the 'good life' is defined as intellectual activity within narrowly defined areas" (p. 42).

The fact that most of those defining these valuable areas that comprise the "good life" are white, male, and upper middle class is not lost on Beane, nor should it be lost on the rest of us. Having the ability to create and live by one's own definitions is an immense amount of power, and

it is the power that those in the more "mainstream" disciplines both have, and unsurprisingly, hold onto. Nelson & Watt (1999) described "disciplinary organizations" as entities that "rarely interrogate their own institutional practices, preferring self-promotion to self-criticism" (p. 107). Protecting one's own interests, however businesslike a concept, again seems to run counter with the "risk-taking" that should be present in academic settings.

Practical Advantages of Greater Interdisciplinarity

> "Liberal education is in trouble. It has always been in trouble...What is really troublesome, however, is that so few significant efforts are being made to translate diagnoses into prescriptions and prescriptions into practices" (Walton, 1979, p. 187).

Among the goals of this chapter is to expand our consideration of "interdisciplinarity" as a means of translating some of the diagnoses concerning higher education into prescriptions and those prescriptions into practice. Most institutions of learning are not endowed with unlimited resources. "Competing" for scarce resources seems both rather unseemly and unproductive. Most importantly, such competition works against our students' larger interests. Interdisciplinarity is linked with scarcity of resources in both academic and nonacademic settings. It has been suggested that people who work in small companies often become interdisciplinary by default. At many small private colleges, my own included, our smallness can become our biggest advantage, just as we surely allow ourselves to say that it is. Professors who actually know and like each other are much more likely to collaborate effectively than are mere acquaintances. Showing students our collaborative efforts should go a long way toward encouraging them to collaborate with others as they leave college and embark upon their professional careers. Human service students, like those in criminal justice and teacher education, who are "empowered" by faculty, rather than "dominated" by faculty are more likely, it seems anyway, to believe in empowering their future clients rather than dominating them. Sanchez & Fried (1997) describe such

empowerment concepts as "giving students voice." Students who are given a voice as students, might be more prone to listen to the voices of those they eventually will be serving.

Several decades ago, Dubos considered the idea of complementarity, in which "the logical relation between two concepts which appear mutually exclusive, nevertheless have to be used together in order to achieve a complete description of reality" (Dubos, 1962, p.4). Too many campuses are divided by narrow departmental interests that become obstacles to learning in the richer sense (Boyer, 1987, pp. 83-4). Hauerwas (1988) refers to the commonly held belief that universities are "loose confederations of departments that jealously protect their turf against one another...their cooperation is more a matter of self-interest than genuine concern about the purpose of the university" (p. 27). Complementarity has been sacrificed to the gods of strict disciplinary adherence.

While the academic community has been spending precious time struggling to understand "lines" drawn between disciplines, the world has been growing more complex, making these lines largely indistinguishable abstractions based more on tradition, than on reality and/or practicality. Accordingly, the lines between teacher education, sociology, psychology, criminal justice, and other disciplines may appear at first to make these fields the exclusive domain of specialized professionals, but a "complete description of reality" requires a more thoughtful approach. Can the American college, with its fragmentation and competing special interests, define shared academic goals? (Boyer, 1987, p. 83).

Despite our efforts to rationalize our many disciplinary boundaries, and a subsequent need for the inclusion of some disciplines and the exclusion of others into the general education curriculum, reality tells us that general education cannot actually be complete until the subject matter of one discipline is made to touch another. Bridges between disciplines must be built, and the core program must be seen ultimately as relating the curriculum "consequentially to life" (Boyer, 1987, p. 91). We are encouraged by the prospect that new academic alliances are being

formed and that departmental majors are interdisciplinary insofar as knowledge crosses intellectual boundaries (Boyer, 1987, p. 91). Scott (1995), in his study of organizations points out that "greater divisions often exist within than between disciplinary camps" (p. 1). It would seem then, that if both Scott and Boyer are correct, and I think they most certainly are, the truly integrated core means overcoming departmental narrowness. As integration in society has meant overcoming narrowness in our thinking, integration within the academic environment will mean overcoming a similar narrowness in our thought patterns and our acceptance of existing organizational structures.

"The Role of Higher Education"

> "In the present form of the university each department guards jealously a domain of expert knowledge, a subject-matter base underwritten by professional associations. Hence, willy-nilly, the university has become a gatekeeper for professional power and an academic identity. In trying to assemble disparate parts into a whole, the university community presupposes an experiential sense of the world, a sense contradicted by the very compartmentalization of knowledge the university promotes. Moreover, as technology is increasingly focused and as professionals are increasingly specialized, judgments about the world that emerge from the study of disciplines are construed solely in technical terms, often imperiling a sense of broadly defined human significance" (London, 1993, p. xxii).
>
> "The structure of disciplinarity that has arisen with the modern research university is expensive; it is philosophically weak; and it encourages intellectual predictability, professional insularity, and social irrelevance. It deserves to be replaced" (Menand, 1996, p. 19).

Those of us seeking an expansion of "interdisciplinary cooperation" and "positive interdependence," must acknowledge that much of the opposition to the concept will surely come from those within higher education. The resistance to change is illustrated by the adherence to

tradition even in the face of influential critics. More than seventy years ago, Alfred North Whitehead (1929) described the lack of integration and the ever increasing dependence upon specialization as "the fatal disconnection of subjects which kills the vitality of our modern curriculum." Costanza (1990) referred to this as the "overspecialization trap" (p. 95). If our curriculum's vitality lacks even a faint pulse, it is, in my view, time to proceed with a new form of resuscitation. Interdisciplinarity and its subsequent curriculum revisions are that form of resuscitation.

Given that change is inherently difficult and threatening to those entrenched in the status quo, assembling disparate parts into a whole will clearly be accompanied by criticism from many within those reassembled disparate parts. Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck (1994) interviewed some 300 faculty at 20 institutions of higher learning and concluded that the chief impediment to achieving quality teaching is often the departmental culture itself. They describe a sense of faculty isolation and fragmentation: "Perhaps the most important pattern we identified is a strong element of atomization and isolation among faculty. For a myriad of reasons, faculty are unwilling or unable to communicate with one another" (p.11). Fuller (1989) describes academic institutions as often "little more than weak alliances among intellectual entrepreneurs" (p.3). Beyer (1997) described disciplines as having “cultural boundaries” that were reinforced by “structural boundaries” of higher educational institutions (p. 157). The dominance of discipline based paradigms has constrained movement between and among the disciplines.

Austin & Baldwin (1991) cite several studies that claim less "alienation" and less "isolation" among faculty who collaborate. Whether we should concern ourselves with the individual "alienation" and/or isolation of faculty members is an issue for the ages; it does seem clear, however, that less alienation and less isolation not only sound like good things to seek, but might show our students the importance of collaboration across disciplines and across vocations in order to most effectively better the ever more complicated "human condition."

> "Professors, to be fully effective, cannot work continuously in isolation...and in the application of knowledge, the complex social and economic and political problems of our time increasingly require a team approach" (Boyer, 1990, p. 80).

However self-evident this may seem to anyone contemplating how best to serve humanity, formidable obstacles to genuine collaboration exist. Sizer (1996) refers to the "compartmentalization of America" which he defined as "the gathering of people with their economic or racial or ethnic kind and protective of the specialness of their turf" (p. 42). This increased protectionism in the form of compartmentalization diminishes our prospects for overcoming so many of the "great divides" present within our culture, whether they are racial, ethnic, economic, gender, or any of the other distinctions that we can create. Cahn (1986) eloquently sets forth the upside and downside to strict adherence to disciplinarity when he states:

> "single-minded intensity avoids the pitfalls inherent in pandering to public taste and and can produce remarkable intellectual accomplishments. An associated danger, however, is that single-mindedness may turn into narrowmindedness, and intensity to insularity" (p. 7).

Beyond our societal tendencies toward compartmentalization, lie the complicated psychologies and sociologies that make us, as a people, largely "change" resistent. Less complicated, but no less real, lie self-interested motives that prevent full discussion of interdisciplinary study and collaboration. Some scholars' attempts to hone their definitions of various social sciences have been both an attempt to increase understanding and to tighten the "boundaries" that distinguish their training and their discipline from "lesser" trained academics in "lesser" disciplines. In these times of increased attention to social expenditures, including education, there are new incentives for scholars to "distinguish" both themselves and their disciplines in ways that are not always of practical use educationally, but that can be of use in justifying their academic survival. In a world that seeks to cut "non-essential" services, defining one's work as essential and others as non-essential becomes more than merely an egocentric or

frivolous endeavour. Indeed "the faculty member's existence and legitimation are at stake when his or her field is threatened...the faculty member's primary loyalty is more likely to be to the field than to the school itself, or to the school's general aims or to higher education" (Farley, 1997, p. 137). Colton (1988) wrote:

> "storm clouds gather when a department senses encroachment on its discipline, whether in the form of course offerings, joint faculty appointments, interdisciplinary programs, or budgetary allocations to new academic enterprises" (p. 263).

Arnold & Civian (1997) similarly asserted:

> "changes in curricular requirements can lead to shifts in the distribution of students among departments. Deleting or adding a given requirement can have severe consequences for an institution's internal faculty labor market. Thus, aside from the oft-cited arguments about the merits of one curricular plan over another, there are a host of issues that can affect the everyday working life of faculty" (p. 20).

Beyond any "danger" in acknowledging the value of others outside your discipline, genuine "interdependence" requires the independence of thought that allows one to acknowledge that others can contribute to one's understanding of society and consequently one's contributions to society. Such "dependency" is not for the faint of heart. It requires a certain level of self-confidence and professional "independence" to willingly expose one's own professional limitations to other professionals. McFarland & Taggie (1990) cite the risks that are inherent in interdisciplinary teaching. Risks that naturally follow a requirement that one view a topic through the perspective of another "foreign" discipline.

Austin & Baldwin (1991) warn of potential threats to an individual's professional identity. These threats are most real in situations of unequal power and status among collaborators. If a scholar who has not gained recognition on his/her own collaborates with one who has, there is a rather common tendency to diminish the "lesser" collaborator and enhance the contributions of

the "greater" collaborator.

"Human Services as a Reflection of our Larger Society"

Brint (1994) defines human service professionals as those who "apply formal knowledge in the treatment of the problems that afflict individuals and in the service of the minimum standard the society deems necessary for a person to be able to live a normal and productive life" (p. 53). Unfortunately for many of the human services, the past several years have seen an increasing emphasis upon "personal responsibility" both in our political rhetoric and our subsequent social policy. Largely drowned out in this din is the larger human service concept upon which our democracies are based -- social and group responsibility. Currie (1995) lamented the emphasis upon personal responsibility in his consideration of what he called our "market society" which he distinguished from our market economy.

> **"Market society promotes crime by increasing inequality and concentrated economic deprivation; by eroding the capacity of local communities for support, mutual provision, and effective socialization of the young; by isolating the family and subjecting it to stress; by withdrawing public services from those already stripped of economic security and communal support; and by magnifying a culture of Darwinian competition for status and resources and by urging a level of consumption that it cannot provide for everyone."**

Given a larger culture that increasingly defines personal worth in terms of one's ability to consume, and a social and economic situation where one's ability to consume often depends upon being able to take what one wants, any sense of personal merit (or self-esteem) rather quickly comes to imply being stronger, meaner, and better-armed than the next person. "Blood flows where life has no purpose" (Wright & Sheley, 1995, pp. 188-189). To stop the flow of blood, our children must be convinced that their lives have purpose and hope. They may not be your children or my children, but as human service professionals we should encourage recognition of the fact that they are <u>our</u> children. Sometimes this caring approach has been associated with the "feminization" of certain fields. Rice & Richlin (1993) refer to fields which have the highest proportion of practitioners and faculty members (education, nursing, and social work) as having

"focused on a more client-centered type of scholarship than have fields in which there are proportionally more men" (p. 294). Giving lives purpose in an ever more complex future will require an on-going commitment to client-centered boundary crossing in attempts to find appropriate human service solutions to problems that cross the boundaries set by various professions.

> "We believe that teams--real teams, not just groups that management calls 'teams'--should be the basic unit of perfomance for most organizations, regardless of size. In any situation requiring the real-time combination of multiple skills, experiences, and judgments, a team inevitably gets better results than a collection of individuals operating within confined job roles and responsibilities" (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993, p. 15).

"The challenge in education is to find incentives that do not divide but bring about a collaborative search for better ways of coping with an extremely difficult set of problems" (Bok, 1993, p. 192). Bruner (1991) defined collaboration as a "process to reach goals that cannot be achieved acting singly" (or, at least not achieved as efficiently or as completely). Collaboration then is a process, a means to an end, not an end in itself. It should be the goal of true "liberal arts" colleges to cross boundaries in search of the ever elusive concept of "true excellence" in teaching and in service. This search is not an easy one. As Barzun (1968) stated: "excellence is rare, because it requires a concentration of congenial abilities" (Barzun, 1968, pp. 154-55). The fact that we seek rarified air is one reason that the search for true excellence requires patience perhaps beyond all else. "Interdisciplinary education is, at its best, school reform, and the reason it is neither simple nor painless is precisely because the things it seeks to accomplish are so large and important -- and therefore complicated and difficult to change" (Panaritis, 1995, p. 628). Back in 1983, Gelwick commented on the connection between the well being of the larger society and the way colleges and universities carry out their responsibilities. Gelwick viewed interdisciplinary education as "a paradigm shift within the academic community representing a transformation

occurring globally as we assume our responsibilities in a pluralistic future." Shifting paradigms and assuming responsibilities necessarily meets the resistance of those clinging to old paradigms and those whose responsibilities are subject to change. "One way to resolve the dissonance between the traditions of the academy and the needs of professional education is to broaden our conception of scholarship to include practice" (Rice & Richlin, 1993, p. 305).

Guinier, et al. (1997) wrote about the need for institutional change in the context of legal education, based upon the view that our society generally, and law school education particularly, must adapt from a "winner-take-all" format toward a collaborative "chance to all win together" format. Successful adaptation to our changing environment and successful adaptation to changes designed to meet the needs of the times, should prevent the further marginalization not just of certain "disciplines" within higher education, but of the entire venture of higher education. Whether one is an evolutionist, or a creationist, there can be no denial of the need of the human species to adapt or die. While altering college curriculums is probably less than a life or death decision, failure to adapt to a changing higher education environment which includes the needs of our consumers, will surely mean profound sickness if not death for many institutions.

Chapter Six

The Difficult Realities of the Entrenched University

> ***"If acceptance of diversity connotes intellectual enlightenment, one might expect colleges and universities to be discrimination-free oases--havens for politically or socially disenfranchised minorities with open doors to equal opportunity and unbiased judgment. Unfortunately, reality falls far short of expectation and popular myth. Instead of a gleaming citadel of racial and ethnic enlightenment, much of academe remains mired in the mud of institutionalized bias--a fortress for discrimination, unequal opportunity, and majority-rule politics" (Martinez & Martinez, 1997, P. 73).***
>
> ***"It is a bitter truth, despite how apoplectic it makes many of us, that the university is based on exclusions and exclusionary practices" (Stabile, 1995, p. 120).***

That we sort or "exclude" people should come as no surprise to those of us within who feel quite "excluded" ourselves. The surprise comes in how freely and willingly we've allowed "liberal arts" to become merely a phrase describing the rather conservative tendency to organize our universities in the manner that we have always organized them. Blackburn & Lawrence refer to colleges and universities as being "truly conservative organizations with changes much more often having come from without than from within" (p. 2). Whether our present acceptance and "conservation" of the "liberal arts" within our changing world is good or bad, is less the point of this chapter than our reluctance to challenge the status quo and our reluctance to question the authority of those who "know" what truly "liberal arts" are. Such acceptance should, I would think, surprise many who have described college professors as "liberal...as caused by the nature of intellectual activities that involve a questioning of the status quo and a critical attitude toward conventional wisdom" (Ladd & Lipset, 1975). Perhaps generally we question the status quo and we assess conventional wisdom, but it seems that when we look at ourselves, at least in terms of members of the academy, we tend to cease our questioning and blindly accept that which has

preceded us. "When academe sets its mind to cover up discrimination or perpetuate traditional privilege, it does so with skill and occasionally even panache" (Martinez & Martinez, 1997, p. 75). While racism, ethnicism, and sexism, exist on college and university campuses as they exist throughout the social structures of our society, it is less about those more "traditional" and now somewhat more openly discussed biases that this work addresses, than it is with the "new" biases against marginalized disciplines within the academy. This is a study in "traditionalism," or traditional privilege in the form of maintaining the status quo of those in "power" disciplines while maintaining the boundaries that keep less traditional disciplines outside of the margins. Traditionalism, while considered less (and in the grand scheme of things it is indeed undoubtedly less important than those other "isms") nevertheless rears its ugly head in many of the same forms: discrimination against "newness" and "change." Essentially, what if it is possible that at least some of the accepted canons and "essential truths" concerning higher education, simply are not true, and should not be so readily accepted.

"It's the Curriculum, Stupid"

During the first presidential campaign of former President Clinton in 1992, he and his staff became well known for attempting to keep potential voters' minds focused upon the economy. "It's the economy, stupid," became a catch phrase through which members of the campaign attempted to keep themselves disciplined in appeals to what really mattered to voters and therefore what they perceived (correctly it turned out) to have been the way to win the Presidency. While history has proven that President Clinton did indeed have significant personal failings, his and his campaign's ability to focus the public's attention on the economy and away from his own personal indiscretions proved to be a winning strategy in capturing the Presidency. The importance of the economy to "ordinary Americans" as we've come to be called, cannot be overstated. The importance of the curriculum to "ordinary professors" is akin to the importance of

the economy to "ordinary Americans." It is everything because it directs our day-to-day functioning within the university. What is to be taught? What department is to be teaching it? Where are resources to be directed in response to these teaching directives? All of these questions concern how the curriculum is formed, and how it evolves, and all of these questions then concern the very nature of how professors go about their business of teaching students.

Wisniewski (2000) wrote "the culture of higher education--its structures, traditions, mores, and practices--serves one prime function: to maintain stasis. What is described as change is a veneer of superficial responses to changing times or criticism" (p. 5). While the literature of higher education, and much of the rhetoric on and off campus suggests that changes are rampant, the reality is a far different one. "Organizational gridlock and exceptionally limited change are more apt characterizations of campus life" (p. 5).

Weiland (1996) acknowledged that while professors are "overwhelmingly liberal in political orientation...they too are resistant to change" (p. 538). Radically altering the liberal arts curriculum, or frankly, even slightly tinkering with it, seems to be retarded by our own "dread of innovation" (see Lee, 1991, p. 56).

> **"A liberal education acquaints students with the cultural achievements of the past and prepares them for the exigencies of an unforeseeable future...it fires their minds with new ideas--powerful and transcendent ideas that will trouble them, elevate them, and brace them for new endeavors" (Freedman, 1996, p. 1).**

"A liberal education is an education in the root meaning of *liberal--liber*, 'free'-- the liberty of the mind free to explore itself, to draw itself out, to connect with other minds and spirits in the quest for truth" (Giamatti, 1988, p. 109). According to Sarason (1993), a "liberal" education is one that "liberates you from the negative consequences of narrowness, prejudice, and unreflectively assimilated myths" (p. 24). Carnochan (1993) describes liberal education as "that which helps save us from our worst selves by establishing a social bond" (p. 29). Accordingly, Ryan (1998) viewed

the fate of "liberal institutions" as resting upon their "success or failure in remaining places attached to ideas of freedom of inquiry and cultural openness, and places that take seriously their duty to encourage good citizenship among their students (pp. 144-145). Academic leaders and mere participants have commonly considered general education requirements to be the part of undergraduate education that ensured a breadth of educational experience and prepared students for their nonvocational lives as self-actualizing individuals, effective family members, productive citizens, and leisure-enjoying human beings.

Lest we think, however, that "liberal education," like motherhood and apple pie, cannot be challenged, we might heed the words of O'Brien (1998):

> **"If general education is broad, does that imply that it is not deep, that is, it is shallow or superficial? If so, why is a brush with 'the philosophical tradition,"world literature,' or 'Eastern religions' a desirable educational goal? If a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, once over lightly with Hinduism seems ill considered" (p. 75).**

Other criticisms exist as well, not the least of which center less upon the "goodness" of the broad courses offered in general education, than upon the nature of the decisions and decisionmakers that choose which subjects are worth knowing and which seem less so. "It came to be curricular expression of which knowledge the faculty believed was worth knowing" (Mayhew, et al., 1990, p. 48). Unfortunately, it has evolved into an end unto itself. The general education curriculum has become so "lockstep" that "fitting in" or being "weeded out" has become less a function of merit, and more a reality of tradition. Katz & Henry (1993) stress the degree of arbitrariness that necessarily divides one discipline from another. Absent clear rationales for the divisions, such arbitrary lines are drawn less from a base in reality than in historical tradition and institutionalization. Tradition and institutionalization that have not always been academically, or even consciously considered in terms of how they might impact learning and genuine "liberal education" in an ever changing world.

> **"The aim of a liberal education, is to teach those general habits of mind which will pay off in good performance when applied to any constructive endeavor. This is not totally convincing to those who start from the proposition that it's a tough, hard world out there, and the object of education is to learn how to make a living" (Anderson, 1993, p. 141).**

Giamatti (1988) similarly asserts that: "a liberal education rests on the supposition that our humanity is enriched by the pursuit of learning for its own sake; it is dedicated to the proposition that growth in thought, and in the power to think, increases the pleasure, breadth, and value of life" (p. 121). Giamatti continues on to presuppose responses directed toward his definition in such form as "that is very touching, but how does someone make a living with this joy of learning and pleasure in the pursuit of learning?" (p. 121). Kanter et al., (1997) define general education as "the organized set of activities designed to promote critical thinking and writing skills, knowledge of the liberal arts, and personal and social responsibilities" (p. xxi). However difficult it is to argue with such claims, and however self-evident the value of general education is as we consider appropriate "responses" to narrow concentrations or overspecialization, our inability to actually get a handle upon what general education is and what it is not continues to define disciplines, students, and professors, as those who are "in" and those who are "out." Given the "power" of such curriculum choices, and the effects of those choices upon human beings, our certainty as to what general education is must necessarily be tempered with a realistic understanding that our own certainties are different from the certainties held by others. The power that necessarily accompanies those disciplinarians who base their standing upon their mandated "place" within a liberal education curriculum, is far greater than the power of those on the "outside" peering in. It is as if those on the outside stand with their noses pressed against the glass windows of the rooms in which private meetings are held. Rooms with the blinds drawn seemingly taunting those on the outside who somewhat pathetically stand with their ears and eyes at full attention hoping to get a small glimpse into what is happening inside. How, the spectators are left wondering, did

our invitations get lost in the mail?

A study cited by Hersh (1997) confirms our suspicions as well as those of the authors above, that "the liberal arts are neither understood well nor held in high esteem by a critical segment of society" (p. 22). Cooper (1996) echoes these sentiments when he wrote:

> **"the new generation of students no longer consider liberal education as crucial to their social transformation and growth in society...they find no practical value in trying to understand the exaltation and triumph of the human spirit that liberal education teaches" (p. 119).**

Shor (1996) similarly asserted:

> **"to many of those underprivileged in education and the labor market, liberal arts seem like luxuriously abstract indulgences far removed from the real world of finding good jobs and earning a decent living. Liberal arts are genteel theorizing to many working students. To them, if theory does not concretely relate to experience and practice, it is useless" (p. 165).**

The devaluation of the liberal arts, for good or ill, is also confirmed by Hersh (1997) who proclaims that an overwhelming majority of parents (75 percent) and college bound students (85 percent) believe that the ultimate goal of college is to get a practical education and secure a first job. Knox, Lindsay, & Kolb (1993) cite the shift away from liberal arts toward professional curricula designed to respond to student interests in receiving "job-related" educations. Delucchi (1997) wrote:

> **"enrollment concerns in recent years have compelled many liberal arts colleges to abandon or sharply scale back their arts and sciences curriculum in order to accommodate student preoccupation with the immediate job market" (p. 414).**

Whether this shift is good and proper in our market-driven economy is open to debate. Appropriately, it might seem, business interests generally applaud such a shift, while more traditional academics tend to see it as yet another sign of the academic apocalypse. Howley, et

al., (1995) perhaps realistically, albeit painfully, suggest that the increasing "vocationalism" of higher education is due to "educators' interests in demonstrating the practicality of higher education" (p. 70). Cooper (1996) rather pragmatically, if sadly, believes that the twin evils of "cynicism and individualism" have led these new generations of students away from the liberal arts toward more lucrative career-oriented paths. Mitroff & Bennis (1993) wrote:

> **"once upon a time, we all wanted to be Charles Lindberg, or Joe DiMaggio, or Fred Astaire, because they were good, now we want to be Pickens, Trump, or Iacocca, because they're rich" (p. 156).**

Career orientation is a different animal than is a mere search for a lucrative lifestyle, and practicality needs to be distinguished from greed.

Vocationalizing the curriculum is not the aim of most "traditionally oriented" professors, nor is it the aim of most professors within such "practical" disciplines as teacher education and criminal justice. These disciplines, like their more traditional brethren, are largely made up of persons who support the view that:

> **"vocational training gives the individual a leg up in the job market for the time being, the humanities and social sciences...expose the context of values and institutions which determine what kind of work is going to be available and what it will be like. This ultimately broadens the individual's choice, enabling him or her to adjust to or change the situation, and to be fully aware of the alternatives" (Engel, 1991, p. 42).**

Schaefer (1990) makes no secret of his belief that in higher education "already far too much ground has been surrendered to career orientation" (p. 137). While he views the "liberal arts" as the main course and not a garnish, Schaefer also shows disdain for the belief that colleges can be both vocational and liberal arts oriented simultaneously. "In attempting to accomplish both they in fact succeed in neither" (p. 10). Mayhew et al., (1990), assert that the "most important agenda item for improving the quality of education at any level and in any type of institution is a limited view of what the institution can and should be about" (p. 263).

Attempting to accomplish separation between the liberal arts and more "practical"

education, however warranted in a perfect liberal arts oriented society, becomes largely impossible in our present day job-oriented, material wealth seeking market society. As evidence of the complexity of the subject, Schaefer's views have been both supported and contemporaneously contradicted by others, including Millard (1991) whose views are described in some detail later in this work. Perhaps Nisbet (1971) cuts to the chase as well as any, through his proclamations that "training for professions is what the universities are all about" (p. 104). Certainly the history of our first institutions of higher learning would bear out Nisbet's assertion. Shulman (1997) likewise authoritatively asserts:

> "the problem with the liberal arts is not that they are endangered by the corruption of professionalism. Indeed, their problem is that they are not professional enough. If we are to preserve and sustain liberal education, we must make it more professional; we must learn to *profess the liberal arts*" (p. 151).

It seems as though much of our dialogue concerning vocationalism versus traditionalism is sorely misplaced, as a dialogue over a distinction that cannot ultimately be made. Nisbet viewed as "absurd" any notions that "true universities" were monastic seats of tranquil contemplation, the history of higher education has always been one in which it was "assumed that, for the brightest and ablest minds at least, the purpose of the education was preparation for a profession" (p. 104). The history of professional education has also struggled with the distinctions between vocational/practical and more "intellectual" study. Tensions, in legal education, for example, have long existed between the two camps, and some blame the disconnect between legal education and the "real world practice" of law as one of the factors in what seems to be a rather intense alienation on the part of many law students (Silverman, 2000).

Nowhere is the debate over the nature of the relationship between practical and theoretical knowledge more lively than in the field of curriculum development. The tension between "theory" and "practice" is historical, and was considered even by Aristotle as a tension between distinct categories of knowledge. The complexity of the debate is illustrated by its duration in the minds of

thinkers from Aristotle's day up until and including the present day.

Katchadourian & Boli (1994) found concrete "researchable" reasons why the distinction between "careerism" and "intellectualism" may be wholly artificial and therefore mostly devoid of merit. According to their questionnaires designed to ilicit responses from college students on such "careerist" goals as "acquiring marketable skills" versus such "intellectual" goals as "obtaining a general liberal education," there was no established relationship indicating that students high on "careerism" were low on the intellectual scale, nor were students high on the "intellectualism" scale necessarily low on the career scale. The evidence should perhaps persuade us that the black/white distinctions often made between "careerist" disciplines and "liberal" disciplines are far more gray than previously believed. History, too, may persuade us that time spent on distinguishing between the "practical" and the "liberal" is time largely wasted. The Sophists, usually credited with the advent of all educational theory, somewhere around the latter half of the fifth century B.C., an era of enlightenment in Greece, had as their goal the training of young people to succeed in a new world of personal and intellectual freedom and democratic institutions. Their goal was eminently practical: to produce citizens equipped to succeed in the circumstances of their society (Mitchell, 1999). Our goal, more than two thousand years hence, remains, or should remain, the same.

While distinguishing career goals from intellectual goals may be unsatisfactory and "academic" in the perjorative sense of that word, I am persuaded by an argument that separates the curriculum from the temporal needs of the labor market and that has been advanced by Spring (1994) in which he states:

> **"An important factor in ensuring that education is devoted to enhancing the ability of individuals to protect their political and economic rights is separating the curriculum from the needs of the labor market. The linking of schooling to the labor market can result in teaching instrumental knowledge as opposed to critical knowledge. Instrumental knowledge might create wage slaves,**

> while critical knowledge might create free people"
> (pp. 175-76).

As professors, is it easy to become cynical and picture the ongoing corporate influences with the college as an attempt to worship at the alter of economic interest, and create a culture, even here on campus, of wage slaves who uncritically and unquestioningly comply with the demands of an administration less and less inclined to consider faculty/student "critical knowledge" issues as important to the functioning of the business of the college. Wage slaves, who not only won't question their employer, but thank the benevolent dictators who allow them to remain employed in a labor market that makes them expendable. A labor culture in which employees, college professors among them, have become a sort of pitiful fraternity who, like the lowly freshman seeking induction into a campus social organization, says, "thank you sir...hit me again," no matter what indignity might be bestowed upon them. Tierney (1989) eloquently expresses his concern for college administrators' increased desire to appeal to the market demands of the student consumers by increasing course "relevance." "Adaptive strategies...have stripped liberal education of its central role and meaning" (p. 13). Perhaps even more problematic than the administrative appeal to the "marketplace" has been faculty members reluctance to persuade administrative authorities and the public as a whole that viewing colleges as businesses is not a particularly helpful or accurate comparison. The college that has spawned much of the material for this work, like others I am certain, seemed and seems to constantly strive for greater "efficiency," and arguments that seek to temper that goal with a greater understanding that "efficient" and "good" are not necessarily always synonomous, usually fall upon deaf and/or unlistening ears. Would, for instance, streamlining committees make us more efficient? Indeed it would. So, in fact, would eliminating all faculty input from decision-making processes. Would a dictatorship be more efficient than a democracy? Yes, again, it probably would. Would such changes be good, and would they make an academic environment better or worse? If only one thing is clear, it is that very little is clear and that simplified solutions to complicated problems

tend to be unsatisfactory on a number of fronts. Efficiency, however worthy a concept, is not always a positive element of every aspect of collegiate culture. In fact, slowness and downright inefficiency may be required in the course of some weighty decisions concerning long-term planning, curriculum changes, and the like.

Flacks & Thomas (1998) wrote of a "culture of disengagement" which they view as particularly prevalent among affluent college students. This "culture," in their view, has made college students, particularly affluent students who suffer from less adversity and enjoy more free time, less likely to engage in the type of search that might expand their economic horizons, and more likely to view their pursuit of a degree as a purely economic interest. Perhaps faculty members are also suffering from our own "culture of disengagement" in which we, by and large, view the limited protections and minimal job security we have as a far greater motivation for conformity than any idealistic "search for the truth" that we may have held in graduate school.

We are all aware of the "dangers" inherent in avoiding our own individual and collective problems. Be they problems of alcohol or drug abuse, marital tensions that build toward divorce, or even poor diets and a lack of exercise that lead toward health related illnesses. In this case, however, an avoidance of the discussion between separating vocational training from the sacred "liberal arts," makes a great deal of sense. Little good comes from a debate over which disciplines and thereby which collegiate majors carry more worth than others. Still, however nonsensical, many of our curricular decisions tend to be just these type of contests over highly subjective measures of worthiness: decisions over which disciplines and which courses are more "worthy" than others. By understanding that our subjective viewpoints are merely subjective viewpoints that may need occasional and substantial alterations in order to comply with our changing external and internal environments, we might lessen our need to continually "prove" our worth, as we might lessen our apparent psychological need to question the worth of others. Perhaps we have already spent too much valuable time attempting to separate vocational training from the

liberal arts. Even among those who have written extensively about "liberal education," there remains much confusion and dissent about any realistic separation between liberal and vocational education. To that end, Ryan (1998) made the following observation in assessing his own work: "this book is about liberal education rather than vocational education (though I occasionally challenge the distinction)"(p. 26).

Advocates of the superiority of each stance have cloaked themselves in "truth, justice, and the American way" to such an extent that neither can be entirely taken seriously. Carnochan (1993) describes the two sides as: "the moderns, exponents of whatever they see as new and useful" and "the ancients, exponents of the traditional and the true" (p. 22). As a sad testament to the influence of the modern economy and increasingly dominant role of business oriented interests into colleges and universities: these sides are often dominated by trustees and college Presidents (the moderns) on the one hand and faculty members (the ancients) on the other. The "moderns" fight for new and appealing curricula to attract more tuition paying students, at least in the short term, and the "ancients," most of whom are solidly entrenched within the traditional "liberal arts," oppose "outside" curricula changes as intrusions upon their sacred turf. This oversimplified illustration is presented not for its own truth, but for the way in which it asserts the "rightness" of both sides. This "rightness," both politically and otherwise, concerns me less than the boldness with which these assertions are advanced, and the possibility that despite such zealous advocacy, they may both be wrong.

Whether it is possible that these sides cannot be separated, or whether it may be intellectually essential that they be separate, it is difficult to find tremendous value in our devotion of great amounts of thought and time toward defining, once and for all, concepts that largely defy definition. The challenges mentioned by McMurrin (1976) more than twenty years ago: "to provide education that both satisfies occupational interests and needs and cultivates a genuine liberality in the individual is one of the most critical challenges currently confronting our educational

establishment" remain largely unabated (pp. 9-10). McMurrin was likely correct in his belief that these challenges would not be met until "a major change is effected in our educational thought" (p. 10). Merely maintaining separation of the disciplines and/or lamenting the decline of the liberal arts is not such a major change. Weingartner (1992) expresses his belief that any and all distinctions between general and specialized education are rather overblown. "Much tends to be made of a distinction between general and specialized education, but its formulation is usually confined to the college catalogue" (Weingartner, 1992, p. 2).

Carnochan (1993) emphasizes that while liberal education is undoubtedly valuable, it is "not the unconditional or transhistorical value it is sometimes said to be" (p. 2). Put simply, liberal education is, as are most value systems, subject to change with the passage of time and the evolution of society. "The belief that liberal education is a transhistorical value has impeded the habit of doing what universities usually do best, namely, studying currents and crosscurrents of change over time" (Carnochan, 1993, p. 6). To allow the sword of liberal education to be removed from the stone within which it is embedded, while undoubtedly risky to some, also allows for an analysis of ways in which it might be altered to work even better. Charles Eliot believed his "radical" proposals were nothing more than "an enlargement of the circle of liberal arts" (Carnochan, 1993, p. 3). To some of us, years later, it seems as though the circle has become impenetrable and "threats" to enlarge it are repelled as if they were threats to the sanctity of motherhood and apple pie.

It is, perhaps, the separation among the disciplines that lies at the base of the trouble. This separation seems to be inconsistent with the aims of general education as an interdisciplinary phenomenon. "The individual, rather than the discipline, was the principal focus of curricular development" (Mayhew et al., 1990, p. 48). As higher education becomes ever more competitive, we seem to have lost much of this focus, and instead concentrate on intradisciplinary ways to enhance ourselves and our discipline, even if it means the exclusion of others.

> **"We are constrained by the content of the liberal arts curriculum itself, which differs from that of the ancients. Our more complex technological era has separated the liberal arts curriculum into distinct disciplines that would have puzzled the ancients. Psychologists, historians, political scientists, and sociologists quickly challenge each other's ability to make informed judgments outside their own fields, and we are generally expected to confine our relationship with our students to our own discipline" (Colman, 1991, p. 175).**

Beane (1997) described this separation as the "separate subject" approach to curriculum. An approach that he believed, had a "deadening effect" on both students and teachers alike (p. 43). Giamatti apparently agreed, asserting the necessity for a more realistic understanding of the purposes of departments, and departmental structures.

> **"The ways people really think, teach, and especially do research are not defined solely by departments and never have been. Of course departments are necessary for bureaucratic and organizational purposes;...but they must be shaped and perhaps reconceived. Departments must be administered, but not as if they were sacraments" (Giamatti, 1988, p. 144).**

It is clearly understood within academic institutions, and within the academic structures of higher education generally, that no one asks impertinent questions about whether what others are teaching is sound, or worthwhile. Muting the differences that exist between and among us, and failing to address the "place" of each discipline within the academy, by an over-reliance on tradition, may be conducive to social peace, but it is certainly not conducive to change. Schwalbe (1995) refers to "turf defense" that implicitly demands that professors not scrutinize each other's work too closely (p. 327).

"Academically, faculty members refrain from questioning or discrediting one another's fields. They rarely articulate their suspicion that another field is trivial and its methods bogus" (Farley, 1997, p. 139). Farley (1997) refers to this as the "hands-off" principle (p. 139). If left alone, we can all do as we please.

> **"This is not the agreement to disagree, which has always been essential to academic life; it is an agreement to be ignorant of each other, and to avoid reflections that might carry them beyond the plying of their respective disciplinary trades" (Fuller, 1989, p. 3).**

Further it is generally assumed that there are not standards of truth, pertinence, or worth that apply across fields. "So the faculty may have collegial responsibilities, but they do not constitute a collegium" (Anderson, 1993, p. 147). Fuller (1989) refers to faculties at most colleges as "disintegrated communities of scholars" (p. 3). Further disintegration is almost inevitable, as we continue to struggle for control of scarce resources, whether those resources are students or funds. Struggles over scarce resources is politics at its most pure, and as such, it seems that organizational politics will continue to play an increasing role in academia [see Kanter et al., (1997) among others].

According to Morn (1995), among others, "higher education, and professionalization of academic disciplines and professional schools, is a highly competitive enterprise. Ultimately, it is boldly academic politics. Campus tranquility masks considerable infighting and struggles for power" (p. 79). Morn (1995) defined academic politics as a process by which individuals in higher education develop reputations and positions of power to influence and persuade other members of the profession, as well as members of the general public that their viewpoints are worthy. No matter how we define academic politics, the pressures, if any, exerted by those of us practicing within the disciplines of criminal justice, ethnic studies, women's studies, and teacher education, among others, have been largely ineffective at breaking down barriers of tradition and prestige (both justified and unjustified). Our ineffectiveness has, thus far, prevented us from gaining full inclusion into the academic mainstream.

Distinguishing oneself by publishing, long a means of upward mobility in academia, might also be a method used by those in marginalized disciplines to better represent themselves and make further inroads into the mainstream. Such advancement is difficult and presents yet another

of the many conundrums that face faculty in emerging and marginalized disciplines. Many of the professors teaching in these fringe disciplines are given heavier course loads than those maintained by their colleagues in the more mainstream academy. Carrying their weight by teaching heavier courseloads has been a common method of granting marginalized diciplinarians whatever status they have been able to attain. The logic has often been as paternalistic, as it has been motivated by economics...if these disciplines aren't quite up to mainstream academic standards...how tough can they be to teach? The result of such thinking has often made publishing a luxury of the few and only a dream for the many. With less publishing comes less prestige, with less time comes less publishing,...etc...the chicken and the egg phenomenon yet again.

At the smaller liberal arts colleges in which teaching is not only primarily important, but often exclusively important, it is even more difficult to gain entry into the sheltered disciplines. When publishing becomes unimportant and/or deemphasized, "marginalized" practitioners are further precluded from making inroads into "foreign" disciplines.

Even in institutions in which failure to publish doesn't mean perish, such a failure might only mean that a swift and harsh academic execution is replaced by a slow and languishing academic death. A death that is the result of inattention from colleagues in other disciplines and the disrespect that is borne out of the lack of acknowledgement and the collegial rewards that accrue naturally to those that publish.

Perhaps most practically, the blessings bestowed upon us as a result of our tremendous freedom presents the curse that is a lack of knowledge of our colleague's work. Since we have tremendous autonomy, it is difficult to know with any real degree of certainty the quality of our fellow professors. Some researchers, notably Kasten (1984), and some commentators, notably Sowell (1993), view publishing and research performance unlike teaching performance, as offering an objective means of evaluating faculty effort. [Consistent with the tenor of his negative views

toward the academy, Sowell emphasizes the importance of "exposing frauds" (p. 224) when praising the value of peer-reviewed publishing]. Whatever the motive behind "requiring" publishing, it is considerably less difficult to determine the effort that goes into publishing than either good or poor teachers put into their classroom performances. Some professors accomplish a great deal rather effortlessly, still others accomplish little while expending great effort, while most probably exist somewhere in between.

Weaver (1991) laments the decline of academic publishing as a requisite factor within a college teacher's existence. Such laments are infrequent, however, as the academy defends itself from outside "real world" criticisms. While it is difficult to argue with the concept of focusing upon "good teaching," it is also in the economic interests (at least short-term) of our institutions to "allow" us the "freedom" from publishing so that we may concentrate on ever increasing teaching loads, and/or our increasing public relations responsibilities as supports of the admissions staff. Our individual abilities to "command" more will necessarily be lessened by our inabilities or unwillingness to publish, given that "publication means visibility, esteem, and career mobility" (Bedeian, 1996, p. 6). Our ability to set ourselves apart from thousands of other well-educated individuals on campuses across the land comes largely through a record of publication, as our teaching, while it may "speak for itself," speaks to very few, and those few tend to be undergraduate students appropriately not prone to worry about faculty members' individual and collective careers. O'Brien (1991) considers both publishing and performances by faculty as a necessary dymamic of an energetic campus: "faculty who are active performers bring an excitement to the campus that the teaching-only institution cannot attain" (p. 154). Lest we think that all scholars think that teaching and research are the necessary twins of dynamic campus life, Cuban (1999) warns us that "teaching and research...are inherently in conflict" (p. 189). It should be clear that the academy is a not a place for widespread consensus.

It is the quality of students and, above all, the reputation of the faculty that determine a

university's prestige (Bok, 1986; O'Brien, 1991). While recognizing the primary importance of teaching at small colleges, particularly, Gleckner (1988) views faculty publishing as something to be "encouraged in the best of such places" (p. 7). Building upon a faculty's reputation is difficult without at least a modicum of outside review that publishing allows. Publishing enhances external prestige for the institution (Boyes, Happel, & Hogan, 1984). The importance of publication can be seen in the fact that publication count has been utilized as the sole criterion for ranking departments or schools in different universities (Webster, 1986). Davis & Astin (1987) viewed publication and scholarly reputation as inextricably connected. Tang & Chamberlain (1997) review the research that addresses the fact that there is a significantly wider audience for publication than for teaching. "The audience for published research extends beyond the campus, and sometimes beyond the nation; while the direct effect of teaching seldom extends beyond the classroom" (p. 214). Achieving an appropriate balance needs further encouragement, and the diminishing support for publishing and other academic pursuits that attempt to share our insights (however they may be) on a wider scale seems dangerously short-sighted.

Further alienation is felt through the very "private" nature of teaching or the "pain of disconnection" as Palmer (1993) refers to it (p.8). While tremendous autonomy is among our great strengths, it also can lead to great separation from our peers. Derek Bok (1986) wrote of law school as seemingly "cut off from the rest of the University as if by a vast moat" (p. 1). Rather than being a part of a larger community of scholars from across the university, law school professors were, in Bok's view, within their own world. Susan Moore Johnson (1984) in her wonderful book *Teachers at Work: Achieving Success in our Schools*, included a chapter which quite presciently predates this work entitled "The Reality of Isolation and the Search for Collaboration." The sense of alienation described by Bok, Johnson, and others, aptly describes the sense of alienation profoundly felt by many within the ethnic studies, women's studies, teacher education and criminal justice departments. We are

indeed "cut off from the rest of our peers as if by a vast moat."

> "Able Ph.D.'s rarely wish to work in isolation. They usually insist on having colleagues from the same discipline with whom to share ideas, graduate students whom they can train, laboratories, computers, or libraries with which to carry out their investigations. All in all, faculty members recruited from Ph.D. programs tend to transform the academic environment in which they serve and to orient it more toward research than toward training practitioners" (Bok, 1986, p. 84).

Jalongo & Isenberg (1995) describe the isolation and compartmentalization of teaching as antithetical to a satisfying and productive workplace. "Without colleagues and community, our lives as professionals are dissatisfying" (p. 190). Bennett (1998) wrote that most analysts are now in agreement that the health, wholeness, and attention to the common good of higher education, as well as its ethics and even spirituality, are in grave jeopardy. "For many educators, the college or university has become a job site and no longer an academy" (Bennett, 1998, p. viii). Bennett views much of this as attributable to "insistent individualism" (p. x).

The opportunity to experiment, to play a special role, exists in tension with the desire to achieve a higher status and to succeed according to the prevailing standards in the disciplines and professions. The latter pressures strongly encourage conformity (Bok, 1986, p. 22). In the early twentieth century the rationalization of the university meant that any subject worth teaching had to be constituted as a discipline, with the full paraphernalia of journals, associations, graduate programs, and the like (Anderson, 1993, p. 27). It also meant that a discipline had to possess distinctive methods and a body of certified knowledge created by those methods. Charles Eliot of Harvard abolished the prescriptive curriculum and instituted the free elective system. To be sure Eliot's scheme was too radical even for Harvard, and his successor, Lawrence Lowell, instituted a system of distribution requirements. Thus was born the familiar pattern of general education, understood as "breadth," leading to specialization, or "depth," represented by the major, which has become, with only modest variations and tinkerings here and

there, the standard format of American higher education (Anderson, 1993, p. 31). Tinkerings here and there also quite ably describe our willingness to "talk the talk, but not walk the walk" concerning deep and meaningful changes in departmental structures that might go some distance toward genuine interdisciplinarity.

> "Departments are often the bane as well as the prop of academic existence. We complain about them, but we regard them as indispensable...we have been willing to vote to abolish grades, requirements, poverty, and war, but never departments. And yet I think that just as one cannot be captive, in order to survive, of attitudes of the recent past, so one cannot be captive of the administrative structures of the dimmer or dimmest past" (Giamatti, 1988, pp. 143-44).

Curry, Wergin and Associates (1993) identified four broad social trends that have profound effects on how professionals work: the social and political forces affecting professionals and their roles; the changing definitions of professional skill; the effects of information technology on the very nature of professional practice; and the increasingly strict demands for professional accountability. Professionals on college faculties must somehow cope and hopefully thrive during these social trends. Whether it is increased accountability (which in some form at least is difficult with which to argue) or simply a greater blurring between the lines of academia and the demands of "business," life on college faculties is changing.

Mayhew, et al., (1990), described "faculty marginality as reflected in a sense of alienation from the dominant established culture that identifies with strong business and materialistic values" (p. 126). Brint (1994) also made reference to the "social tensions between those close to the world of business and those close to the world of universities" (p. 19). As boards of regents, and boards of trustees are increasingly comprised of professional "businesspersons" the lines between running a business and running an academic institution are further confused. Board members often very ably represent an America that "has never been less interested in achievement or more interested in success" (Mitroff & Bennis, 1993, p. 159). Academic

achievements that do not clearly impact the bottom line are often less important than the "success" that is measured simply by a numerical assessment of that bottom line figure.

College presidents must now concern themselves with "the bottom line" in ways that seem unprecedented on college campuses. The great visionary university presidents, once intimately involved with attempts to change America's thinking on weighty political, social, and economic issues, have been largely replaced by a generation of leaders whose vision is focused on raising large donations (Reich, 2001). Reich cited James Conant, Harvard's President from 1933 to 1953, who instructed the nation on the importance of civilian control of atomic energy; and Robert Maynard Hutchins, who led the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951 and gained some notoriety for his provocative ideas about education and justice (Reich, 2001, pp. 208-9).

Visions of truth, education, and justice, have also been hampered by the realities of a new "corporate" and "flexible" workforce. Nelson (1997) laments the difficulties that faculty will have in "healing ourselves" given the increasing use of adjuncts which he explains are just the sort of "flexible (disposable) workforce" that bond-rating services consider a sign of financial health (p.2). The thought that college presidents might somehow be "above" worrying about such "trivialities" as these, and might instead focus upon thinking great and lasting thoughts, continues to be overcome by the knowledge that most boards of trustees and boards of regents are composed of exactly the sort of business people who value "bond ratings," and who often are themselves "downsizing" their companies while they make greater use of more "flexible" workforces. Business leaders, often dependent upon "corporate welfare" for their profit margins, loathe other forms of "welfare," and paralleling their often stated views toward welfare clients, many business leaders believe that faculty could "teach better if only they would try harder" (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 196). Eliminating job security may be an extremely effective way of making faculty "try harder," whatever the end result upon education. Universities increasingly led by

corporate executives (with their own form of immense job security, including incredible severance packages) have "compromised" on tenure by allowing it for an elite and ever aging few, and enlarging a lower order of lecturers and non-tenure track part-timers who lack decent pay, benefits, and job security...but provide the administration with the "flexibility" it requires in a "changing market." [For an excellent discussion of the "flexible workforce" and the strategies of corporations in pursuing contingent workforces at the expense of permanent workforces, see Kuttner (1997); Leslie and Rhoades (1995) address the troubling tendency of colleges and universities, like corporations in recent years, to both downsize and trim costs, while administrative salaries and expenditures rise dramatically]. Tierney (1989) laments the increase of "professionalized management" within colleges and universities which has altered the administrative make-up away from traditional collegiate "presidencies" toward CEO's and managers (many of whom hold the necessary formal academic degrees that would otherwise make them seem to be academically minded). These "managers" more and more have acceded to trustees' demands and have accordingly silenced minority and dissenting views while they legitimize the already ample rights of the dominant.

At the institution from which most of my academic anecdotes have been drawn, there had been a debate ongoing over whether faculty should have access to trustees meetings. The reluctance to move in such a direction expressed by both the trustees and the President is consistent with the findings of Leslie and Rhoades (1995) in which they cite the tendency for governing boards to favor ever stronger financial control by higher administrators. While centralized financial control "at the top" seems practical, it also seem inevitably to lead to a major reallocation of resources away from instruction and toward administration. I trust that most professors at most institutions would be able to insert their own colleges where I have discussed my former college, and the differences in administrative thought would be minimal. Whether it is the start-up of "institutes" such as the one to be discussed later in this work, or other

"administrative" entities, there seems to be a clear preference for increased spending in areas other than traditional academic endeavours. Given the make-up of most boards of trustees, such an emphasis upon management with a concurrent "distrust" of the workers and traditional academics can hardly be considered surprising.

I am not the first to express concern over the make-up of boards of trustees. Koerner, contemplating the demise of tiny Parsons College in rural Iowa in 1970, wrote: "the self-perpetuating board of trustees that prevails among our private colleges, that is dominated by noneducators and answerable to nobody, needs reassessment" (p. 225). Despite misgivings like these, the reality over the past three decades has been for an even greater domination of boards of trustees by non-educators tied to business interests.

Faculty members who argue for better pay and greater benefits based on their value to the institution are often met with "market requirements" that keep wages and salaries low. At campuses where I've taught, professors driving old and compact cars park next to trustees who attend meetings after exiting their Mercedes, Cadillacs, Jaguars, and similarly prestigious symbols of "success." Soley (1995) speaks of similar disparities in parking lots used by social science professors on the one hand, and their well paid colleagues in business, engineering, and medicine. [Mayhew et al., (1990) refer to privately supported liberal arts colleges as places where relatively low tuition is possible because of "inadequate compensation of the faculty" (p. 41)]. It is all too common at some places, that when pay raises are considered, the administration takes pains to tie faculty raises to tuition increases, without making similar ties between other operating expenses of the institution and the "students' welfare." The popular comic strip *Dilbert,* refers to the concept of "humiliation as a management tool." When such humiliation occurs in real life, the humor is gone. Mills (1997) refers to the "Triumph of Meanness" in his work of the same name. In such a culture, it is most difficult to encourage a spirit of teamwork and cooperation, yet it is all the more mandatory that we do so; for our survival, economically, politically, and perhaps most

importantly, and most easily assessed, emotionally. The symbolism that is easily viewed within our parking lots is too great to ignore, and presumably at least, is not lost on future generations of students who more and more seek careers in "business," to the detriment of the "traditional liberal arts" and/or academia.

Critics of greater trustee "activism," myself included, charge that, on many campuses, trustees have supported excessive budget cutting, and/or excessive shifting of priorities that sometimes subordinates educational goals. This concern stems from the belief that trustees, most often a group of economically "successful" businesspersons and professionals, often view the faculty as less than equal partners in accomplishing the objectives of the institution. Soley (1995), among others, commented upon the tendency for trustees to have a business background with little to no traditional academic ties. The notion of trustees as "educators" is as foreign as has heretofore been the image of educators as corporate heads. The ideas of "shared governance" and other aspects often prevalent within the academic culture, are not surprisingly, often seen as foreign and even threatening to those more entrenched in the business world. Lazerson (1997) addresses the issue of appropriate college governance in his article *"Who owns Higher Education?"* He optimistically concludes that along with the stresses and difficulties that trustee activism engenders could come positive outcomes such as a more engaged, articulate, and accountable faculty and administration.

The "great divide" within our parking lots is not unlike the great divides between our disciplines. Coming to terms with the mission of any organization of individuals is difficult, coming to terms with the mission of a traditional liberal arts college is made doubly difficult by a collection of individuals whose life's work has been to consider alternatives, and to "question everything." Still, "a faculty that has made a considered choice of *some* common philosophy is vastly better off than one that struggles along with no philosophy at all" (Bok, 1986, p. 45). A coherent vision and value structure guides the institution.

It is with chagrin that I report that on many campuses that coherent vision does not include certain "marginalized" disciplines within those disciplines "favored" by inclusion within general education core requirements.

Inclusion within general education requirements not only delivers students, it symbolizes the importance placed upon a given discipline in fulfilling an institution's mission (Arnold & Civian, 1997).

Where I have taught, ethnic studies, women's studies, criminal justice and education courses fail to warrant a place in the sacred "core" of general education requirements deemed as necessary for a well-rounded education. This "choice" to marginalize such disciplines can only have a natural tendency to alienate both the faculty in those disciplines and to a lesser extent, the students in those disciplines themselves. Our alienation is a natural product of our existance "outside" of the general education requirements. With the exception of marginalized disciplines like the ones written of in this book, other majors tend to have courses which are included within the general education requirements. What does this tell us (students, faculty, outsiders alike) about the marginalized disciplines? Perhaps that those who perceived the need for "general education" requirements as contributing to "breadth," see these majors as periphery to the mission of a college. We exist as our own little "quasi-professional" schools.

"Anyone familiar with the contemporary university knows that it is not simply indifference and ignorance that divide the disciplines, but far too often suspicion, derision, and contempt as well" (Anderson, 1993, p. 123).

"The disciplines...lead a shadowy existence. They are not truly incorporate. Their professional associations are little more than chambers of commerce, intended to hold annual meetings and bestow honors. The annual conventions advance careers, not knowledge" (Anderson, 1993, p. 154). Bennett (1998) laments the "burdens of rigid academic departmental structure," that "fosters the professional isolation and disconnection associated with insistent individualism" (p. x).

> **"Despite the allegiance of most faculty members to their specific disciplines, it would be difficult to argue that any field has a monopoly on encouraging students' intellectual or value development or ability to think effectively" (Stark & Lattuca, 1997, pp. 12-13).**

The social sciences have much to teach about the diversity of the human experience. Social scientists have tried, and continue to try, to understand humanity in its extremities. Theoretically, they should also be able to teach us about the universality of human experience, about the things we all know, all sense, all understand. But here, they generally fail us. People pursue self-interest (Anderson, 1993, p. 133). Those that think otherwise, might attend a faculty meeting concerning curriculum in which another discipline is attempting to incorporate itself into the "general education" requirements. Those faculty members representing disciplines already represented are quite reluctant to allow another to "intrude" upon their domain. Understanding humanity in its extremities seems to play a meager role in the thought process, with self-interest and self-preservation playing a significantly larger one. Large scale "self-interest" and "self-preservation" within institutions, and the subsequent diminishment or "marginalization" as I have referred to it, of some disciplines could be compared at some level to the "marginalization" of women over the course of our history. The silencing of women has been viewed by Lipman-Blumen (1984) as a conscious effort by those in power (men) to keep those out of power (women) oppressed. Education as the great equalizer, necessarily threatens the power establishment. If Lipman-Blumen is correct, then only when the power establishment is changed, either in belief and action or in its makeup, will education and educational opportunity be the same for women as for men. Since it is often highly improbable that those with power will gladly share, the need for women to become part of the "universal establishment" is heightened. Becoming a "genuine community" in which the establishment is "universal" requires the involvement of all people. Whether the "marginalized" group is women, or professors of "lesser disciplines," change will only occur when the status quo is challenged.

The first and most evidently adverse tendency of organization, large organization in particular, is that discipline is substituted for thought. Discipline is inescapable; there must be acceptance and willing pursuit of a common goal, for it is this that makes organization effective, even possible. The individual who conforms fully is commended in highly relevant metaphor as "a good soldier." At the same time there is no doubt that creative thought is suppressed and often replaced by the disciplinary process. "The man or woman of independent view -- who identifies weakness or error and sees or foresees the need for change -- may well be considered uncooperative, irresponsible, eccentric" (Galbraith, 1996, p. 105). At my prior institution, and as a relatively new faculty member in criminal justice, I was living this dichotomy. While I certainly wanted to be a "good soldier" and I believed in loyalty to my institution, it was apparent that changes needed to be made within that curriculum if we had hoped to make criminal justice "viable." While some might see this belief as irresponsible and eccentric, and my advocating this change as evidence of my uncooperative nature, I had convinced myself, that the changes I was advocating were necessary for students of criminal justice and were in the long-term best interests of the college.

The obstacles to change are, of course, rather formidable. Primary among the obstacles is the "sacredness" attached to the present curriculum, and the concept of "general education requirements" within a "liberal arts context." "Any religion worth its salt cannot tolerate those outside the faith questioning basic tenets, and particularly, those heretics within its ranks" (Phipps, 1995, p. 23).

Even beyond the "religion" of adherence to tradition lie perhaps less philosophical and more practical reasons for resistance. Carfagna (1997) cited the limited degrees of openness and cooperation that persons might bring toward change if they are deeply invested in the present. These deep investments may have come through actual participation in developing the requirements that are now in use, so that "pride in authorship" might preclude acceptance of

change.

Most directly, entrenched professors with credibility based upon years of service as well as more useful measures, oppose change that impacts their disciplines. The impact is real and the threat is genuine. It has been the practice, at my former institution for example, for general education offerings that students may use as a social science course to consist of "Introduction to psychology," "Macroeconomics," "Introduction to sociology," and "Introduction to American politics." If "Introduction to criminal justice" and/or “the foundations of education” were added to this mix, increasing the choices from four to five or even to six, it would seem to follow that as many as 20% of students now taking the other four, would opt for "Introduction to criminal justice" and/or “foundations of education.” How many of these students would be so enamored that they might feel compelled to major in criminal justice or teacher education is impossible to determine, but it is impossible to imagine that some would not be. Therefore, adding criminal justice and/or teacher education to the mix of social science general education requirements would necessarily mean a slight reduction in students in the other four disciplines. Katz & Henry (1993) suggest that "many students fumble around during the first two years of their undergraduate experience and may be seeking a disciplinary channel that seems to be congruent with their interests and emerging modes of thinking" (pp. 154-155). O'Brien (1991) equated, if somewhat cynically, the term "liberal arts" with "undecided" (p. 74). Boudreau (1998) lamented the specialization that prevents first year students from truly "discovering" their own unique gifts.

> "While the first year of college ideally is such a time, the truth is that most freshmen find that prerequisites, overly specialized and specific core requirements and their own preconceptions often prevent this period from becoming a time of exploration and discovery. In reality, this forced choice of highly specific course of study is the very antithesis of 'enlarging the mind' that characterizes the true liberal education" (p. 84).

If marginalized disciplines are not included among the general education offerings, the

"fumbling around" that undecided students may do, will be within a context of general education course offerings of which professors of the marginalized disciplines are not a part. Any interests or "emerging modes of thinking" that a student might not be fully cognizant of coming out of high school will necessarily go undiscovered and hence, unexplored. Boudreau (1998) suggests the somewhat "radical" initiative of restructuring the current variety of academic disciplines into truly interdisciplinary majors.

In these times of down-sizing and a seeming "corporate" need, even in liberal arts colleges, that departments "justify" themselves in the face of threats, is hardly surprising. Unfortunately, as we justify, we sometimes play right into administrative (corporate) hands when we compare ourselves to one another not by lifting ourselves, but by burying our competitors. In the "justification" process, having one's discipline within the "general education" requirements is clearly in one's best interests. Conversely, excluding as many "other" disciplines from the general education requirements is also in one's best interests. From the perspective of one on the "outside looking in," it seems to speak more directly to self-preservation than it does to a commitment to a valuable undergraduate liberal arts education.

> **"For over two decades, departments have shoehorned courses into distributional systems of general education in order to (1) ensure credit hour production that will justify faculty positions in the department, (2) expand the requirements for the major, and/or (3) to expose more freshmen to the subject matter so that more can be recruited into their specific major" (Mayhew, et al., 1990, pp. 69-70).**

Weaver (1991) writes of his concerns for the marginalization of teacher education:

> **"Teacher education programs, because of the putatively intrinsic properties of their subject matter, are necessarily inferior to the real business of the institution and are to be tolerated only as long as student demand and external agencies make retaining these programs politically and fiscally expedient for the health of the institution**

as a whole" (p. 86).

Hirsch (1996) similarly asserts: "both critics and defenders of education schools agree that professors of education in these institutions are held in low esteem as a group by their colleagues" (p. 115). Clifford & Guthrie (1988) write of education professors' "multifaceted and chronic status deprivation" (p. 332).

No college or university would, I presume, consider dropping philosophy or political science as departments merely because of a lessening in the number of majors. Criminal justice, ethnic studies, women's studies, and teacher education, as marginalized, free-standing agents periphery to the "main" college, hold no such power. Our survival depends upon our fiscal viability, and/or perhaps, the benevolence of the administration.

> "Budget deficits in the 1980s and 1990s encouraged many research universities to reconsider their curricular offerings. In these reconsiderations, the less popular scholarly fields, the 'softer' social sciences, the newer interdisciplinary fields, and, in particular, the more marginally situated 'human services' fields experiences losses" (Brint, 1994, p. 44).

It has long been customary to distinguish between "liberal" and "practical" or "vocational" education. Determining which is which is the "age old tension" as Millard (1991, p. 92) described it, between the liberal arts and more specialized education. Usually, at least among those protecting their own self-interests, it is said that criminal justice and teacher education lean toward the practical or vocational side. This somehow diminishes the value of these disciplines and makes them, therefore, wholly appropriate subjects for exclusion from general education requirements. Unlike "practical" education, it is said that a liberal education is something that one pursues for its own sake, not for instrumental value (Anderson, 1993, p. 51). Linda Ray Pratt, former President of the American Association of University Professors, describes the habits of mind fostered by liberal education as "a manner of thinking commonly developed by critical inquiry, aesthetic enjoyment, literary engagement, and philosophical reflection" (1994, p. 48). Botstein simply

described the undergraduate years in their ideal form as a “time when an individual, as an adult, links learning to life” (p. 186). Giamatti (1988), among others, described liberal education as that which "can spark a lifelong love of learning" (p. 119). Specialized professional education, is nonetheless, the very essence of the modern university. Every program of study, no matter how "liberal," culminates in a major (Anderson, 1993, p. 52).

Millard (1991) laments the propogation of the "myth that liberal arts and concern with career are conflicting concepts" (p. 100). For him, this means that colleges could have and should have been more effective at helping students discover that their "vocation" includes much more than simply "work."

Weingartner (1992) similarly proclaims that "there is merit in not distinguishing, from the start, between liberal education and undergraduate professional education" (p. 2).

> "Except for extremists, no undergraduate educators in the professions object to having their students be familiar with literature, with American history, not to mention having them know how to write; except for fanatics, liberal educators do not object to having their students obtain jobs upon graduation by virtue of the fact that they learned something useful as undergraduates" (Weingartner, 1992, p. 2).

The real work of the university is to enhance the powers of the mind (Anderson, 1993, p. 59). The difficulty comes into play when it appears that many disciplines seek to enhance the powers of the mind "only in directions that they themselves have deemed worthy." Rather than a true "liberal education," such closure within and among a group of established disciplines, is "conservatism" at its finest. Since our society tends all too often to throw around the labels, "conservative" and "liberal," we have all become so accustomed to their usage and our "place" within them, that we seldom consider their actual meanings. Webster's Dictionary defines "conservative" as "opposed to change; desiring the preservation of the existing order of things; moderate; cautious; wanting to conserve." It is difficult to come up with a better description of many professors' views about their "liberal arts" curriculum. Many of our finest "liberal arts"

minded individuals, so openly "liberal" in their personas, are the most clearly "conservative" in their views toward "liberal education." Confused? So are many of us on the outside looking in.

Sowell (1995) describes what he calls the "vision of the annointed." According to his analysis, "vision has become self-contained and self-justifying -- which is to say, independent of empirical evidence. This is what makes it dangerous, not because a particular set of policies may be flawed or counterproductive, but because insulation from evidence virtually guarantees a never-ending supply of policies and practices fatally independent of reality" (p. 241). It would seem as if many of our more entrenched college faculty are the "annointed." Phipps (1995) referred to the academy of higher education faculty as a "bona fide and authentic religion...deriving its legitimacy through a set of historical values and beliefs" (p. 20).

> "Like most religions, these values and beliefs gain their sustenance from and are held together by the 'faith'" (Phipps, 1995, p. 20).

If indeed the faculty are both "annointed" and members of the "faith," change is not soon forthcoming. "A challenge to the core values and beliefs of the academy will elicit a negative response" (Phipps, 1995, p. 23). Why would we expect professors to be different from other members of society who recoil and defend themselves when their core values and beliefs are challenged? Faculty members "know" that adding criminal justice and/or education to the general education requirements is not appropriate, although they cannot empirically express why. It is among the most dangerous of facts, that which is just simply accepted because it has been accepted for a long period of time. Havel (1985) told us that "reality does not shape theory, but rather the reverse" (p. 33). The theory that has lied behind the traditional liberal arts curriculum has shaped the reality that has become entrenched. Just as Havel wrote about the subjection of the powerless within society, so too are the powerless and marginalized professors of education and criminal justice forced to operate within a system that largely devalues and diminishes them. We might take solace in the struggles that other now established disciplines endured before us.

> "More than a few fields of learning, today integral parts of the university curriculum, had to come into being not merely outside university walls but under the lash of university scorn and contempt" (Nisbet, 1971, p. 19).

Perhaps still another reason to consider "change" however constituted, is the growing role played by undergraduate adult or "non-traditional" students within colleges and universities. Giczkowski (1995) urges that we consider the experiential learning of these students as, in certain instances, negating their individual "need" for an introduction to intellectual life in the form of certain general education requirements. A truly "liberal" system within our colleges and universities that promotes learning at all levels, should provide for the differences that these students might bring.

However conservative an undertaking that higher education is [see inter alia, Mayhew et al., (1990), p. 199] we must not always be frustrated by this "conservatism." Some conservatism within traditional institutions does have its place, and change merely for the sake of change furthers no purpose. Faculty reluctance to change, in fact, can and often does signify a legitimate concern for the maintenance of quality. Changes sought must bear a legitimate relation to the improvement (whatever that means) of the academic institution, a point upon which I presume, even academic "liberals" and "conservatives" might agree (accepting, of course, the very real possibility that they could not even agree upon what "improvement" might be).

> "In sum, the curriculum is a machine in finely tuned balance, composed of working parts from society, the accepted foundations of knowledge, some learner needs, community values and interests. Managing this potpourri of ingredients may be assigned to one or more individuals within an institution. But it is a collective professional responsibility" (Sharpes, 1988, p. 95).

This is not the first book to consider an "expansion" of curricular horizons, though it may be the first to so specifically concentrate upon criminal justice, ethnic studies, women's studies, and teacher education. Collett & Karakashian (1996) edited a book entitled *Greening the College*

***Curriculum*, in which it is argued that the curriculum needs to consider, to a much greater extent, environmental issues that threaten our surroundings, and thereby threaten us, both individually and collectively. The mere fact that such books exist, and such opinions are held by scholars of some stature, should indicate that curricular decisions need to be made in an open and inclusive environment. Whether a given curriculum should be "greened" or whether it should include more or less social science, more or less natural science, more or less writing...etc...should be a matter that is often considered, often revised, and seldom left on "auto-pilot." As professors we surely would not want our students to allow their thinking to be set on "auto-pilot" or "cruise-control," but rather we would strive for their minds to be open enough to consider given alternatives in given contingencies, having an array of facts at their disposal. Our minds should remain open as well to the many contingencies, as well as the many changes in available technology, that can and should often impact a college curriculum. The "openness" on colleges, that is so ably reflected in our rhetoric and in much of the literature, runs counter to the practice on most campuses, in which the modification of existing practices is done only in an extremely limited fashion.**

Discipline is to Profession, As Artificial is to Genuine

One of the many ways in which a college reaches out to the community, and seeks support for its programs, is by contacting alumnae and citizens interested in the continued presence and success of the college. A genuine academic community cannot, of course, abandon or even lessen its concern for the "accepted foundations of knowledge" and their impact upon the curriculum of the college. Keeping the need for "tradition" in mind, it is equally critical that the college leaders continually assess and meet the needs of the community in order to maintain the continued viability and vitality of the college. To effectively do so requires the sometimes painful negotiation between traditional academia and those "beyond the ivory tower."

The fact that the social sciences, in particular, began to turn toward attempts to solve social problems, contributed to the curricular evolution that has been and continues to be a central feature of this book. The reasons behind the social sciences movement in this direction are, as usual, many and varied. Some of this move occurred quite practically as a response to student demands for a more "relevant" curriculum. Increasing the "relevancy" in conjunction with the ongoing "corporatization" of higher education, allowed for the corollary demands of faculty and institute managers who saw the potential for greater funding and political power if they could convince the public and supporting agencies that they were contributing something of immediate community value. Such perceptions of "value" are often even more influential than student demands (Cohen, 1998). The necessity, then, for academics to begin serving several masters began to influence the politics and social climate of numerous institutions of higher learning.

Practicing physicians, lawyers, and executives tend to have priorities quite different from those of the academy. As one might expect, they tend not to elevate abstract, theoretical ideas over findings of a more practical nature. If anything, the reverse is true (Bok, 1986). In fact, "there is a broad public expectation that the universities will teach the young how to earn a living. It is also understood that the universities are a primary instrument of social mobility" (Anderson, 1993, p. 51). The degree of "control" that the professions have over formal knowledge is both a cause and effect of our higher educational systems. "The professions construct cognitive frameworks that define areas within which they claim jurisdiction and seek to exercise control" (Scott, 1995, pp. 95-6). In other words, not unlike those setting forth the "liberal arts," professions are able to define their own realities, and as we recognize certain groups as "professionals," challenging those realities from "outside" of these "professional lines" becomes daunting, if not impossible.

In many applied fields, there is a close, structured relationship between the acacemic disciplines and the organized communities of practitioners. We can think of this relationship as part of the overall organization, and the internal system of governance, of the profession or

enterprise. In such applied fields, the stipulation of best practice, the definition of the normative culture of the profession, the certification of practitioners, are functions performed through close, deliberative collaboration between academics and professionals (Anderson, 1993, p. 155). Just as many professions require some form of "continuing education" in order to keep practitioners up-to-date, more of us need to understand and accept that "higher education is a career that requires relearning your discipline as it changes over time" (Nelson, 1997, p. 8). If the "times they are a changin'," then it is incumbant upon higher education to be at the forefront of the recognition that interdisciplinarity is more than a word, and is in fact, a way in which we might genuinely improve the lives of our citizens and respond to the needs of a changing society. Interdisciplinarity, like the concept of postmodernism, itself, might effectively point out some of the contradictions, ambiguities, inconsistencies, and hypocracy present within ourselves and within academia itself. Once pointed out and illuminated, some of the heirachies within higher education, so long accepted and even revered, might be exposed as largely arbitrary exclusions that have effectively marginalized new and "other" ideas, if they have not excluded them entirely.

The creativity, initiative, and independence of thought that higher education has professed as a value of the college experience seems largely at odds with entrenched curriculum practices that often both prevent students in the short-term, and alienate students in the long-term, from undertaking the “adventure” of large and searching questions, by focusing them toward specific skills and a mastery of "core" subjects chosen by us. "The curricula of the next century can evolve into permutations that are flexible, supportive of collaborative learning and research, genuinely interdisciplinary, and inventive of new disciplines when needed" (Kolodny, 1998, p. 41).

Chapter Seven

"Boundary Crossing in Education & Criminal Justice"

> ***"There are, of course, very sound reasons for seeing the world of higher education as a jumble of meaningless contradictions that can never be changed or understood" (Miller, 1998, p. 3).***

There are a number of formidable obstacles to disciplinary boundary crossing. Not the least of which is our reliance upon specialization and "expertise" which effectively creates as many or more boundaries as it was intended to cross. While there is little doubt that expertise in a narrow field allows for advances in science and life, advances that otherwise would have occurred less rapidly if at all, expertise also creates boundaries between "us" and "them." These boundaries may also be viewed as existing between those who "know" (whatever specialty pertains) and those who "don't." As we live by the sword of specialization, we may die (or perhaps only be wounded) by the sword of specialization, at least when it comes to some of the most intractible social problems that specialists (however knowledgeable and however skilled) simply cannot, or at least have not, been able to solve.

Perhaps as we grow in our recognition that some problems, if not most problems, require cooperation and "interdependence" rather than straightforward, if not simple, specialization, we might further encourage collaboration and interdisciplinary consideration. In fact, boundary crossing has occurred between and among a variety of disciplines. Ogloff, et al., (1996), wrote of the opportunity for collaboration and interdisciplinary work in the fields of law and psychology. Other collaborations have frequently involved social work and nursing, religion and philosophy, and English and history, to name only a few.

My experience in "boundary crossing" across traditional disciplinary barriers occurred when I (a criminal justice professor) was involved collaboratively in teaching a course with a colleague (a teacher education professor). This new course was previously two courses, one of

which was confined to the teacher education discipline and the other to the criminal justice discipline. Combining the teacher education course entitled "learning disabilities" with a criminal justice course entitled "juvenile delinquency" allowed for rich expansions of a consideration of the interconnections between schools and the criminal justice system. The interconnections between a lack of educational opportunity and/or the apparent unresponsiveness of the education system to the direct needs of a variety of persons, and crime, poverty, teen pregnancy and other "societal ills," requires the more divergent responses that a variety of professionals bring. By allowing teacher educators to direct classroom experiences for students taking courses in criminal justice emphasizes, both in real terms and symbolically, the interdependent nature of the criminal justice professions with schools and other youth oriented institutions. Conversely, a criminal justice professor directing classroom experiences in education courses might more effectively emphasize the role education plays in lessening the likelihood of future criminal behavior and in understanding and formulating appropriate solutions to the demand for costly responses to criminal behavior. Underpinning our philosophical framework of interdisciplinary teamwork among and between teachers, should lie the message to students, both explict and implicit, of the importance of professional cooperation and "positive interdependence."

Despite the perceived virtue of collaboration, and its relationship with the perceived "romance" of being a professor (the excitement of engaging in ideas and the challenge of working with stimulating colleagues) collaboration seems sadly absent. Tierney & Bensimon (1996) write that in higher education today: "some faculty feel isolated, and others never learn the 'rules of the game'" (p. 4). It seems less and less a game played for enjoyment, and more and more a game played for survival.

In these times of tightened government spending and heightened government scrutiny, the relationship between spending on corrections and spending on education seems ever more connected. Targeting government dollars toward marginal and at-risk students in school

programs is, arguably at least, more cost-effective than targeting government dollars toward correctional programs (see inter alia, Lawrence, 1995). The relationship between teacher-education and criminal justice seems to mandate at least a cursory understanding of each. Only by crossing disciplinary lines will students truly be able to gain the insight of educators most familiar with the issues that will impact their future professional careers. Teachers and school administrators surely would benefit by having the knowledge of these interconnections and by gaining the ability to argue persuasively for increased funding for programs that seem to lessen the propensity for deviant behavior. Similarly, criminal justice professionals would benefit by understanding the role that school "failure" plays in juvenile delinquency and ultimately, adult crime. Studies of truancy (Robins & Hill, 1966); "troublesomeness" (West & Farrington, 1973) and poor school performance (Hirschi, 1972) have long associated these educational issues with a rise in juvenile delinquency and ultimately, adult crime. A better understanding of what is now "commonly" accepted, but seldom considered, might improve both our educational and criminal justice systems.

It follows that research should not only contribute to a given "field" but to human understanding and decency. "For the most part novelists do not write to enrich the field of novel-writing. The good ones write because they are angry or curious or cynical or enchanted" (Postman, 1988, p. 17). Our writings should reflect our anger, curiousity, cynicism, or enchantment, and our research and teaching should parallel our desires to enrich human understanding, not simply advance our standing within our "narrow" disciplines.

Colleges might also consider "reaching out" into secondary schools as one method of contributing to the community of which they are a part. Allowing secondary students to recognize the implications and usefulness of discipline crossing in order to most effectively address human service issues, is one method of promoting interdisciplinary thought prior to the time in which many young people begin seriously considering single "disciplinary" training. Graham (1992)

writes of the "common educational mission" that "schools" and "colleges" share:

> **"one of the most deeply suppressed truths in America is that elementary/secondary education and higher education are part of the same enterprise" (p. 106).**

Graham also equates some of the difficulties that schools of education have had (low prestige and relatively small resources) as a "mirroring many of the problems that elementary and secondary schools face in American society" (p. 131). More than 50 years ago John Dewey taught us that schools should be viewed as microcosms of the broader society and that the broader society should play a role in school policies.

> **"A democracy cannot flourish where there is a narrowly utilitarian education for one class and a broadly liberal education for another. It demands a universal education in the problems of living together" (p. 320).**

The truth of Dewey's teachings remains self-evident. As society becomes more violent, schools tend to reflect that violence. Combining the expertise of education professionals and criminal justice professionals is a natural evolutionary response to the problems afflicting our schools and our society. That combination, among others, reflects not only society's needs, but the larger reality of a world in which problems cross disciplinary boundaries. "Schools, health-care agencies, and other caregiving institutions are constantly influencing family patterns, wittingly and unwittingly, and these influences, if better understood, can be positively directed" (Weissbourd, 1996, p.79). Understanding the influence that schools and other social institutions have upon families, and the influence that families and other social institutions have upon schools may allow professionals a better base from which to move forward when confronted with any crisis situation. "Teachers, police officers, health-care providers, and other professionals cannot be expected to be well-versed in family patterns and dynamics -- or to become family therapists -- but the reality is that the problems of many children will not dissipate if they are not seen in the context of their families" (Weissbourd, 1996, p. 79).

Status Issues

Issues of status must be addressed so that "teams" of professionals consist of "equal players." These issues come into play whether or not the "team" is made up of members from within the walls of the university or from outside. Nisbet (1971) wryly suggests the difference in status between "theory" oriented disciplines and more practical enterprises:

> "If plumbing ever passes from its present system of apprenticeship to a college or organized curriculum, one may confidently predict high status for courses in the history and the philosophy of plumbing" (p. 27).

Lamont (1992) addressed the status of "experts" who by virtue of their expertise, both real and imagined, often signal superiority and can thus make others feel "uncomfortable" (p. 95). Team members must, of course, attain a certain level of comfort with one another in order to accomplish shared goals. If a highly regarded, better paid professional --say a physician -- is teamed with social or rehabilitation workers, there may be marked differences in the way they value their time and each other, let alone what they are actually paid. Coleman & Rainwater (1978) in their work concerning social status studied the perceptions of people, based on income, education, and job status. While job status, and educational level are factors in the status that people are afforded, "income is of overwhelming importance in how Americans think about social standing" (p. 220). Brint (1994) refers to the different "self-image" that physicians and lawyers tend to bring to the human services, and the tendency for these two professions, in particular, to "objectify" their clientele to a much greater degree than other human service professionals (p. 59). Brint (1994) also addressed the "distrust" that some professions (most notably law and medicine) often have for the authority of those in "lesser" or "minor" professions such as nursing, teaching, and social work (p. 25). Genuine and effective collaboration requires at best equality of status or at least a comfort and recognition among the participants that status is unequal. Status can also impact the choice of team leaders, if team leaders need to be chosen. Allowing for a "heirarchy" to

develop within a team can make it difficult to achieve the type of freedom of participation that will lead to the most effective collaborative results.

Ephross & Vassil (1988) identify some of the constraints upon group interplay. Among the foremost constraints are those that involve the status of persons within organizations. "A staff person who works with a board of directors has to be able to 'forget' the fact that the board collectively controls his employment in order to work effectively" (p. 101). Variables of class, race, gender, ethnicity, and age affect small group processes, and are thereby necessary considerations in effective collaborative processes.

In accordance with traditional "status" considerations, lie those feelings of value that individuals must have in order to appropriately participate in any organization or collection of individuals. Jones (1996) cites the need for the participants to share a "comfortable and familiar feeling" in order for successful collaboration to be achieved (p.11). "The quality of a group's problem solution will be determined by the extent to which the group is successful at making the best use of its own resources in the course of solving the problem" (Ephross & Vassil, 1988, p. 123). The comfort level of the participants in large part determines whether the group is making the best use of its own resources. According to Ephross & Vassil (1988) "teamwork needs to be taught, practiced, facilitated, and undergirded by a supportive climate within an organization" (p. 135). As will be addressed more fully in succeeding chapters, it is this supportive climate that is most in doubt within the presently formed academic institution.

Philosophical and Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues arise concerning how power is distributed on a team and how responsibility is shared. Lemert (1997) reminds us that "power is not the sort of thing that descends upon all persons equally, as though they were all in the same social boat" (p. 171). Genuine "teams" require that any social separations be minimized, and in a perfect world, eliminated. While reality

tells us that the physicians on the team may not be as prone out of economic necessity to clip coupons from their Sunday newspapers as the social workers might, a focus upon the commonalities of their efforts must not be naively assumed to be all that is needed during the formation and duration of an effective team.

Beyond any practical problems associated with teamwork, there is the matter of the client which must remain the center of the team effort. A team should be not only problem-centered but also patient-centered, educating patients to the process and making them, in effect, fully qualified members of the team. Yet the more parties who are involved, the wider information is spread. The growing dissemination of information about patients through computers, joint committees, and teams raises questions about confidentiality. Other questions are raised, particularly among managers within the business sector, about the inherent nature of collaboration and its focus upon consensual decision making and process rather than outcome. I think such questions are largely unfounded, as genuine collaboration in which collaborators use the process of consensual decision making to most carefully weigh alternatives available will tend to achieve the most desired outcome.

Barriers to greater collaboration among higher education faculty members concern such legitimate concerns as: a lack of planning time, a lack of knowledge about each other's discipline, and the content demands of specific courses (see inter alia Strawderman & Lindsey, 1995). Confidence becomes central to breaking down these barriers. A lack of planning time must be overcome by the administration's show of confidence in a program that encourages collaboration and allows for course loads that reflect that confidence and encouragement. A lack of knowledge about each other's discipline requires that each practitioner have the necessary self-confidence to professionally expose oneself in front of one's peers. Finally, content demands of specific courses, such as those that state departments of education require of teacher education courses must be met with understanding on the part of students and faculty alike. Genuine collaboration may mean

that not all class periods within a given course can be "shared." Breaking apart occasionally in order that one "discipline" concentrate fully upon only that discipline can be both highly appropriate and effective.

As administrators contemplate the concept of interdisciplinary and greater faculty collaboration, they must not mandate collaboration for the sake of collaboration. Such "contrived collegiality" as Fullan and Hargreaves (1996) refer to it, must be discouraged, as both a waste of time and a drag upon the efforts of genuine collaborations between and among fully engaged faculty members. Forcing people to be collegial, or even more troublesome, forcing people to be collaborative cannot be effective. Just as our students must want to learn in order to effectively engage themselves in their education, so too must faculty members want to collaborate in order to effectively engage themselves in an effective collaboration.

Goals of an Interdisciplinary Program

While professors must surely promote the sharing of knowledge and divergent perspectives, both on a real and a symbolic level, we also need to increase awareness of the concept of "positive interdependence." This promotion of awareness foretells the long-term goals of the college. Among these goals are the following:

1) The promotion of the education of future professionals with a "positive interdependence" orientation. "Genuine professionalism requires engagement with moral and civic purposes as well as technical means, and competence in mutual understanding and compromise as well as knowing how to maximize the attainment of a single goal" (Sullivan, 1995, pp. 178-79).

2) The acceptance of the need for integration of the disciplines throughout higher education.

3) The positive coordination of services throughout society.

4) The "sharing of revenues" so that cooperation among various societal agencies will impact the level of funding from federal, state, and local sources. Agencies that most effectively coordinate human services to the betterment of their clients, should be rewarded accordingly. Shrinking budgets often make collaboration essential to survival as well as appropriate for institutional and societal advancement. When schools collaborate with other institutions in the community they are in a better position to serve students and their families in a comprehensive fashion when compared to schools that work in isolation from the broader community (Jones, 1992, 1996). When colleges collaborate with other institutions in their community they can better contribute to understanding the "world in the round" as Boyer and Levine (1981) have referred to collaborative educational practice. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) have acknowledged that general educational boundaries have blurred in recent decades, but nevertheless they write: "scholars who choose to attempt works of synthesis, explore interdisciplinary territory, or speak to nonspecialists are still at a disadvantage" (p. viii).

As we continue to practice our craft, and attempt to grow in our abilities to reach our students, we continually practice our philosophy that we've described above, by encouraging our students to look toward the interconnections between the different roles of a variety of professionals, and a variety of communities, to encourage students to consider the implications of their actions upon all of their contacts. Anything less would minimize what we can offer education generally, and our students specifically.

The chapters immediately following this broad "plea for inclusion" focus more narrowly upon criminal justice, ethnic studies, women's studies, and teacher education as specific "marginalized disciplines." The historical status of marginalization to which these disciplines, among others, have been relegated, is surely not due to one simple factor. It would be extremely naive to presume that this long-standing marginalization has been the result solely of history and tradition, or solely of academic politics and in-fighting. It would be equally naive, however, to

discount the importance that these factors have played in keeping certain disciplines from attaining greater heights in the academy. If indeed, as critics of my assertions would no doubt contend, there have been and continue to be practical and functional reasons why certain disciplines have been largely excluded, then my petulant whining about exclusion might be considered to be among the rather academic practice of finding a problem where none exists. If, however, certain aspects of this petulant whining might ring true, we might be encouraged to further consider the plight of certain disciplines within the academy. Most importantly, we might move toward greater empowerment of practitioners within these academic fields and towards eliminating curriculum decisions based largely on history and politics alone. If we can instead focus more appropriately upon functionality and reason when we make what tend to be long-term curriculum decisions, we should benefit students, faculty, and administrators alike, all struggling with assessing their present "place" within the future oriented social institutions that comprise our system of higher education.

Marginalization, of course, is not a subject upon which all of us agree. Who has been marginalized more, and whether some groups have actually been marginalized at all is ripe for debate. The fact that some groups have historically been treated adversely in our society, however, can scarcely be argued. For these groups, it is not a matter of whether marginalization has existed, but only a matter of degree.

> **"No calculus, of course, can determine whether--over the course of written history and before--worse pain has been inflicted in the name of race or gender" (Caldwell, 1999, pp. 171-172).**

Heirarchies, whether racial, gender, or otherwise historically based, have greatly impacted the self-perception and "other" perception that have long faced those working within those disciplines within academia. The following chapters assess four such "marginalized" disciplines that have traditionally been subject to relatively lowly places within the academic heirarchy. To suppose that these four disciplines are the only four such afflicted would be too naive even for me,

and to suppose that the treatment afforded each is entirely comparable to the other, is again, far too simplified. These four are studied only as a means of painting a more complete (but not entirely complete) portrait of academic life and how heirarchy and "status" within the academy is every bit as pervasive as are such concepts outside of the academy.

Chapter Eight

The "Discipline" of Criminal Justice

> ***"Nothing Endures, after all, but change" (Gleckner, 1988).***
>
> ***"If there is anything unambiguous about the history of higher education, it is that different types of knowledge have enjoyed varying degrees of status, prestige, and authority, and their hierarchical rankings have changed enormously over time as a function of a diverse array of social factors" (Lucas, 1994, p. 312).***
>
> ***"To create the future, challenge the past" (Seymour, 1995, p. 99).***

Lindskoog (1995) referred to the discipline of psychology as a "discipline engaged in an identity search not unlike that engaged in by some young adults" (p. ix). If a relatively established discipline (certainly established in the sense that nearly all institutions of higher education in this country have established psychology majors), can struggle to define itself and identify its boundaries, then it is no small wonder that the emerging disciplines that are the focus of this work have even greater difficulties identifying their boundaries. Where newly identified identities will lead may be anyone's guess, and what the future will hold for emerging disciplines as well, to a lesser extent, as for established disciplines is little more than pure unaldulterated speculation. The fact that all the disciplines, emerging and established, have borrowed and will continue to borrow from others is, I think at least, beyond reasonable dispute. With such an initial paragraph, this chapter begins to explore the "identity" of criminal justice as a discipline.

The discipline commonly referred to as criminal justice, having evolved from the more "vocational" roots of "police science" suffers most not from an everpresent "inferiority complex." What may be most responsible for the discipline's relegation to second or third tier status is its own "congenial adequacy" complex. By this I mean the propensity of criminal justice programs to cordially, if not happily exist, as an "adequate" discipline outside the margins of academia. It is as if the longing to be "included" in some form has created a complacency and

reluctance to challenge the marginal way in which the discipline actually exists within college curriculums (better, I suppose, to be on the back of the bus, than not on the bus at all). Not all academics in criminal justice, perhaps not even most, have been complacent; nor are all willing to quietly sit at the back of the academic bus. There are many methods which have been used by various criminal justice programs in order to gain greater inclusion. Some programs seek to be incorporated into the liberal arts, others into pre-professional programs, and still others identify themselves with the behavioral sciences. While all of these "places" may in fact be appropriate given the variances within and among criminal justice programs and within and among various colleges (see Holden, 1998), the lack of any certitude as to where we belong tends to limit our effectiveness and prestige (at least on many campuses).

Singling out one reason why certain programs exist on the margins of academia is, no doubt, too simplistic. Institutions of higher learning are complicated social institutions and their histories are the products of numerous events, as well as the social, economic, and political conditions that shape their developments at given periods in their individual and collective evolutions. The fact that criminal justice as a discipline, like teacher education as a discipline, has a history (and a sociology) of practical orientation has been one reason for the "separation" between these disciplines and more mainstream units within the academy. Another significant reason, and perhaps even the most significant reason many criminal justice programs exist outside of or ancillary to general education programs within our colleges, might be easily explained as a logistical reality of our existance as a relatively "new" discipline. Women's studies and African-American studies now take their place as even "newer" disciplines and continue the struggle for acceptance on and off campuses across America.

Having come after the other "traditional" disciplines included within general education requirements at many colleges, it would have meant change, however minimal, to include criminal justice within the general education program. The same can be said for the other "marginalized"

disciplines that are considered in this work. Many professors and administrators are surely not inherently opposed to the ideals of multiculturalism and/or diversity issues, but are simply, like the rest of us, resistent to change. Depending upon the entrenchment of the "traditional" faculty, as well as the degree of "sanctity and virtue" placed upon the general education requirements as essential for a well-rounded liberal arts education, it became quite unlikely that the new kid on the block would get to play. And so it goes that those new kids in these new disciplines continue to play largely on their own, sometimes using the older kids' equipment, but never joining in their "really important" games. Holden (1998) describes the evolution of criminal justice programs as largely a political process.

> "Forces both within and without the discipline have attempted to shape its form and destiny. Lacking the long history of other academic disciplines, criminal justice has stumbled and staggered along, experimenting with a variety of academic theories never establishing a unified philosophy and only vaguely aware of the mission for which it was created" (pp. 1-2).

As criminal justice and other "new" disciplines continues to age, it is less and less clear why it is that they continue to exist outside the mainstream. If these disciplines and their practitioners belong outside the mainstream, perhaps they don't belong on these campuses; if, in contrast, they do belong, then perhaps they belong in the mainstream as a valued discipline more alike than different from other disciplines. Kluge (1993) wrote of reputations as a "tricky business, a thin line between living off of them and living up to them" (p. 8). The reputation of the discipline of criminal justice has been a tricky business as well, but the line has been between living off of the discipline's reputation and living *down* to it. At the risk of sounding like Ross Perot (seldom a goal of many academics) I equate the disciplinary status of criminal justice to that of the crazy aunt or uncle whose presence within a family is not entirely denied, but is also seldom publicly acknowledged.

To understand the truth about the profession of teaching criminal justice, those in the

discipline must first understand what it is that they actually do. This is made doubly difficult by the rather ambiguous nature of the "discipline" of criminal justice and the even more ambiguous nature of the concept of "teaching." Understanding the concept of teaching any discipline is difficult at best, despite our commitment to its cause. Those who teach criminal justice are not the only ones who find it difficult to definitively express what it is that they do. Reynolds (1998) laments what he perceives to be the "sorry state" of sociology as a discipline; due largely to sociologists inability to agree upon what it is they are to do and what contributions they are to make. He perceives of sociology as "structurally marginal in the academy... we are handicapped by our theoretical diversity, tend to be irrelevant in terms of the solution to major social problems, and suffer from pronounced ideological biases" (p. 23). The fact that sociologists lament their plight may or may not make those "professing" criminal justice feel better about themselves and their discipline. If misery does indeed love company, then, apparently at least, those in criminal justice have some company. Sociologists are split (like most educators) about the role of criminal justice within (and around) the curriculum. This split, according to Reynolds (1998) is between those who seek greater integration and who worry that new fields such as criminal justice, women's studies, ethnic studies, and the like have actually eroded sociology's key ideas. Others argue that sociology has lost its edge in academia precisely because the incorporation of such departments as criminal justice has lessened intellectuality in favor of practicality and has therefore allowed for the process of "dumbification" (Reynolds, 1998, p. 23).

While I cannot personally deny the effects of "dumbification" on my own intellectual endeavors, to blame other emerging disciplines for subtraction from established disciplines when they are added in to the curriculum, seems a bit of a stretch. Disciplines with enough to offer students need not feel threatened by integration, and instead might feel further challenged and intellectually stimulated by the ability and necessity to offer greater incorporation of divergent thoughts, theories, and practices.

> "Some of us are professional educators. That would seem to imply that we have a skill: that we know how to teach. Teaching is a practical activity. Thus it should be possible to analyze our practice and improve upon it. Over time, the university should become more efficient. It will be demonstrably more effective in educating people. Of course it does not work that way. Most of us have only the vaguest idea of what is effective and what is not. We throw something out. Some catch on and others do not. We really don't know why" (Anderson, 1993, p. 79).

Given our inability to define, or even more globally, to figure out exactly what it is that we do, it is almost impossible to accurately tell the truth about the practice of teaching criminal justice. Are we educating students to "succeed" in a given profession such as policing, corrections, probation,...etc...? Are we educating students to "succeed in life," an even less definable or identifiable goal of the liberal arts? Are we succeeding at teaching our students to succeed? How do we measure whether we're succeeding? By the number of our graduates who get jobs? By the number who measure success by monetary means, or by more grand and altruistic measures?

Criminal justice, like the other disciplines, tends to give the most to students who reach for the most.

> "American higher education does extremely well at providing stimulating opportunities for students who are well-motivated, culturally literate, and eager to be intellectually challenged. Where American higher education does *not* do well -- and probably cannot do well in the current dispensation -- is in reaching those students who have little or no intellectual curiosity, and regard college simply as a four-year social ritual or as a vehicle for narrow vocational or preprofessional training" (Nelson & Berube, 1995, p. 8).

Barzun (1991) annoyed by the oft-used descriptive phrase "made it come alive," referred to the interest that all subjects contain, and "all" a teacher need do to "make it come alive" is to "know the subject and teach it properly" (p. 63). "It is not the subject but the imagination of teacher and taught that has to be alive before the interest can be felt" (p. 63). "Good teachers are

not those who know how to interest students, but those who teach what is interesting because it is crucial to their disciplines" (Hauerwas, 1988, p. 22). How we become "good" teachers and who should get such a chance becomes yet another subject open for contentious debate. What is crucial to our disciplines raises the philosophical question raised by Lindskoog (1995) in his analysis of the discipline of psychology, of what could be called the actuality of a given discipline's subject matter. Having others decide what is the actuality is impossible, given the reality that even those within many disciplines have difficulty assessing and then asserting what is the "actuality of the subject matter."

In my classes, near the end of the term, I ask for students' input regarding their experiences in "good" versus "bad" classes. Invariably, the students' arrive at consensus quite easily. They believe that a "good" class allows for their interaction, and applies knowledge to "real-life" situations that are "relevant" to their lives. "Good" professors are those who "practice" what they preach in terms of having the ability to relate texts to "real life," and who are not afraid of student interaction, and even student disagreement. While it is again not my intention to disparage the genuine "liberal arts," of which I am a product, it is certainly interesting to note the reactions of students concerning "good" versus "bad" courses. The classic "liberal arts" perspective of providing a well-rounded education without concern for "real world" distractions, such as vocations, seems to be somewhat at odds with what students want from their courses. The question for me is not whether we should give them what they want or "what's good for them," but rather who are we to judge what's good for them.

It is our job to provide a good education, one that enriches their lives, gives them value for their education dollar, and prepares them for life. There is no reason why enriching their lives and preparing them for life cannot be done simultaneously. My own informal polls indicate that a failure to recognize what students' want and expect often results in a "bad" class. It is doubtful that students who perceive of themselves as the victims of "bad" classes are gaining much that

will be lasting and meaningful. Since providing lasting and meaningful experiences that enrich lives is the desire of liberal educators everywhere, we need to better examine how it is that we reach students. Millard (1991) cautions that:

> "instead of lamenting increased student interest in jobs, even making money,...we should have welcomed it and placed our emphasis on helping students to discover or recognize that career or vocation, while it includes work, includes much more" (pp. 100-101).

Tying together "liberal education" with careers and with "real life" more generally need not diminish liberal education, but may in fact, enrich it. Houston (1996) set forth his belief that liberal arts education and professional education together contribute to the goal of "providing a foundation for how to live life" (p. 12). Millard (1991) believed that we must overcome the "contamination myth" which he described as the longstanding belief on the part of many that careerism "contaminates" the liberal arts (p. 101). There has been a certain pride taken in liberal arts majors that are "good-in-themselves, but good-for-nothing," at least nothing specifically. If we listen to our students, it appears that how we tie the concepts of careerism and the liberal arts together is how we separate "good" professors from "less good" professors.

Speakers are continually taught to "know the audience." As professors, if we don't know our audience and speak to them, it matters little what profound words we might say. In order to be heard, we must make connections between the liberal arts and the real world; connections that heretofore haven't been deemed as necessary. Perhaps it is because of the increasing difficulty new graduates have in finding "good" jobs, that their concern for "real world" issues is heightened. In an economic environment in which new graduates routinely find "good" jobs, such as was the case in not too distant American history, the luxury of providing a genuine "liberal" education without concern for "practical" and/or vocational issues was appropriate. In contrast, today's marketplace finds many new college graduates struggling to find good jobs, and, in many cases, even lesser jobs. In such an environment, it is only natural that students demand more

"real world" connections between the education they pay for and that which will meet them on the outside.

Respect versus Disrespect

Many within the profession of teaching in the marginalized disciplines including criminal justice lament the disrespect, perceived and real, heaped upon them by their academic and non-academic brethren. Academic segregation of criminal justice from other disciplines has become all too commonplace among our colleges. Delucchi (1997) groups curricula into two groups: "liberal arts and professional fields" (p. 417). Not surprisingly, criminal justice and teacher education, among other marginalized disciplines take their places among the latter.

Morn (1995) suggests two reasons for such segregation on the part of the discipline of criminal justice: First, that "the historic connection of criminal justice with police science made it appear too vocational," and second, "criminal justice borrowed heavily from other disciplines, primarily sociology, psychology, and political science; it never completely formed its own disciplinary identity" (p. 181). Whether "borrowing heavily" from other disciplines was and is a precurser to genuine "positive interdependence" and "interdisciplinarity" or whether it is the outright theft of real disciplinary information, by an emerging "pseudo-discipline" depends, I suppose, upon the eye and imagination of the beholder.

Criminal justice professors, of course, are not the only professionals seeking greater status. Furman (1994) bemoans the lack of clearly articulated standards within the teaching profession. "If ... professional accountability is adherence to the standards of the profession, then what are these standards for teaching?" (p. 432). Like many school teachers and college professors of education, many within the criminal justice teaching fraternity seek respect and/or greater recognition from those outside their profession. Achieving that respect can be difficult even with support from colleagues, achieving respect in an ever more divided academy in which

many disciplines are faced with their own worries about "marketability" and declining enrollments can be nearly impossible. Given these constraints, those in the criminal justice discipline must be prepared, as more generally must academic institutions that include criminal justice as a major course of study, to hear the sting of criticisms directed at the "pseudo-discipline" of criminal justice. Morn (1995) wrote:

> "academic criminal justice--the studying and teaching of crime, police, law and legal processes, and corrections--is of recent origin in higher education. Beginning in the 1920s and 1930s and accelerating in the 1970s, it has become a significant academic mainstay in second and third-rank colleges and universities" (p. 4).

It is open to debate whether "first-rate" institutions bar criminal justice for sound academic reasons, or whether they are merely more steeped in tradition that allows for little inclusion of non-traditional disciplines, whatever their merit. Perhaps, another take might be that truly "first-rate" institutions would never "bar" any discipline, but rather incorporate the teachings of all disciplines into their curriculum.

What Fuels the Debate?

"In one form or another, self interest is the engine that drives ordinary people" (Hochman, 1994, p. 36). The entire debate over minimum standards within the criminal justice discipline, like the debate over general education requirements within the liberal arts curriculum, seems often to be driven by self-interest, rather than student or academic setting interest. Whether we are able to couch it in terms of acting in our students' "best interests," or in "the advancement of the profession," it all, seemingly at least, comes down to self-interested hyperbole. Preserving our own distinctiveness by erecting barriers around ourselves may merely play directly into the hands of those already "inside" academia who continually marginalize new and emerging disciplines. Rather than viewing disciplines as overlapping circles, as the interdisciplinarity I've written of

requires, the use of individual credentialing may achieve less community and may be more accurately represented by circles that do not touch one another.

Freidson (1986) referred to licensing as "credentialing," the most impressive forms of which produce an "occupational cartel," which gains and preserves monopolistic control over a supply of a good or service in order to enhance the income of its members by protecting them from competition by others. An analogy Freidson used was that of the "gatekeeper" to the profession, only allowing certain persons in to perform the tasks of that profession. Collins (1979) referred to an "occupational community with strong controls and defenses." Bledstein (1976) described how "professional" had come to signify a narrow and intimidating specialized knowledge and expertise, often merely used to legitimize one's standing in a social class, and barely masking an underlying arrogant egoism. Veysey similarly and skeptically argues that professions are little more than "a rather random set of occupations that have historically been called that in our culture" (p. 17). Like so many of our most "exclusive professions," able to define themselves, exclusion of certain disciplines from the "core" or "general education" requirements of a given college necessarily locks the gate to those outside of the mainstream as defined by those within that mainstream.

As we seek greater and more full inclusion, we must practice what we preach. Criminal justice professionals, like all professionals in all disciplines, must strive to adhere to the academic doctrine that respects the differences of individuals and acknowledges that everyone has something to offer. As a relatively new discipline, the credibility of criminal justice as a discipline will come from the discipline's teaching, research, and product (students), and to a lesser extent from sheer numbers alone, as there are now in excess of 1,000 undergraduate criminal justice programs, and more than 40 graduate programs in the field (Ogloff, et al., 1996).

Freidson (1986), perhaps the most notable "sociologist of the professions," argues that the professional credentialing process supports a "rigid caste system." The dichotomy within the

"profession" of criminal justice education is startling, as we seem to be guilty of an underlying arrogance (like many professions and/or disciplines), while our insecurity has us pleading for greater legitimization within the academic community.

My words that appear largely against the implementation of national accrediting "standards" are not intended to be taken as a denigration of those in favor of standards, and in fact, I wholly understand why those seeking standards might rationally feel such standards will increase our discipline's standing. Ultimately, as so often is the case, their own rationales may be perfectly on mark, and my own rationales may simply be wrong. The thought of an outside accrediting body forcing administrations to "fish or cut bait" with regard to criminal justice programs, and other marginalized programs, is not unattractive. Perhaps our only hope of increased standing does lie in "telling" administrators what outside accrediting bodies require, rather than merely "asking" for increased resources. Certainly, this work's views concerning the non-academic nature of many college and university administrators seem to support such an argument. I am not oblivious to it, I merely think there may be a better way (give me a couple of more years, and I may be with those leading the charge for accreditation on a national scale). This year, however, my belief is that what might increase the "standing" of criminal justice moreso than any internally devised standards, is a concerted effort seeking inclusion within general education requirements. Disciplines, such as those discussed in this work, seeking to increase their standing, need to be incorporated into the "mainstream." What universities need most...is a determined effort to evaluate new initiatives and to move the successful ones into the mainstream of the curriculum where they can have greater permanence and reach more students (Bok, 1986, p. 189). While universities will and should work harder to enlarge their libraries, expand their facilities, increase the number of Ph.D.'s on their faculties, all of these measurable criteria bear only an indirect and tenuous relation to the quality of learning (Bok, 1986).

No one knows a great deal about how much students learn in colleges and universities,

and it is very difficult to find out (Bok, 1986). As with many issues of policy, our views about the importance of education must be based in large part on judgments rather than proven facts, judgments that depend on a prudent assessment of the stakes involved (Bok, 1986). Perhaps it is telling that the "professions" of probation officer, police officer, and schoolteacher, are relatively low-paying, and low-status vocations. Given such status, it is perhaps small wonder that programs that prepare many of these professionals are equally low in status.

If resources are not adequately shared with such programs and if those entering these professions begin their "marginalization" as they begin their courses of study on college campuses, the ability of those of us within these disciplines to attract and appeal to the best and the brightest will necessarily be compromised. But beyond any effects upon our disciplines within the academy are the larger effects of marginalized workers performing more and more difficult and important tasks. Bok (1996) stresses that as the work required in many walks of life grows steadily more demanding, the costs of being poorly prepared must presumably rise as well. These societal costs lie at the heart of the reasons for reassessing curricular decisions made on and for our college campuses. These costs are far greater in the long term than any costs to individual professors that the "pain" of marginalization brings to them.

Chapter Nine

The "Discipline" of Ethnic Studies

> "How precisely does the issue of color remain so powerfully determinative of everything from life circumstance to manner of death, in a world that is, by and large, officially 'color-blind'"? (Williams, 1998, p. 15).

> "While we need standards and must employ the ones that seem best to us, there is room for a certain modesty born of a recognition that our standards may, at the very least, have an element of the merely parochial" (Garcia, 1994, p. 26).

> "Once we become aware of the persistent and pernicious nature of dominance, we begin to realize that each choice we make regarding educational structure, process, content, curriculum, or pedagogy has implications for equity and social justice" (Howard, 1999, p. 78).

It can scarcely be questioned that the choices we make regarding the curriculum, particularly in terms of which subjects are "in" and which are "out" have profound implications upon the education and the delivery of that education to our students. What can be and often is questioned is the method in which those decisions are made. Once we recognize that the decisions made have implications for equity and social justice, we are faced with the need to come to grips with the role that higher education should and does play in addressing equity and social justice.

C. Eric Lincoln (1996) referred to universities as places in which learning was very "selective," and where politicians who might shudder at the thought of genuine societal change, need not fear their constituencies gaining any "enlightenment from the universities." Lincoln's harsh words stem from his belief that the notion of race and place have saturated American society. He describes "the infrastructure of the American commitment to a pervasive doctrine of race and place" (p. 10). It is the cracks in that infrastructure that disciplines such as ethnic studies seek to repair in the short term, with an eye toward total

reconstruction in the long term. Understanding our own places in the existing infrastructure is critical to understanding why some of us feel so comfortable and others so ill at ease. Williams (1998) wrote that our failure to "deal straightforwardly with the pervasive practices of exclusion that infect even the very young" allow us "to indulge in the false luxury of a prematurely imagined community" (p. 5). Ethnic studies stands as a micro study of "prematurely imagined community" within this larger macro study of similar misperceptions widely held within larger academia. Whether imagining a greater and more inclusive community is "all academic" or whether it can be implemented, at least to a degree, in the "real world," lies at the center of whether or not the "place" of ethnic studies within the curriculum is to be assured or whether it is to exist here and there, but not everywhere.

Contemporary sociologist Peter Berger has noted that each of us is confronted with numerous ways of responding to the world around us. Our interactions with members of the majority and members of minority groups are anything but mandated. In fact, we have "multiple options of possible ways of thinking about the world" (Berger, 1979). Not all of these multiple options have been positive. Indeed, many "constructions of the myth of race and its perpetuation in terms of attitudes and treatment have had frequently devastating consequences" (Monk, 2000, p. xxi). Assessing these constructions has been one of the goals of sociologists throughout the ages (at least the recent ages); assessing these constructions and how they specifically impact racial and ethnic groups is not simply a goal of ethnic studies programs, but a primary goal of these programs.

The fact that I am white has, no doubt, colored my perceptions about race. The fact that I am a male, has, no doubt, colored my perceptions about gender. The fact that I am a white male has, no doubt, colored my perceptions about privilege and oppression. All of these facts combined with my interest in "marginalized

disciplines" have focused my attention, for this chapter at least, on the discipline variously known as "ethnic studies, black studies, or African-American studies." For the purposes of this chapter, a study of the discipline and its status in the academy, these terms can and will be used interchangeably.

One of the most interesting aspects of writing about emerging disciplines lies in the knowledge and self-awareness that has naturally accrued to me, despite what may have often been my best efforts to fight it off. As a white, middle-class male, I have led a life in which race has simply not been a factor for me. I, like many, if not most white middle-class Americans have been able to view myself simply as a "generic" American. Recognizing that such a viewpoint is a privilege of my status, and not a birthright of all Americans, is a significant portion of gaining an understanding into the need for disciplines such as ethnic studies. Why should we focus upon our "differences" some of us "generics" are often heard to say. The fact that those of us in the majority do not tend to focus upon differences, is not a feather in our collective caps, but has instead been a function less of feathers on our head, than of blinders over our eyes. We don't tend to like it when we are confronted by the "unearned privileges" that we have derived on the basis of our race. Our discomfort has often led to total denial when confronted with the premise that these "unearned privileges" should require us to more fully assess a society in which birth often determines privilege, not just socioeconomically, but culturally as well.

Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot (1999), in her work, *Respect*, wrote of a teacher who spends time "opening minds and exploding caricatures" (p. 149). Ethnic studies, as a discipline, like the other marginalized disciplines discussed in this work, seems also to be at least partially about opening minds and exploding caricatures. Contributing to a better understanding of a marginalized group, inside or outside of academia, is among the primary benefits of the study of any such group. Ethnic

studies assists our understanding of various ethnic groups that have long been relegated to an unequal status in society and by reflection, in the academy. Diversification of the curriculum has numerous benefits. Many students historically excluded may more readily identify with works and entire disciplines in which topics that are important in one's own self-conception are addressed. Universities are not about narrowing one's mind in a way that reduces a person to the definition assigned historically by gender or race or ethnic origin. Indeed, universities are about just the opposite, opening one's mind to the concept of "otherness."

Stephen Grant Meyer wrote a book entitled "As Long as They Don't Move Next Door," in which he assesses, among other things, a tendency among northern supporters of civil rights, quick to castigate southern opponents for their support of African-American issues...so long as those "issues" didn't actually touch their lives. Such a thesis can be transferred to the treatment of the marginalized disciplines within universities. Disciplines, such as ethnic studies, have a place... "so long as that place didn't actually touch the mainstream curriculum."

Cary Nelson, an author frequently cited in this work, observes that it is now self-evident that we live in a "fundamentally racist society" arising from "the founding acts" of genocide of Native Americans and of slavery as an institution. Not everyone perceives of our society as "fundamentally racist" as illustrated by studies that, perhaps not surprisingly, indicate that whites, for example, are less inclined than blacks to believe that police actually discriminate against minorities (Weitzer, 2000). Despite the abilities of the majority to view oppression of the minority as less important than "more significant" issues that have a greater personal impact, as a professor of criminal justice, it is virtually impossible to argue with the nature of our "fundamentally racist society." The difficulty in maintaining rational arguments against that pervasive racism is made salient, particularly when one studies such phenomena as the disproportionate numbers of

young African-American males incarcerated in our penal institutions and the damning anecdotal and academic evidence of the existence of such phenomena as "driving while black," "zero-tolerance policing," and racial profiling. If racism is self-evident in our society, what should be the response of those in higher education? Should it differ from any sort of response about the self-evident state of rising income inequality?

Should higher education play a role as a force for social change? It is not difficult to find those holding high academic standing standing on different sides of such a question. Shattuck (1999) argues that a search for knowledge requires professors to stay away from political causes and direct political advocacy. Others, many cited in this work, believe that higher education requires a sense of political action...if only to transcend all that is accepted as a given in society that instead should be probed and examined with great intensity. *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, the title of a work by Neil Postman, conveys such a need to get students to delve more deeply into questions that may need different answers than those so often accepted. This "force of change" thesis comfortably parallels earlier Marxian views of scholarship as largely existing for the promotion of change. What the role of higher education should be, is, of course, not a new debate, and while many disciplines have struggled historically with finding their particular niche within the academy, the marginalized and new disciplines are at the forefront of that struggle today. Ethnic studies, like the other marginalized disciplines, straddles the question of whether or not higher education should play a role as a force of change.

Helen Keller's *The Story of My Life* makes the essential revelation that what we too easily think of as a given, such as the very condition of being human, is not given but is learned (Shattuck, 1999, p. 16). Keller's work might be considered the "Bible" of pragmatism. Pragmatism, whether in the form of today's "post-modernism"

or "de-contextualism" or even "social constructivism" has played a central role throughout the ages in how educators view their roles. Supporting the proposition that the condition of the curriculum of colleges and universities is not a given, and is in fact also learned, has been the fundamental purpose of this writing. As we learn which disciplines are marginalized and which are not (none of us are born with such knowledge), we are likewise educated about other forms of categorization. Ethnic studies responds to some of this categorization. "Race itself is a social construct, a learned category. Its meaning is communicated through interaction with our own and other racial groups. Many of us are inculcated with more negative images than positive regarding racial categories, necessitating considerable unlearning and reevaluation in the process of acquiring positive racial attitudes and identity" (Howard, 1999, p. 85).

> "After decades of slowly bringing minorities toward full partnership and gradually starting to protect the poor from the worst ravages of poverty, there has been an upsurge of indifference, fear, or outright hatred of others on the part of the American public and cynical manipulation of our fears by elected leaders, political candidates, media, and political commentators. It is once again fashionable to blame those who are the victims of these pressures for their own problems and for many of society's other problems as well. It is also fashionable to assume that their failures must be rooted in the immutable nature of things--in their own inherent biology--and not in the American political system or the circumstances of their birth and life" (Cohen, 1998, p. 1).

Ethnic studies in education programs, refers to courses of instruction in the history and culture of U.S. minority groups. African-American studies has been the most prevalent of the "ethnic studies" that have sprung up on campuses throughout the past thirty or so years, but other ethnic minorities, especially chicanos and other hispanic Americans have begun to obtain similar course offerings on select campuses.

Like the other disciplines discussed in this work, ethnic studies has been relegated to a place not among the established disciplines, but rather among the emerging disciplines which are struggling to find their proper place within the academy. "Despite more than thirty years in the academy, Africana studies remains in the shadows of explosive criticism" (Dawson, 1999, p. 168). Perhaps the criticism is centered upon the reality that the ethnic studies curriculum has no clear boundaries. Unlike chemistry, there is no clear progression of knowledge. After 30 years, it is still unclear in many cases, whether ethnic studies represents a smorgasbord or a coherent subject matter. "The discipline's strengths (its eclectic, expansive, experimental curricula) and its weaknesses (its eclectic, expansive, experimental curricula) are all on display in ethnic studies courses" (Dawson, pp. 168-9).

Criticisms of ethnic studies programs have largely come in two forms, and with greatly varying degrees of validity. First, some criticisms have simply reflected business as usual in "petty academia," as such, we must be able to assess whether a given criticism contains more meat than many rhetorical attacks currently contain. A second criticism, having significantly more validity, goes to the heart of the programs themselves. In many cases, particularly given difficulties with "political correctness" even at the expense of genuine academic discussion, such criticisms are justified. One must not lose sight of the fact that a close inspection of other disciplines in a vast majority of our academic settings might show us equally disturbing tendencies in many of our more respected disciplines.

Like the marginalized disciplines of women's studies, and criminal justice, ethnic studies programs were initiated based on the requests (sometimes demands) of certain interest groups. Many African-American studies programs, in particular, were created in response to requests made by particular university's African-American communities and their supporters. Programs that concentrated upon the experiences and history of African-Americans began sprouting up on campuses across the country.

The University of Texas at Austin, a program with much in common with many began its program in June of 1969. The value of the new disciplines was sometimes debated, and sometimes ignored, as they were allowed to exist on the margins in universities across the country. The allowances made in creating these programs was not always done in the interests of furthering the academic mission of the universities, it was indeed sometimes done more to quiet the dissent from those seeking inclusion. Partial inclusion was seen, quite rightly, as preferable to total exclusion, and so the status of these disciplines as being only partially included was begun in earnest. Still, what often began as a way of keeping peace on newly desegregated (both legally in many cases and practically in still more cases) campuses has grown in many places into a wide-ranging interdisciplinary field that encompasses the histories and cultures of people of the African diaspora, in particular, and the meaning of race and difference in general (Painter, 2000, p. B7).

Partial inclusion within the academy is a concept that is not unfamiliar to minority students. According to Wilson (1993) the diversity of the student body nationally is far from great. African-Americans for example comprise more than 10 percent of the student body at very few institutions, with the average enrollment more around 5 percent. Given such numbers, African-American students often quite naturally experience feelings of isolation and conspicuousness (just about the last things that many new college freshman need). When so few African-American students populate collegiate classrooms there can be a tendency on the part of many of these students to feel excluded and to exhibit tremendous reluctance in participating in classroom discussions. Failing to participate begets the vicious circle of failing to be fully included; which comes first is only a further consideration of the chicken and egg phenomenon, so omnipresent in many discussions of marginalization. [It should be noted that, at varying times and to varying degrees, many persons may be overcome with feelings of marginalization

within the academy. Asians, Jews, Gays and Lesbians, and perhaps religious fundamentalists on some campuses, atheists on others, have all, at times, faced marginalization, alienation, and a sense of being alone. Chronicling the full scope of marginalization, while a valuable exercise, is beyond this work's scope. I do, however, want to acknowledge that "my marginalization" and the selected disciplines involved in this work, in no way comprise the full spectrum of marginalized persons that may exist on college campuses.]

Acknowledging the struggles of others with varying burdens placed before them is only a part of the role of those of us in the academy. For those practicing in certain disciplines, that struggle is more internalized than it is for others. Unfortunately, African-American/Black Studies/Ethnic Studies and the word "struggle" are synonymous. Despite attempts to escape the quarter century battle for acceptance, this discipline often finds itself in an inferior position in the academic world. An identity based on a history of suffering oppression and denial of privilege is not an identity that one might aspire to achieve. The care with which those offering Black Studies courses must take in maintaining their desire to build for the future while gaining an understanding of a past built largely upon oppression is great and is built upon a rather fragile foundation. Much, or at the very least some of the difficulty academics have had with Black Studies as a discipline are similar difficulties to those our other marginalized disciplines have been forced to endure. Those in established disciplines, like, dare I say, those in established and non-marginalized races and ethnic groups are reluctant to acknowledge their own identities that have been based on privilege and the oppression of others. "If we do not face dominance, we may be predisposed to perpetuate it" (Howard, 1999, p. 26). Waller (2000) described an encounter he had after he had presented a community lecture: "A major in African-American issues or studies is irrelevant! This type of major, if one can call it that,

should only exist at schools with a large black population" (p. 37). It appears that the dominant culture is one of indifference and marginalization.

"Racism, greed, and indifference to the needs of others are back in fashion. Tolerance for others--almost anyone who is a little different from ourselves--is out of style. Compromising with the needs of others no longer seems necessary" (Cohen, 1998, p. 1). While Cohen's sentiments are in line with much of the tenor of this work, it again must be acknowledged that, at least in legal terms, "different" citizens have more protection than at any other point in our history. Despite violations in our collective respect for difference, whether from the police or other "institutions" within our ordered society, it cannot be denied that society's tolerances in the form of hiring practices, mass media treatment, and even through less "concern" about inter-racial dating and marriage, reflect a far more tolerant society than ever before.

That we are likely more tolerant than we have been before, is not a substitution for continued vigilence and efforts to promote more tolerance. As with racism and other forms of intolerance, many members of the academy have been intolerant of the "differences" that are present among those in the marginalized disciplines. The power that has been historically present within the established disciplines has allowed for an uncompromising style, one in which the shortcomings of the emerging disciplines have been overstated, much in the same manner as other oppressed peoples have been blamed for the inequities that have colored their lives. Should poor people just "work harder?" Should ethnic and racial minorities just "get over it?" While most members of the academy would be loathe to utter such musings (at least publicly), there is must less reluctance to publicly proclaim similar beliefs when established members of academia are presented with proposals for greater inclusion of "lesser" and less established disciplines.

In his study of "rudeness," Caldwell (1999) points out that not everyone

agrees that race and gender oppression still infiltrate and thereby define our every unconscious utterance and gesture. There exists what Caldwell calls an "anti-P.C. backlash" that laments a stifling of criticism and even debate in an environment in which there may be too much "political correctness."

> "A groundswell of reaction has risen against the very idea; it has become a contemporary cliche to resent the once oppressed as the new oppressors, ever-whining demanders of special consideration, always espying imaginary depths of prejudice behind every chance gesture and empty remark. Who, demands the anti-P.C. backlash, gave women, blacks, or gays unlimited license to detect and rebuke an intentional slur behind any gesture or utterance that irritates or displeases them? Moreover, isn't it rude all by itself even to claim such an exaggerated consideration, to deem oneself entitled to set up absolute imperatives and taboos, dictating aggressively what others may or may not say?" (Caldwell, 1999, p. 172).

It appears that even "no-brainer" concepts such as the historical oppression of racial minorities cannot always be assumed to be a part of our collective consciousness. If the oppressed are indeed now the oppressors, then the status and heirarchy issues that much of this work is based upon are significantly less real and deserve significantly less attention. While this author, through research and personal experience, doesn't believe that the historically oppressed are now the oppressors, it would be disingenuous of me to ignore those that hold such a belief. The acknowledgement of those who disagree is, after all, much of what this work yearns to achieve. Whether or not higher education is too heirarchical, and whether or not some are more fully included within the structures of higher education than are others, the importance of higher education as an entry into the upper echelons of our society cannot be overstated. How we govern ourselves and how we formulate our various curricula provide either the foundation for entry into professional success for large amounts of our people or they provide formidable barriers against such entry. Despite the importance of our decisions, we have made them largely with impunity, and mostly without vocal criticism or with any

genuine oversight.

"Higher education in the United States has long provided the prototype of a self-governing profession. Lawyers, doctors, civil servants, and even business managers must earn academic and other outside approval or licensing before they can practice their trades. But the academic profession itself has remained a self-regulated guild" (Sellers, 1994, p. 1). The curriculum that this self-regulated guild sets forth will invariably embody the goals of the university. The goals of the university (or at least those powerful enough within the university to have their goals pursued) may not always be compatible with the goals of each individual member of that community. It has been inevitable, it seems, that the goals of those in the more prestigious disciplines have been pursued more diligently than the goals of those in the lesser and emerging disciplines.

"White educators can help open the door to healing by assuring that the full story of dominance is allowed to be expressed through the many aspects of our school curriculum, both formal and informal" (Howard, 1999, p. 79). A danger that many "white educators," as well as a myriad of other groups often and usually unwittingly trip upon is the danger of falling into the trap that excuses our individual and collective conduct because, to us at least, race simply "doesn't matter." Patricia Williams (1998) eloquently spoke of this danger when she relayed a story concerning her nursery school age son. In his school, he was informed by well-meaning teachers that color makes no difference, that "it doesn't matter." The danger is not from that rather enlightened view that most of us reading this work, no doubt share. The danger is when we transform positive thoughts such as "race and color don't matter" into the inherently dangerous "I don't think about color, therefore your problems don't exist" (p. 4). There is seemingly at least, a fine line between positive denial of difference, and negative denial of reality within our social world.

Informal discussions in classrooms are sometimes (often) hampered by the numerical dominance of the majority group over the minority group. Attempting to deal with issues of dominance on campuses which are indeed "dominated" by one race and/or one gender makes the role of the professor as mediator and facilitator in the classroom all the more critical. Making certain that students feel as though they have the freedom to express their individual opinions and concerns about subject matter is crucial to the success of a given class. From the student's perspective, having "allies" in a classroom makes talking and expressing one's feelings much easier (Rush, 1994, p. 195).

Levin (1998) wrote of his conversations with young African-American youths in a Boston ghetto. In these conversations, Levin described the kids take on the American dream as a "come-on designed to keep minorities committed to the system" (p. 3). He also described the lament of the powerless, and their attraction to conspiratorial theories as a means of explanation of their dire straits. While the straits of professors in the marginalized disciplines may not actually sink to the level of "dire," there can be a certain paranoia that lends itself to thoughts of a conspiracy on the part of the empowered. Whether allowing "marginalized" disciplines a place at the margins of campus life is merely a "come-on designed to keep us all committed to the system" is open to debate. The fact that this issue can be debated, and is not immediately invalidated by all of us, indicates that there is room for great improvement within the academy in terms of how all diverse members are treated. Surely a rank among the "ultimate marginalized" groups, allows African-Americans a great understanding of "place" and "identity" both inside and outside of academia. Painter (2000) laments this "ultimate marginalization" as I refer to it, with the following: "the widespread American assumption that black people are not intellectual affects everyone in higher education who is black or who does black studies" (p. B7). Williams ended her book *Seeing*

a Color Blind Future with the following perspective on overcoming racism: "our rescue, our deliverance perhaps, lies in the possibility of listening across that great divide, of being surprised by the Unknown, by the unknowable. Old habits of being given away, let us hope, to a gentler genealogy of Grace" (p. 74).

Given the tenor of this work, that assumptions and presumptions often must be overcome by shining light on some of the hypocracy and adherence to tradition that has allowed many beliefs to endure, the "place" to which ethnic studies has been relegated on many campuses stands as convincing evidence that marginalization within academia is strong and thriving, and usually at odds with our professed values. Perhaps overcoming our old habits and our reluctance to let certain members of society out of our "prison of prior expectations" is the most important function of all the marginalized disciplines. Most surely it is the province of ethnic studies to assist us in overcoming widely held notions and powerful presumptions.

Chapter Ten

The "Discipline" of Teacher Education

> ***"The quality of instruction in education courses is perhaps lower than that of any other department. Only the extraordinary docility or disinterestedness of the education student permits the low level of instruction from being called more often to public, as well as campus, attention" (Koerner, 1963, p. 96).***
>
> ***"There is a legitimate place for schools of education as teacher training institutes, not as rivals to liberal arts colleges" (Markie, 1994, p. 89).***

It is no secret that teacher education, as a discipline, ranks far down on the typical campus heirarchy. Like criminal justice, teacher education is often viewed as a pre-professional program out of place in the rarified air of the liberal arts. Airspace (and often budgetary space) is instead reserved for the elite liberal arts "intellectual" fields, not the "vocational" programs that such disciplines as teacher education and criminal justice are perceived to be. Koerner's words from 1963, above, ably illustrate the place to which teacher education has been traditionally assigned. (Teacher educators can take some minimal solace from the fact that in 1963, criminal justice, ethnic studies, and women's studies programs were just beginning to emerge on campus...and perhaps for that reason alone, escaped the initial wrath of those "studying" the disciplines). Garger (1995) referred to the "class system" that existed among the various subject areas, even at his small Iowa liberal arts college. Much of this chapter was written as I sat at a small Iowa liberal arts college (other than the one referred to by Garger) with an entrenched "class system" firmly in place. I remember longing for the day that professors might read Garger's work in wonderment; for then and still now, I read his work only with recognition and resignation.

Sears, Otis-Wilborn, and Marshall, (1994), themselves advocates of teachers and proponents of positive change for colleges of education, devote a chapter in their work on educational reform to "being special in an unspecial profession." Even works which do not focus

upon curriculum issues per se, and/or educational reform, have commented upon the "low esteem in which education as a subject of study is held in American colleges and universities" (Koerner, 1970, p. 116). Tom (1997) wrote: "even excellent work in teacher education is viewed by many outside our field as unworthy of respect" (p. 203). Many of those who have studied professions and professionals note the prestige of certain professions that is often largely the result of mystified knowledge, or for lack of a better phrase, professional secrets. In order to be rendered great esteem, it seems, one must possess a measure of specialized knowledge to which laypeople have little access. Bess & Associates (2000) argue that professors, generally, must be "repackaged" in order that they be allowed to "specialize," for example, in either teaching or research. Such specialization, Bess argues, would allow for both better teaching on the one hand, and better research on the other. Teacher educators, more specifically in accord with the focus of this chapter, are not only expected to "teach" future teachers, and contribute to the literature, but to solve the widespread perception that schools desperately need repair. Perhaps we are asking simply too much of our teacher educators, and setting forth expectations which cannot be met, to the detriment of the discipline's ultimate standing both within and outside of academia.

Like so many truisms, the lack of status of teacher education programs has taken upon a life of its own, and now seems to be accepted with or without supporting data. This truism has gained acceptance beyond the ivy-covered walls of the academy. Even many members of the American public have accepted the words of our elected leaders who have often found it to be politically expedient and even fashionable to criticize the preparation of schoolteachers (Gallagher & Bailey, 2000). Within the academy itself, liberal arts and sciences faculty are often quick to denigrate education schools' faculty, research, students, and curriculum, and even within the education schools themselves, many faculty distance themselves from the preparation of new teachers.

> "Instead of being viewed as a subject relevant to the whole academy, education is seen as having to do only with the training of teachers of children and adolescents and research on schools as institutions--topics considered less prestigious than the study of any other aspect of our society" (Maher & Tetreault, 1999, p. 41).

Overcoming the stereotypes that have relegated teacher educators and teacher education

programs to second and third-rate status has been difficult at best, particularly when many on the inside of these programs have become among these programs' most vocal critics. The collective voices of these critics has saturated our views of teachers and teacher education so effectively that potential positive images have been largely anecdotal and transient. The image I conjure up is that of a wilting plant so soaked by rainwater that any attempts at revitalization and/or fertilization are largely too little and too late.

Markie (1994) in his study of college teaching, plainly refers to the standards of scholarship in schools of education as "lower" (p. 89). These perceptions persist even in the face of evidence to the contrary. Imig (1985) cited several studies from such diverse places as the Universities of Missouri, Kentucky, and North Dakota which found either no statistically significant differences between the averages of education students and other campus majors, or in some cases, higher averages on the part of education students. Like many of our most persistent and powerful stereotypes, their ability to remain a part of the public consciousness prevails despite increasing amounts of contrary evidence. The ability to stereotype itself requires a certain ability to put aside facts in favor of personal perceptions and personal anecdotal evidence, and the profession of teaching and the discipline of teacher education have suffered as a result of those abilities on the part of those outside of the discipline. Again, tremendous irony is present, given the speed at which those within the mainstream of academia generally criticize the invalidity of stereotyping as they engage in no small degree of "academic stereotyping" of their own.

Bok (1990), not a critic of higher education generally, nor of teacher educators in particular, cites as evidence of teacher educators' low standing, the ongoing public debate over "school reform" and the simultaneous exclusion of teacher educators from the debate. One cannot imagine physicians being excluded from a healthcare debate or lawyers from a legal system debate, but there is little public sentiment for colleges of education to involve themselves in school reform initiatives and proposals. If then it is generally accepted on campus and off, that the

discipline of teacher education is not among our most prestigious, there must be a myriad of reasons why. Garger (1995) writes of education's status as having the most "first-generation college graduates" and the "largest proportion of faculty with working-class backgrounds" of any discipline. Empirical data on such a statement might be difficult to gather, yet his belief seems compelling enough. He also emphasizes education's emphasis on the practicalities of what happens within a classroom, as a reason for its perceived lack of intellectual rigor. "Reality," in fact, as both a concept and a lifestyle, has taken on a somewhat anti-intellectual tenor. I think Garger's theories are in fact right on target, and this chapter focuses upon his and other theories, beginning with the "feminization factor." Like all explanations of social trends and longheld conventional "wisdom," allowing too much importance to be placed upon any one factor diminishes the worthiness of the analysis. Labaree (1999) correctly pointed to "a long history of status deprivation" that has led to the acquisition of the negative labels that have become firmly attached to the "subculture" of teaching (p. 35). A long history of status deprivation suggests that just as "Rome wasn't built in a day," so too has the status of schools of education and teachers generally been the product of accumulated conventional wisdom and folklore that has become firmly grounded in the minds of many citizens.

Among the primary reasons that teacher education has, like criminal justice, been largely outside of the academic mainstream, lies, arguably at least, in its numerical domination by women. In a society with a tradition of sexism and gender inequality, a profession dominated by the dominated and traditionally marginalized gender is likely to be given short shrift in a variety of areas. Curriculum inclusion within higher education is but one of these areas. Blackburn & Lawrence (1995) surmise that much of the reason women (and for my purposes, their "dominated" disciplines) have been given short shrift in academia, has been the reality that has seen males do the vast majority of "studies" that have focused upon women in academia. Looking into the mirror, many traditional male academics have seen what they perceive to be the superior academic's

reflection staring back at them. Hinchey (1998) focuses upon the "constructed consciousness" of a cultural value system that has taught teachers that their work is far less important than that of doctors, lawyers, and "judging by income comparisons, less important than the work of plumbers" (p. 24).

Many women used to "submit" themselves to their husbands upon marriage. Indeed, many marriage vows proclaimed the value of the submission of the woman as loudly as they proclaimed the more asexual virtues of monogamy, understanding, and patience. While many women (and many men) continue to endure such expectations that society may have placed upon them, others have refused to play a part in the submission of themselves or of others. Likewise, many academics have been, in some sense at least, forced to submit themselves to their discipline at the expense of genuine independent thinking and genuine independence of action. Just as "knowing one's place" played a key role in the suppression of women for hundreds of years, "knowing one's place" now often plays an equally important role in the suppression of academics who practice their craft in the "lesser" disciplines.

MacKinnon (1987) espoused the belief that "gender is not difference, gender is heirarchy...the idea of gender difference helps keep male dominance in place." This idea was expanded in an article I co-authored in the *Journal of Teacher Education* [see Volume 48, No. 2, Kaufman, et al., "The Dichotomy Between the Concept of Professionalism and the Reality of Sexism in Teaching," March/April 1997].

MacKinnon's thought is in accord with the premise of this work, as the preceding chapters have focused upon beliefs among the "established and/or entrenched" which have kept traditionally dominant disciplines heirachically above newer and/or "lesser" disciplines. It is likely the case, as I've stated in preceding chapters, that the "differences" are less real, than they are simply the creations of those in dominant positions.

These "created" differences have kept both the disciplines of criminal justice and teacher

education in their places near or at the bottom of the disciplinary standings. Just as the "newness" of criminal justice has played a central role in keeping it down, the "femininization of teaching" has played a central role in keeping it in its accorded place. As feminists of both sexes continue to chip away at traditionally sexist practices, inroads are being made toward greater inclusion at all levels in our society. This chapter concerns greater inclusion of teacher education as a discipline in the larger structure of higher education and within the sacred liberal arts.

There are numerous studies and commentaries that have focused upon the feminization of teaching and the role that has played in the advancement, or more realistically, the diminished standing of the profession. One of these commentaries lies buried in a section within a book I've written (probably properly buried shortly after its publication) entitled *The Professionalization of Teaching: Is it Much ado About Nothing?* The gist of these studies concerns the belief that in what has been traditionally a male dominated workplace and a male dominated professional atmosphere, vocations that are dominated by women are given less attention, less credit, less pay, less prestige, and in sum, less. For the purposes of this work, "less" includes less likelihood of inclusion within the traditional liberal arts curriculum. Professors of education, ever in search of greater acceptance, have been accused by Glazer (1974) and Kramer (1991), among others, as "abandoning the connection with the lowly women who taught children in elementary classrooms" (Kramer, 1991, p. 5). Detached or attached, teacher educators are and have been, damned if they do and damned if they don't.

Sarason (1999) cited historical “reasons for the feminization of teaching.” Among the foremost, in his view, was that “women were seen as more ‘with it’ in regard to understanding young children and responsibly ensuring that their behavior was consistent with a clear, bedrock morality” (p. 39). Whether women truly were more tender, compassionate, and sensitive is a debate for the ages; that they have been perceived as so and that these virtues have been correlated with “weakness” and accommodation, rather than with strength and ability have

dominated the historical perceptions of teaching. Given the marginalization that teachers have historically endured, gender based marginalization or not, it is not altogether surprising that the teachers of teachers have undergone significant criticism as well. In fact, colleges of education and their faculties have been under assault for a number of years. In a political and social environment that consistently bashes the public schools, it should be of small wonder that the producers of most public school teachers should bear their share of blame. Casting aside the validity or invalidity of most of the dispersions cast upon schools and teaching, the discipline of education has taken a pronounced and prolonged public flogging. [An excellent look at many of the issues concerning public education in a well documented and researched "defense" of education can be found in *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America's Public Schools*, (1995), by Berliner & Biddle]. Soder (1996) informs us of the misguided nature of focusing solely on teacher education programs if we are concerned about the preparation and ability of our education graduates.

> **"To focus exclusively on the need to change teacher preparation programs is to ignore the plain fact that virtually all intending teachers spend some 75 percent of their higher education time taking courses in the departments of the arts and sciences, either as part of their general education or in conjunction with their teacher preparation program" (p. 247).**

Former Secretary of Education William Bennett has been perhaps the loudest and most influential critic of the usefulness of teacher education (as well as other social institutions which don't share his propensity for knowing virtue when he sees it). The underlying assumption of his position, held by many others as well, was and is that all prospective teachers needed was a strong subject matter background and a willingness to teach. The rest, any pedagogical knowledge that might be needed, would come on the job (Grossman, 1990). Bennett, of course, has made millions off of a long series of books lamenting the loss of virtue in our society...as he as simultaneously supported social policy that largely leaves the poor and less "virtuous" out of

"our" future plans. Virtue, again we lament, seems to be in the eye of the beholder. Whatever one's viewpoints concerning the virtue of those of us engaged in the teaching of college students generally, the virtue of those specifically teaching our future elementary and secondary schoolteachers has come under constant and sometimes vicious attack.

Kramer (1991) delivered a scathing attack on the preparation of teachers.

> **"What we have today are teacher-producing factories that process material from the bottom of the heap and turn out models that perform, but not well enough. What we need is to sacrifice quantity for quality, both in the institutions that educate teachers and their graduates. The institutions should be essentially academic, and their graduates should be judged by how much they know, not just how much they care" (p. 211).**

Even among those of us who view ourselves as advocates rather than critics of public education and/or teachers, there are recognized levels of truth to Kramer's words. How we respond to those truths is less than self-evident.

If we want to improve the quality of the raw materials (students) who enter teaching, one path toward that improvement might be to increase the status of the discipline by granting it inclusion into the traditional liberal arts. Students who either choose or are "called" (depending upon your level of belief in the sanctity of the teaching profession) should have the opportunity to self-select the major of teacher education during (rather than before the onset of) their college careers. By using a college where I formerly taught as an example of how criminal justice and most importantly for the purposes of this chapter, teacher education students, are obligated to choose their majors <u>prior</u> to beginning their college careers, I hope to plant the thought that inclusion of the "foundations of education" and "introduction to criminal justice" within the general education curriculum might increase the odds for finding more and better teachers and criminal justice professionals. "Undecided" college freshman, who make up a large segment of

the college freshman class at most institutions (and who arguably should make up an even larger percentage, as they are mostly 18 year olds after all) tend to begin their college careers by focusing their first year course schedules upon "core" or "general education requirements." Such a choice of focus, entirely rational, is often done less on their own, than it is done upon the suggestion of their highly influential advisors. In either case, students begin their careers by taking Intro courses...Intro to sociology, psychology, political science, and so forth. Based upon their experiences in these courses, good and bad, many of them are able to make more informed decisions as to choice of major. These informed decisions seldom if ever involve criminal justice or teacher education because these Intro courses are not included within these "core" or "general education" requirements. Therefore, any student or advisor alike having the ultimate goal of seeing progress toward the student's degree, is highly unlikely to suggest to an undecided freshman, a course such as "intro to criminal justice" or "foundations of education," courses which will not contribute toward general education graduation requirements. In effect, these lesser disciplines are largely "locked out" of the undecided student population, which ultimately means a loss not only for the disciplines, but for some of our brightest and most able undecided students who might have chosen different paths.

There is certainly nothing inherently wrong with having students who "know what they want," still, it would also be a service to students and programs alike, to also have students in classes who were still searching for what they wanted. Being a part of that search rather than being excluded from that search might actually be more in accord with the tenor of most of our mission statements seeking to provide broad and general liberal arts educations that prepare students not just for work, but for life.

Ducharme & Ducharme (1996) eloquently defend teacher education programs through an assessment of society's historical need to supply teachers for a rapidly expanding population. The enormous service that was provided by the "normal schools" in producing teachers quickly and

inexpensively has been overlooked and the perceptions, both correct and incorrect, of a low intellectual climate within schools of education has been persistent. In our commercialized world, we are aware that "perception is everything," and it is such a reliance upon past perceptions that have impeded and continue to impede schools of education in their quest for acceptance within the academic mainstream.

There is a commonly held view among academics and educators alike, that education is an applied area of study with no methodological principles or conceptual domain that it can call its own [for a more complete discussion and an excellent challenge to that view, see Beyer, et al. (1989).] Only academic "snobbery" has allowed for such views to take root, given the reality that no one discipline can properly assert "ownership" over methods of study. Methods of study, as the saying goes, are indeed "bigger than the both of us," and indeed, bigger than any one or two disciplines. "Practicing" education, like "practicing" any discipline, requires reflective consideration and analysis of social trends. As such, the effective practice of education is every bit as "intellectual" an endeavour as effectively practicing sociology, psychology, or even philosophy. Teaching, at least good teaching at the collegiate level, is generally not an exercise in the domination of one person's (the teacher) will over another. Teaching students to prepare for a life in such an interactive profession may seem significantly less burdensome than teaching students the "classics" of literature or philosophy or of other more knowledge-based and generally accepted disciplines. The combination of teaching pedagogy with practice makes the realm of teacher-education ripe for criticism from both perspectives.

Done poorly of course, anything can fail to be an intellectual endeavour, and sadly, many teachers, like many professors of all variety of disciplines have ceased to reflectively examine that which surrounds them, and have instead lapsed into a complacent acceptance with little more. Complacent acceptance of one's "place," however rational for one's emotional survival, has done little for advancing those disciplines whose place has largely been determined by others in vastly

different contexts. Poor practice of any discipline is a criticism that transcends each and every discipline and all professional endeavours and cannot be the exclusive provence of teacher education programs and teacher educators.

Baiocco & DeWaters (1998) believe that teaching excellence involves "character, knowledge, actions, and outcomes" (p. 214). How schools of education might prepare students possessing these traits and abilities is a constant concern in both the academic and mainstream literature. Teachers who garner great amounts of unwanted publicity for failing general competency tests as well as legislators who seek to impose such competency tests suggest both a genuine lack of ability in some of our teachers and a genuine lack of confidence in our schools of education. If indeed teaching is too important to be left to teachers alone, and, like many other professions, it may be, we might also consider the importance of law and medicine and other professions which have been granted great deference in how they assess their members' competencies and performances. Scrutiny of programs and scrutiny of the professions may be warranted in our society, particularly those programs and professions which profess to serve people and their needs. Similar levels of scrutiny and similar methods of scrutinizing members may, however, be appropriate, and might allow both teachers and colleges of education to be seen in a significantly more positive and fair light. Labaree (1999) humorously (poignantly?) conveys his impression of the ease with which harsh "scrutiny" is given to those practicing in the field of teacher education.

> "This is supposed to be the era of political correctness on American university campuses, a time when speaking ill of oppressed minorities is taboo. But while academics have to tiptoe around most topics, there is still one subordinate group that can be shelled with impunity--the sad sacks who inhabit the university's education school" (p. 35).

Shelling subordinate groups with impunity, long a favorite ploy of politicians eager to appeal to a willing majority, has become more entrenched within an ever more corporatized

academic workplace. A workplace in which competition and the "dressing down" of rivals is not only accepted, but ever more expected. Mills (1997) wrote of the increasing use of humiliation as a "management tool." The increase in humiliation and scapegoating within society, as recognized by Mills, are paralleled by Labaree (1999) who refers to the education faculty as the perfect scapegoat for the entire university faculty. The power of scapegoating as a concept has made tremendous inroads within college faculties who have often allowed themselves the luxory of placing blame for problems within schools (both real and perceived) to fall upon teacher education in particular rather than higher education in general.

Perhaps most critical in terms of increasing both the status and "product" of teacher education programs is the need for increased funding to support these programs. Tom (1997) laments the fact that most teacher education programs are funded as if they were simply another arts and sciences major, without an adequate regard for the extensive clinical component needed to prepare prospective teachers to work with groups of immature "classes" of clients, many of whom would rather not even be in the school setting. These difficulties are realities faced by those within teacher education programs at the same time their budget fights are constrained by their lack of status, and less tangible financial contributions to academic life. The exasperation felt by many teacher-educators is illustrated by Weber & Mitchell (1995) who refer to a common perception on the part of many teacher-educators that firmly entrenched stereotypes and ideas about teaching are so solidly in place that they simply cannot be overcome. Such exasperation, however in accord with reality, does not set the stage for any type of curriculum reform that might enhance the place to which teacher education has long been relegated. Indeed, it is more likely that pervasive negative images have retarded teachers' abilities to integrate new views into practice at every level of education, including higher education curricula.

Chapter Eleven

The "Discipline" of Women's Studies

> *"The attitudes of policymakers, educators, and students about who is worthy of being educated, and about economic entitlement, the deep-seated attitudes about race, class, and gender, also constitute real barriers to educating all the varied groups and individuals within American society" (Sidel, 1994, p. 51).*
>
> *"As every educator knows, the structures and policies of institutions are themselves telling signifiers, teaching students (however silently and indirectly) what is and is not prized" (Kolodny, 1998, p. 158).*
>
> *"I myself have never been able to find out precisely what feminism is: I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a doormat" -Rebecca West.*

During the course of writing this chapter, a colleague of mine turned my attention to a book, first published in 1939, entitled *The Saber-Tooth Currriculum.* In the book, a satiric account of life in academia (one begins to wonder if there is, or could be, any other type of account), the line "immunized against infection from new ideas" (p. 56) is used in the context of professors dulling the minds of their students through the use of rigid adherence to structure. This chapter, concerning women's studies, like the others focusing upon individual marginalized disciplines, hopes to address those within the academy who, so entrenched within their historical foundations, have largely been immunized against new ideas. It has not been an altogether new idea to include in the college curriculum courses that attempt to teach students to understand how society construes differences among people. How society confers privilege upon some and justifies discrimination with regards to others. Courses concerning "minority groups" and "ethnic relations" have for several decades now, been a staple of colleges and universities across the country. While we have addressed, at least superficially, the need to understand societal privilege and discrimination through the use of some courses, we have

often failed to understand privilege and discrimination in our own backyards.

Questions have arisen more frequently in recent years over the treatment of diverse human experiences in the curricula of our institutions of higher education. Achieving consideration, let alone prominence within these debates over curriculum development has been no small feat. It seems that many meetings which debate the "fully inclusive" curriculum are by invitation only. Crashing the gates of entry into the "academic aristocracy" (however "unnatural" that aristocracy is, as I have argued throughout this work) has often been the only method of gaining access, despite the limited appeal that such confrontations have upon our individual well-being and perhaps even our own perceptions of our "better selves."

Cultural pluralism and increased awareness of the value of human diversity have heightened curricula response to the needs and wants of those seeking greater inclusion within the higher education sphere. The concept behind the "invention" of women's studies was the perceived need to overcome some of that bias and to bring to light previously omitted histories, literature, and ideas. Epstein (1988), for example, was concerned with and subsequently wrote about both the neglect and misinterpretation of women by the various social sciences, and the attendant damage that was therefore done to women and the disciplines themselves through such malfeasance (intentional and unintentional). The assessment of where women belonged in the academy and in the larger society carried with it the sense that wherever that place was...it surely could not be in the mainstream.

Increased democratization in our social order and social orders has been reflected by higher education which has included ever more courses in such diverse fields as African-American Studies and Women's Studies. Increased democratization has allowed many former "outsiders" to openly question the role that bias has played in higher education, and to more fully explore the intersection of gender

and race with other identities.

Probing questions coming from within the programs, however, have often been overshadowed by questions about the programs. Rojstaczer (1999) while not referring to women's studies in particular, or to ethnic studies or criminal justice education, referred to "new wave" classes that began in the 1960s. These new wave classes, in his "traditionalist" view, "tended to be easier in terms of workload, intellectual expectation, and grading" (p. 15). The "dumbing down" of the curriculum and the increased awareness of "grade inflation," while surely not the sole responsibility of these "new wave" courses, have allowed for further shots to be taken at new developments within the curriculum.

The history of Women's studies is generally depicted as having developed out of and alongside the women's movement, which itself developed in relation to the civil rights movement in the 1960s (Poovey, 1995). This history reflected the fact that, as was the case in the larger civil rights battles, one element of society was not being adequately represented. In fact, knowledge that the universities claimed was representative and universal was actually neither. In essence the curriculum on college and university campuses during this tumultuous period, was based more on exclusion than it was on inclusion. Women's studies was seen as a means of gaining inclusion into the "legitimate" corridors of power in academia. Different institutions made different commitments to women's studies programs. On some campuses, there was, seemingly at least, a genuine commitment to the establishment of a new and strong discipline. On others, however, the inclusion of "new wave" courses was often merely "window dressing" and a way of quieting growing dissent. Full inclusion into the curriculum and/or into the actual corridors of power within the disciplines was not always, perhaps even not often meant to be the end result of the advent of women's studies programs.

The inclusion of courses usually did not necessarily mean full inclusion

for the programs within the larger higher education environment. This chapter addresses that wish for genuine and full inclusion on the part of the discipline of women's studies; the fourth of the marginalized disciplines selected for inclusion within this work. Who has the power to determine where women's studies exists within the curriculum, or perhaps more fundamentally, whether women's studies will exist within the curriculum, are the initial questions that plague women's studies much as they do the other marginalized disciplines. "Power in education is operationalized by creating, defining, encoding, transmitting, and evaluating claims to knowledge" (Morgan, 1996, p. 108). Claims to knowledge, like the "ownership" and "possession" of other intangible assets, is often met with resistance on the part of those not included in the "ownership." Who owns the curriculum? Who owns women's studies? What relationship should one have with the other? All of these questions have to do with power, and power has been in limited supply among those within the marginalized disciplines.

Gender has been one form of social structure which has played a significant role in the allocation of resources, programs, and attention given to given disciplines on college campuses. Not all of the exclusionary practices that have prevented women and women's studies from achieving coequal status in the academic community have been overt. A variety of processes much more subtle than discriminatory rules and practices of days gone by still exist as barriers erected and maintained by colleagues, informal groups, communities, and of course, tradition. It is tradition that no doubt carries the most weight in the exclusion of all of the marginalized disciplines. Given that women's studies has a limited tradition, it has followed that much of the discrimination that has plagued its development has been more subtly played out in the form of protection of tradition, rather than overt gender bias. There can be little doubt that academia shares and has shared many of the same interactional expectations and possibilities that have influenced gender

roles and advancement outside of academia. In the case of the marginalized disciplines, these low expectations have often placed heavy burdens upon the possibilities of those within these disciplines.

That women might know and acccept their "place" has historically played a significant role in the development of gender differences and gender expectations in our society. That women might expand that "place" or even ignore that place in order to more fully integrate into the society at all levels, did not come without resistance, and sometimes at least, open and preexisting contempt. Academics are far too enlightened to express these sentiments openly and the oppression of some of the more marginalized disciplines has been effectively placed at the foot of tradition rather than historical oppression. Whether that placement has always been fair is open to interpretation. That the gender of the vast majority of those seeking inclusion of women's studies into the curriculum might be a factor, even when it has not been explicity mentioned, is hardly arguable given a long tradition of adherence to social norms and conventions that have shaped all the disciplines.

Women's studies, like ethnic studies, and criminal justice studies, is an emerging discipline that is coming of age after a roughly thirty year history of triumph, tribulation, tragedy, and, perhaps above all, trial and error. Like other emerging disciplines, women's studies as a course of study, has embodied different forms in different places. While all women's studies courses explore the rich details of women's lives and experiences, describing the field as a generic course of study is no more true for women's studies, than it would be an appropriate description of the many criminal justice programs, ethnic studies programs, or teacher education programs that occupy places, usually somewhat marginalized places, upon college and university campuses.

Women's studies, as a collegiate program, is widely recognized as having

begun with one program at San Diego State University, in 1970. That single program has now spawned (or at least played a role) in the formation of the more than 600 women's studies programs on American college campuses today (Boxer 1998). The impact that these programs have had upon higher education has and continues to be, debated. Like has been the case with criminal justice, the onset and the incredible growth of these programs has been taken as a sign of both the academic apocalypse and of an academic rebirth, depending upon whom has been consulted. The disparate feelings that these programs have engendered (and the fact that, as in many of our long lasting debates both sides know that they are correct) make them considerable fodder for more heightened academic discussion over the place that they do, and the place that they should occupy within our institutions of higher learning.

That a debate over the worthiness of women's studies is far from merely academic is illustrated by attention given to the topic in the mainstream press. Criticisms of women's studies range from the type of petty in-fighting present among and between departments at all colleges and universities to more substantive concerns over the meaning of a liberal arts education in the twenty-first century. *Newsweek* magazine devoted an article to the debate over women's studies that cited scholars' contrasting beliefs in the subject as ranging from those who believe the field is a solid academic endeavor, and those who are concerned that, on some campuses at least, it is less a solid academic endeavor than it is a "support group" (Begley, 2000). Perhaps women's studies most vocal critic, Daphne Patai, of the University of Massachusetts, accuses the field of "ideological browbeating and indoctrination passing as teaching" (Begley, 2000, p. 70). Others, less academically qualified, seize upon "looksism" to diminish women's studies. Christina Hoff Sommers points out "there are a lot of homely women in women's studies." (Sommers as quoted in Anna Quindlin, "And Now, Babe Feminism," *New York Times*,

19 Jan. 1994, A21). That equal numbers of "homely men" populate other disciplines is either lost or simply not relevant. Rush Limbaugh, a favorite of the unenlightened, and usually uneducated, has come forward with the charming "feminism was established to allow unattractive women access to mainstream society" [(Limbaugh quoted in Jody Rohlena, ed., *Sounds Like a New Woman* (New York: Penguin, 1993)]. *Perhaps radio was established to allow unattractive men such a forum, but such a thought might be construed as petty, and as such has no place in this work, that's why it's in italics!* Despite these formidable obstacles and "mainstream" voices, there are still others who believe that there is tremendous value in teaching students to recognize the influences of gender even in seemingly unlikely places.

Margolis & Romero (1998) assert that the creation of women's studies a academic departments may have been the result of mere "resistance to the hidden curriculum in mainstream departments as they were attempts to open the official curriculum to include women and people of color and those from working-class backgrounds" (p. 29). Whatever level of truth may be within that statement, it has been the ability of those pioneers of women's studies who have been responsible for bringing about the tremendous growth within these programs who have now made a discussion of "academic place" possible. Many of our most successful, if still ongoing pleas for inclusion, began as resistance movements. Not sitting on the back of the bus was a simple act, but a complicated and courageous decision. Whether the discipline of women's studies began as an act of resistance or as a wellspring of support for a new and emerging discipline, the result has been the same: continuing acceptance and mainstream consideration.

Lewis (1993) wrote that the "spaces opened up by...women's studies programs, and the seemingly open discourse on feminist politics on many university campuses are significantly countered by limited job opportunities, denials of tenure and promotion, and open harassment" (p. 51). Deeply rooted institutional practices

coupled with equally well entrenched social relations of inequality have made the success of women's studies all the more impressive, as it illustrates the need for vigilance. Status on the fringes of mainstream academia make the inroads made more easily subject to blockade than status within more mainstream academic life would allow. Too much energy is necessarily expended justifying the existence of many of these programs that could be better spent on expanding and improving these programs. As in Maslow's "Heirarchy of Needs," our quest for survival must outweigh our quest for personal enrichment and fulfillment.

The rich, if relatively short history of women's studies in many ways parallels that of criminal justice. Two disciplines strengthened in the long-term (if sometimes weakened in the short-term) by internal struggles and academic disagreements over the proper direction that course offerings and program initiatives should take. These struggles concerned such issues as: should these courses be part of interdisciplinary programs or should they be part of their own departments; should they emphasize teaching, or research; should they play a role in advancing the status of women on campus, or would that transcend academia and too closely resemble a political movement. These and other questions continue to both plague those within the discipline as they search for greater status, as it simultaneously enlivens the discipline's vitality and search for both the greater truth and its own truth.

Women's studies has been built on the premise that "women have been both stereotyped and ignored by mediators of the culture" (McLure & McLure, 1977, p. 17). Women's studies completes the quartet of disciplines in this study, for that very reason: those disciplines which have been ignored and/or unfairly stereotyped continue to assert their proper role in the academy. Exactly what that role should be continues, of course, to provide fodder for discussion.

The parallels between the emerging disciplines of women's studies on the

one hand, and criminal justice on the other, might in and of itself be taken as evidence that equality, while far from attained in higher education, may be within our grasp. Time alone has been a legitimizing factor in so far as these marginalized disciplines' survival (if even at the margins) has ensured that they are more than the "fads" or "educational experiments" that many of their critics contended.

Women's studies, while not the exclusive domain of women, has been necessarily a field dominated by female practitioners. Criminal Justice studies, has been, particularly in its earliest days, just the reverse...a field largely dominated by male practitioners. The fact that both have made tremendous inroads, and that women's studies might, arguably at least, be the discipline that has actually advanced the most distance toward full academic inclusion...speaks volumes as to the intellectual ability and the emotional persistence of those pursuing greater equality for their emerging field.

Carol Gilligan, among others, has commented that women speak "in a different voice." Whether or not such a statement is true, and whether or not such a statement advances, diminishes, or merely recognizes gender differences, it is, for the purposes of this work, cogent in so far as it is the "different voice" of all of the marginalized disciplines that is yearning to be heard. Deconstructing these differences (both real and perceived) is as valuable for the marginalized disciplines more generally, as it is for women's studies most particularly.

Like the other disciplines mentioned in this work, those working in the field of women's studies on college campuses have had to assess their own place within the academy as "insiders" or as "outsiders" having more autonomy but less institutionalized worth. Allen (1996), in her study of women's studies programs, wrote that these two positions assumed various forms according to cultural context and historical period. Outsider strategies were necessarily deemed as more "militant," while insider strategies ran the risk of being deemed irrelevant.

Those working from within ran the risk of being perceived as merely coopted by the academic establishment already firmly in place. Assimilation into the existing academic structures has been deemed as inappropriate and professionally painful as has been the assimilation into existing society of marginalized groups throughout American history.

The reason this study considers women's studies as it considers ethnic studies, teacher education and criminal justice, is that like the others, women's studies has advanced by leaps and bounds in a relatively short time, while it still treads on very unstable academic turf. The success it has achieved in such an unstable environment does not, unlike more established disciplines, ensure women's studies of anything in the future. While perhaps nothing in academia should be guaranteed, working on unstable turf can be every bit as exhausting as it can be intellectually challenging.

Many naturally accruing side benefits accompanied the advent of women's studies programs on campus. Foremost, may have been the necessary inclusion of women in decision-making positions. Such positions were often a precondition for the development of women's studies programs (Allen, 1996). These side benefits (while critical) have not entirely overcome the perception on many campuses and the reality on many others, that women's studies has been an "outsider" field, created by women for women. Challenging firmly held assumptions and structures, cannot however be as effectively done by disciplines that remain separate from more established and more "accepted" mainstream scholarly bodies.

It is clear, or it should be, that colleges mirror the culture in which they exist. "While weird and often wonderful things go on in higher education, what goes on still happens mostly at the will of common American culture" (Schuman & Olufs, 1995, p. 82). Higher education in the United States has been a powerful force, even if it has merely reflected the will of American culture. One of its

powers has been to carry forward cultural stereotypes of the place of women in the larger society, and many of these stereotypes have limited the sense of place and the identity with which women have been afforded. Houston (1996) credits women's studies with allowing all of us a glimmer into the ways, both powerful and subtle, in which gender has been and continues to be a basic organizing principle in every society. In sum, the world has long presented itself differently to women than it has to men. Recognition of this fact, however painful it has to be, has been one of the many benefits of the legitimization of women's studies.

Chapter Twelve

"The Impasse Between Militant Radicalism and Cynical Despair"

> ***"When one began teaching at a university almost the first things that one learned were the hostilities that divided this or that pair of faculty members, the rooted conflicts of objective that divided this department from that and, every so often, the conflict that engulfed an entire faculty when some major issue arose" (Nisbet, 1971, p. 46).***
>
> ***"The personal courage of sociological work is that of being able to remember what one might wish had never happened" (Lemert, 1997, p. 64).***
>
> ***"Institutions always tend to behave unkindly toward individuals who make them look bad" (Schneiderman, 1995, p. 141).***
>
> ***"University politics are hell. I've compared notes with friends in other departments and universities and have been somewhat heartened to find out that they can be much worse. I have only witnessed a little of this childishness, acrimony, and boorish behavior that exist in much greater quantity elsewhere" (Rojstaczer, 1999, pp. 158-9).***
>
> ***"I've tried to adjust by avoiding faculty meetings unless they are absolutely critical" (Rojstaczer, 1999, p. 160).***

When one studies broad philosophical questions concerning curriculum inclusion and exclusion, marginalization, justice, equity, and reluctance to change, it is impossible not to include anecdotal episodes that convey the depth of our misunderstandings, however narrow and limited any application of those anecdotes beyond their immediate environments must necessarily be. Having said that, I seek your patience as a reader in considering this chapter to be more than a compendium of complaints (however cathartic that might be) and rather an attempt at including just the type of "real world" episode that we professors often use as attempts to get our abstract points across in more concrete terms. There is certainly a danger inherent in extrapolating from experiences in order to form generalizations about something as diverse as "academia."

Recognition of that danger coupled with knowledge that anecdotes and analysis are not one and the same will hopefully convince the reader of this chapter, that whatever and whichever aspects of these stories resonate, they are not to be taken as a statement that such conditions exist universally in academia. Further, there is no doubt that moral outrage is far from an adequate substitute for enlightened policy. It can, however, be fertile breeding ground for the type of activism that is sometimes necessary if change is to be implemented.

Having the above caveats firmly in mind, it still seems as though whenever the word "crisis" is used in a work concerning colleges and universities, anyone who has had even passing contact with higher education usually has several anecdotes that convey a crisis from which to choose. Crises that involve what a campus might tolerate in terms of professorial discourse and what a campus might attempt to suppress make for meaningful conversations about academic freedom, appropriate conduct, loyalty to one's institution, and less global issues such as academic suicide, and one's own sense of justice.

Within a study that concerns the marginalization of disciplines in academia, it seems appropriate to devote a chapter to the marginalization of faculty as a whole. While the focus of this work has primarily concerned certain "less accepted" disciplines, there is room for a chapter concerning the general health and well-being of the faculty generally. This is such a chapter. The goal of this chapter was not to create as much muckraking trouble as I could (a side-benefit no doubt), but rather to express, in real terms, the depths to which “leaders” sometimes sink in pursuit of unbridled power and unfettered discretion.

There is also ample cause and sufficient space to consider the more positive concepts of leadership more generally, and how good leaders can bring out the best in those that follow them. Seymour (1995) spoke of the necessity for followers to carefully scrutinize the words and actions of leaders.

> "Followers want to be reassured that tomorrow will be better than today, that where they are going offers

> more oppportunity than where they are now. They need to be convinced that their current position is untenable and that the risks associated with change are acceptable. They listen intently to hear the right words, spoken with clarity and honesty. They watch carefully to see that beliefs are manifested in strong, purposeful actions, that what leaders say matches what they do" (p. 93).

When words no longer match deeds and when hypocrisy reigns supreme among our leaders, the ability to properly "follow" becomes muddled and sullied. Real work becomes difficult in a drippy molasses-like goo of idle gossip, unfounded and founded rumors, and paranoid turf battles. While leaders can often encourage behaviors among subordinates by exhibiting those behaviors in themselves, it is nearly impossible for subordinates to exhibit appropriate workplace allegiance and devotion to task, when it is perceived that those above them tend not to exhibit such necessary workplace attributes as devotion to cause, loyalty, and open and honest communications concerning both successes and failures.

Previous mention has been made of the "great divide" between trustees and administration on the one hand and the faculty on the other, a divide which seems to grow deeper and wider with each passing month, and is illustrated not only by our prevailing thoughts but by our own experiences within academia. Some of these experiences have led me to believe that there is often one set of academic values and an entirely different set of management or administrative values. These different values, while usually concealed, cannot coexist peacefully forever, and must often bubble up into a heated cauldron of conflict that scalds members of both sides. It comes as no surprise to faculty members who've had the opportunity to interact with trustees that differences between these conflicting values cannot be glossed over eternally. Where these differences are perhaps most glaring, can often be observed by looking down into the deep chasm that exists between the lifestyle, attitudes, beliefs, and values of faculty members on the one hand, and trustees on the other.

Allan (1997) refers to trustees as "a self-perpetuating group that is in no way beholden to

the college's faculty, administrative staff, or students and alumni" (p. 91). A college is many things, but most surely, it is not a democracy. One of the many ironies of collegiate culture is that many trustees who might laud the "virtues" of democratic governance in their rhetoric, have no intention of relinquishing any voting privileges either in their own corporate workplaces or in the collegiate world they are entrusted with overseeing. Colleges that are typically open in their rhetoric are typically closed societies in their governance structures, unable to allow different voices a forum in which to be heard, and unable to understand the importance of disagreement.

The great divide between faculty and administrators is, of course, a function of many interrelated and complex factors. One factor that seems like a straightforward and simple place to begin an examination of the divide, has been the evolution (devolution?) of the college presidency from an academic role to a business role. Greenberg (1998) writes: "as universities have become more like other businesses, their presidencies have attracted administrators and fund-raisers more than scholars and visionaries" (p. 17). Events on my former campus, and other campuses I am sure, illustrate quite vividly this change away from vision and long-term thinking, toward fund-raising and bottom-line administration. Perhaps even more vividly they represent the self-destructive nature of hubris, even, "academic" hubris. Other campuses have begun to acknowledge this realism, and have divided the collegiate presidency into two jobs (perhaps a chancellor and a president) one of whom concerns him or herself with long-term planning and fund-raising, and other with day-to-day operations.

What this chapter does specifically, is to consider the state of governance within higher education, by taking a "micro" look at the events that have recently unfolded on one "typical" small college. Events that both worry and antagonize many of us who seek to make careers within a higher education realm that we find increasingly to be coopted both financially and spiritually by business and economic interests. It is, of necessity, a chapter that is largely anecdotal. It's worth, however, might be judged less by the specifics of the anecdotal episode used as a backdrop, than

by its message that this type of episode is merely a symptom of a much larger disease within academic governance and within a culture that continues to sit idly by and watch corporations and selected administrators reep ever greater rewards while the silent and thereby nameless and faceless "workers" are ever more excluded and ever more left behind. While denying the anecdotal nature of this chapter would be to deny its truth, and thereby its value, similar stories can and have been told concerning faculty/administrative relations that both assist the reader in using this chapter to understand the greater context of this work, and in understanding the greater context of higher education generally. Getman (1992) for example, spoke of his law school dean as one who was "fearful of controversy, disliked many of the faculty, and was manipulative in his dealings with us...and a poor speaker who represented the school inadequately in public appearances" (p. 98). Obviously, there are a lot of unflattering descriptions of persons, and a lot of unflattering books written by academic minded persons that quite adequately illustrate the wide and deepening rift between faculty members and administrators. Whatever personal joy all of us might gain from such a listing of a cast of characters at one's own institution, this chapter, hopefully, goes beyond the characters to study the "roles" that these characters portray and how these roles have affected the very nature of academic governance. The characters have their own interesting histories, differing levels of decency, and extraordinarily divergent views concerning appropriate and inappropriate speech and conduct; differences which seem to reemphasize the affirming and tolerant nature of the campus community even in the face of seemingly intolerant and, dare I say even indefensible, administrative actions.

> "By nature, universities are controversial places. Their successes and failures draw intense public scrutiny because they really matter" (Kennedy, 1997, p. 22).

These are times in education, at all levels, in which we hear a great deal about high-minded concepts such as "shared governance" and "empowerment." Places and people known for their dictatorial managerial styles nevertheless conform to these buzzwords and often advertise for

employees by proclaiming their own and their institution's belief in "shared governance." The concept of sharing is apparently not as simple and straightforward as that which we learned from our parents and in our pre-schools. To some, sharing means collaboration on important decision-making...to others it simply means the ability to retain a role in the organization, however silent that role must be.

There is an on-going and never-ending conversation about education "reform," and the increasing costs of education at each level. Juxtaposed with these discussions are political issues and views that run the gamut from those extolling the virtues of our present system, to those in support of an entire overhaul. Within the mirk and mire of education discussion, it is difficult to swim one's way out, let alone properly assess the success of given initiatives and various governance schemes. Having said that, it may be time to take a closer look at higher education governance, an area that seems to receive relatively little attention within the literature.

It is easy, perhaps too easy, for college professors to criticize how K-12 schools operate, and those who operate them. It is far more difficult and tenuous to criticize those who actually have power and position over you. Perhaps that is why we see few critical and thought-provoking books and articles from schoolteachers about their situations, and few from professors about life in higher academia. One recent exception can be found in Joanna Vecchiarelli Scott's 1997 article entitled "Death by Inattention: The Strange Fate of Faculty Governance." Among other things, Scott argued that "the increasing decrepitude of the tradition of faculty governance, and with it whatever reality 'shared' governance once had, is no longer the sad condition of individual campuses but a nationwide phenomenon" (p. 30). This chapter considers and expands upon the sad condition as described by Scott, by examining an individual campus that, no doubt, shares many traits with numerous other colleges across the country. The events are truly characteristic of those things we wish never might have happened, but for which we are better for having taken the time to attempt to understand them. Our attempts to write and speak about them as professors

concerned with such high-minded concepts as justice, equity, and due process, are more than merely self-serving attempts at catharsis. The attempts at understanding are at the base of that which we study, and that which we attempt to teach others: how human relationships matter in this world. When faculty members are bound together largely by a set of informal bargains, there hold on the center can be tenuous. When enough people perceive of themselves as the victims of humiliation or, perhaps even injustice, movements can be created and a credible collectivity interested in the pursuit of a given action may take root.

Career Suicide by Word Processor

Many people fear speaking out about injustices for simple and explainable personal interests. During the course of these events, now removed from my life in both geographical and historical terms, my position as an untenured assistant professor often gave me pause when considering how I might reconcile my beliefs, my sense of justice, and my need to speak out, with my own need for career-preservation. Chomsky, Noel, and others I am sure, have wondered about the role played in maintaining the status quo by our collective and individual levels of willing submission. Our own willingness to submit to the whims of authority in attaining greater status in and out of the workplace and in social mobility more generally has surely played a significant role in "conserving" social institutions. The ability of professors, like the ability of all professionals to put themselves first and concern themselves with their future job prospects above all else, should not surprise us, as it simultaneously disappoints us. True believers, on the other hand, have passions that are ignited with only a spark, and the intensity of their belief can lead to significant polarization among and between those interested in their own perceptions of "justice" and those more intensely interested in self-preservation.

I imagine, without the use of much creativity, that there are many out there in the academic hinterlands who might have similar stories to tell, but cannot bring themselves to write what might

be construed as a career suicide note, and a one-way ticket down the ladder of success. To study organizational realities, however, should be less a personal statement than it is a valuable study of a subject within higher education that has gotten remarkably little attention. Our job status is indeed tenuous, as Matthews (1997) ably reminds us: "so many desperate Ph.D.s remain on the market that any dissident can be replaced in half an hour" (p. 180). Still, however career suicidal such musings might be, it seems worthwhile, if not ultimately essential, to ascertain a bit about the "institutions" that make the decisions concerning our forums of higher learning [It may also be my own attempt similar to that made by Readings (1996) to "think my way out of an impasse between militant radicalism and cynical despair" (p. 5)]. I was comforted by the words of Nisbet (1971) who referred to assistant professors as:

> "having every right to pronounce the traditional academic community an authoritarian gerontocracy. For the qualities in which the young tend to excel--energy, originality, brilliance--were not crucial to the traditional academic community when it came to either advancement up the academic ladder or to participation in the powerful councils of the organized faculty" (pp. 51-52).

While the gist of Nisbet's thoughts correspond to my premise that with age does not necessarily flow wisdom, as a relatively young and untenured professor, I make no claims beyond having a sufficient level of energy to challenge the status quo, tempered with the understanding that any claims toward originality and/or brilliance would be highly overstated. Podgorecki (1997) counsels us that scholars must be consistent. "They should be dedicated to solving certain problems and should not abandon a given problem without sufficient cause" (p. 2). This chapter, as I hope has been the rest of this book, is about adhering to the principles of fairness, justice, and problem-solving in an open and collaborative environment in the face of the secretive and abusive, if ever more influential, rules of business. Ultimately, this chapter is more critical of a faculty unable to rise above personalities and past relationships than it is able to stand upon any principles...even such seemingly laudable ones as truth, justice, and due process.

The "institutions" to which this chapter largely refers, for better and for worse, are boards of trustees, more and more comprised of persons with great influence, wealth, and corporate standing and a corresponding lack of understanding about higher education, social inequities, and life beyond the boardroom. Such a lack of understanding is usually kept under wraps, (after all how many of you have ever met your trustees, and if you have met them, how many of you have actually meaningfully interacted with them?). Given professors' incomes, and thereby their social standing in comparison to that enjoyed by trustees, it is unlikely that we might live in the same neighborhoods, send our kids to the same schools, or even vacation in the same areas. Interaction then, must be purposeful, and as such it often only occurs when both sides are in a crisis mode. Rosenzweig (1998) comments upon the fact that trustees are often geographically far flung from the colleges they "oversee," and that geographical distance serves as a "useful metaphor for their connection to the work of the institution" (p. 110).

An almost complete lack of meaningful interaction between professors and administrators/trustees, may or may not be, in certain instances, a hindrance to the operation of an effective organization. "These days, the president's connection to teaching and learning is often tenuous" (Greenberg, 1998, p. 17). Given the reality that most boards of trustees depend upon their presidents, who generally serve "at the pleasure of the board," for information concerning the college, the lack of connection between the president and the genuine and identified mission of the college should be troublesome. Communication between the president and the faculty is criticial. “Good administrators understand the importance of the faculty to the university” (Ehrenberg, 2000, p. 22). Likewise, good administrators understand the importance of maintaining appropriate communication channels with the faculty so that decisions do not appear to be heavy-handed.

The reality of the relationship between the president, trustees, and faculty, and the heirarchical structures in place, necessarily mean that

disputes on campus that do arise may tend to be presented in one-sided (administrative) fashion to boards of trustees, since professors have little to no input into board meetings. Some, certainly not all college presidents present disputes to their boards as trifling matters that can be quashed without any unnecessary mess or publicity that might impact their lives' works...namely fundraising and the appearance of virtue. Other, more able presidents and administrators, view disputes as necessary and part of the virtue of open-minded academic discourse. We must rue the former and encourage the latter...perhaps by more ably rueing the former.

The lack of insight into what actually occurs at a college, and what professors and students face day-to-day, becomes a hindrance to the decision-making process that impacts most those with whom contact is least made. This chapter speaks to that hindrance, and addresses the need on the part of faculty to know at least something about their boards of trustees, and perhaps more importantly given the power structure, for boards to know a little bit about their faculties and students. In part the desire of faculty members to know more about trustees is fed directly from our realization that they will probably never seek to know more about us. In order to gain understanding, one party needs to take a first step...I think that party needs to be those of us faculty members not so paralyzed by fear who remain willing to ask. Everyone, in every social system feels pressures to conform. Some are more ready than others to bend their principles, or even abandon their principles in favor of silent conformity. Scholarly individuals, in contrast, should be willing and ready to pay a price (even sometimes humiliating and painful) in defense of their beliefs (Podgorecki, 1997).

The Spark, The Ignition, and The Combustion

"Never retract, never explain. Get it done, and let them howl" - Benjamin Jowett [(Oxford's Balliol College head during the nineteenth century describing his leadership style), Greenberg, 1998, p. 18].

As with most written projects that have meaning (if only for their authors) this anecdotal chapter in particular, and the body of this work generally, needed a spark in order to inflame my writing passions enough to embark upon it. I hope that I have been able to convey those passions to the reader. The spark that ignited this chapter occurred when the chairman of the board of trustees (at a former college of mine) addressed our faculty in an attempt to quell dissent and displeasure that select faculty members had expressed with regard to an academic personnel decision that had been made without any consultation with or even notification of, any faculty members. If the board chairman had merely responded to and addressed our grievances...this matter likely would have died a merciful and peaceful death. Cyert (1979) viewed factfinding as among the most important attributes of a good chairperson of the board of trustees: "leadership requires capacity to get the facts as sensitive events develop with respect to the president or to other university business; it is important that the chairman get the right information" (p. 104). Sadly, what we thought might be a fact-finding mission became instead a forum chosen by the chairman to condemn the faculty collectively and express the contempt and "shame" he felt over faculty "actions." These actions were written proposals condemning the decision made and expressing displeasure with the President for having made such decisions without consultation, explanation, or even the hint of consultation or explanation. I had expected the type of "quasi-apology" that our politicians have now made famous..."mistakes were made...if anyone was offended..." The type of apology that only apologizes for others sensitivity and doesn't actually touch upon any culpibility. Even these low level expectations weren't met, and the fires of dissent, low morale, and open contempt burned on.

Putting out a small brush fire with gasoline seemed to me to be an unfortunate way of dealing with a crisis (although I must acknowledge that most faculty seemed quite contented with such treatment). Nevertheless such an exhibition of "crisis managment" skills led me to wonder, now aloud, if these are the type of people who might most effectively lead an academic institution

into the 21st century. I began this section with a quote attributed to a college leader during the 19th century. There is a fear on the part of some of us at least, that as we near the 21st century, collegiate leadership is regressing toward a mode of supervision that might be more suitable to the distant and regressive past than toward any sort of progressive future. Questioning the directions that we take is not the act of a disloyal employee, and should not consequently be seen as a threat to academic administrators. Indeed, questioning our directions are the rational concerns of an "at risk partner" in an academic enterprise unwilling to complacently sit by and watch colleges simply go the route of an ever more "Wal-Martized" economy and society.

Unfortunately, as so often happens in society, questions often arise only when a crisis occurs. No doubt the job of a college trustee is much like that of a police officer or a basketball referee, both thankless and difficult. Perhaps most similarly, all of these jobs are done best when they are noticed least. Having a base understanding of the thankless nature of the job is important in trying to be level-headed about decisions which are made which upon the comfort of "post-game" review or replay, seem to reflect poor judgment, whether that judgment is in making a bad call in a basketball game, drawing a pistol on an unarmed citizen, or making an academic decision without the support of facts.

Chait, Holland, and Taylor (1996) boldly proclaim: "after 10 years of research and dozens of engagements as consultants to nonprofit boards, we have reached a rather stark conclusion: effective governance by a board of trustees is a relatively rare and unnatural act" (p. 1). My study is much less in-depth than theirs, much more anecdotal and limited. Still, my conclusions tend to be similar. Is this cause for concern? Less for concern perhaps, than cause for greater understanding on the part of faculty members who should have a role to play in academic decision-making on campuses that truly value academic life and the integrity of that life and consider the future of the college, and the best interests of all of the members of the college "community." According to Readings (1996) "the professoriat is being proletarianized as a body"

(p. 1). The increase in short-term and part-time contracts are evidence of this proletarianalization, as is the devolution of "real wages," diminishments in travel and book allowances, and the increase in teaching and research loads. Nelson & Watt (1999) believe that the reason we hear phrases like "flexibility" and "competitiveness" bantied about in academia, is because these phrases represent the only real knowledge base that corporate executives serving on boards of trustees are interested in bringing to bear on higher education (p. 1).

Ehrenberg (2000) presents a more tolerant view of college trustees, than I've thus far allowed, perhaps a natural result of his administrative background. Still, his words concerning the responsibilities and obligations of trustees lies at the heart of the dispute that arose on the campus discussed in this chapter. "Most trustees know that they are not experts on academic issues" (p. 20). Ehrenberg was discussing the fact that trustees rarely override administrative recommendations, and delegate most of their legal authority to the president.

Sworn to Protect the Status Quo

Hamper (1991) vividly described many of his acquaintances holding superior power positions on the assembly line, as "weasels deputized to protect the status quo" (p. 32). In academia, we sometimes have weasels not only deputized but so paralyzed by their fear of the administration that any questions put to administrative decision-making must be done in the shadow of anonymity or by those too young, too reckless, or just too angry to think carefully about their futures. Those that were silent remained comfortably ensconced in their pitiful little power bases, serving on every committee, and chairing searches for new (presumably complacent) faculty members to replace leaving (presumably combative) ones. They no who they are. Hentoff (1997) in his typically straightforward fashion described similar occurrences in the world of academic journalism quite bluntly: "there's always a scab."

I am unwilling to accept that this is the way "it has always been," nor am I willing to allow

such a response to quell the desire that burns within me to get to the heart of governance issues. In my most altruistic moments, I believe that if indeed it must be on the shoulders of those of us new enough, naive enough, and energetic enough to care about the future of higher education to be willing to take the type of stance necessary to enact positive changes, then so be it.

Academics have often been chastised for their "separateness," and their "ivory tower" existence. While we comfortably write about the inequality in society, and the inequities within a workplace that is more and more becoming a corporate controlled vision where profits and power are concentrated in the hands of a few, while the "workers" toil long hours with little reward and less security, the "real world" continues to encircle us. Our enclave is becoming smaller and our boundaries are ever more compromised. We can sit idly by and let the "invaders" overtake us, or we can protest, with whatever effectiveness that may or may not carry. I fear that we collectively "doth not protest enough." Bringing governance issues into the light may be one form of protest that will be effective if only for ourselves and in support of the proposition that "the truth will indeed set us free." This is not a protest led by radicals, it is, in reality, a protest led by those of us who want to conserve what is good about colleges and universities in the face of an opposition that seeks to convert them into entities more concerned about money and status, than about people and education.

Dewhurst (1997) wrote about the need for emotion and passion within education. Mere dispassionate cognitive thinking is not always enough. Just as good writing must surely flow from passionate feelings about a given subject, so too must good teaching, and good citizenship. Cold calculation without emotion is less an education in the liberal sense, than it is an education in how to function as a human computer.

It's a Mad, Mad, Mad, Mad World

"If you forget about what happened in Oklahoma City, Tim

> McVeigh is a good person" (unidentified friend of McVeigh's at his trial).

The absurdity of the above quote is of course obvious, and was not lost upon the jurors in McVeigh's case who ultimately opted for the death penalty...despite his friend's belief in McVeigh's overall "character." Some events, and some actions are simply so aggregious, that a lifetime is measured and defined by that act. Criminal acts are, of course, most notable in this regard. One need only hear the initials O.J., to realize that those initials will be forever deemed to belong to those of a man tried for murder, more than they will be associated with one of the NFL's all-time leading rushers, both in and out of airports. Which, it might be queried, is more reflective of O.J. and Timothy McVeigh...the killing of innocents or their other lifetime "accomplishments?" I am squarely on the side of those who believe that these people cannot get past their bad acts and will forever be associated with them. Perhaps, in fact, their bad acts are actually more reflective of the real O.J. and the real McVeigh, than are their accomplishments in their lives before the incidents that made them infamous. It is, after all, difficult to conceive of a "good person" killing innocent people. It is much more likely, it seems, that a person who is capable of committing such an act...perhaps wasn't so "good" after all.

Despite their "overall" good characters, the recent actions of many in administrative positions tend to indicate and illustrate a pattern that reflects an "anti-community" atmosphere and a workplace more suited to complacent workers than to thinking and questioning individuals. The type of workplace that seems antithetical to one that might be expected at a genuine "liberal arts" college. Hinchey (1998) eloquently speaks of power and our need to be vigilent in understanding power relationships and how those relationships affect various interactions.

> "Since power operates in all things, we would do well to remember that a dictator who smiles and speaks courteously is no less a dictator; a 'kind' slaveowner is no less a slaveowner" (p. 33).

The Crisis

> **"I would try to open communications with every group and build up a level of trust, on campus and off. That's what presidents are supposed to do" (Kreuter, 1996, p. 24).**
>
> **"Boards of trustees do in fact hold the university in trust" (Bogue, 1994, p. 76).**

The above quotes seemingly no longer apply at all colleges, many of which are facing increasing levels of paranoia, suspicion, anger, frustration, and concurrent drops in the levels of communication and trust. That these concepts should ebb and flow together is no surprise, of course, unless you happen to be a high-level administrator or trustee, in which case it seems (based on recent anecdotal evidence at minimum), that such a correlation between closed communication and distrust has never before been contemplated. While I don't mean to compare small college administrative decisions to national politics, it does seem as though the management lessons we might have learned during Watergate have been lost. Were the lessons of Watergate to avoid cover-ups or merely to practice them more effectively? Perhaps more to the point, don't administrators learn about group theory and the importance that people attach to "belonging?" Don't they realize that the best work is usually done on a team in which all the members have a role to play in a common cause?

Shared governance as a concept is not particularly controversial. Shared authority as a principal in the governance of colleges has been jointly approved by the American Association of University Professors and organizations of colleges and universities. The principle holds that professors should be consulted in regard to a number of important institutional decisions made by the president or board of trustees (Gaff, 1991, p. 167). The high-minded rhetoric that surrounds this principle has tended to be lasting, even as the practice of actual shared governance may be losing it rather tenuous grip on the academic workplace.

Reconciling the reality of "quasi-shared" or "sometimes-shared" governance with the

glorious rhetoric of true shared governance can be difficult intellectually and exhausting emotionally. The gap between words and deeds has been ably illustrated in an institution in which I formerly taught. My college, at that time in the late 1990s, went through a crisis, the likes of which it had not previously encountered. The President was challenged on a decision made to release the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The crux of the dispute centered upon the unilateral decision made by the President (and perhaps the board of trustees) to release the chief academic officer without consultation of faculty members individually or collectively. Lest one think such unilateral action without guidance from the faculty is questionable only in my world, Nisbet (1971) writes: "nothing was more vital to a faculty than that it be consulted regularly, and its judgment followed in all except the smallest number of cases, when it came to appointments and promotions" (p. 49). Johnstone, et al., (1998) considered the damage done by unilateral action in broad terms: "every time critical decisions are made without consulting the faculty impacted by the decisions, trust is diminished" (p. 19). Once trust is diminished, reestablishing that trust is problematic at best, and at worst, it may be impossible without structural and/or personnel changes.

The decision that led, on my prior campus, to the demise of our chief academic officer, was one that all believed was based largely on "political" grounds, rather than any sort of amoral or immoral behavior on the part of the person dismissed. These beliefs were later confirmed by no less than the President himself who assured the faculty that the dismissal had nothing whatsoever to do with any type of immoral or even questionable conduct. In yet another stunning bit of irony, he then disparaged the faculty for the "mailroom murmurs" he had been hearing about how such a quick dismissal must have meant that some serious and morally reprehensible conduct was being addressed. His assurances that such conduct was not at issue, led only to more speculation, more misunderstanding, and a complete lack of faith in how the remaining administration was dealing with the crisis. Rumors, perhaps even some with truth attached, swirled around concerning who

had "real" power, and who did not, and about who wanted the dean out and for what reasons. These rumors did genuine damage to morale, but an admission on behalf of the President that the dismissal was "political" was perhaps not the best way of handling the rumors or of quelling dissent and dissatisfaction.

The faculty's lack of information concerning the change created an environment in which speculation was not only rampant, but was beginning to serve as our best form of entertainment. Fagin (1998) wrote: "during the process of change, rumors and gossip tend to be given more credence than official announcements from management" (p. 111). Since official announcements from management were not forthcoming, rumors and gossip were all that we had and were thusly afforded even more credence than they deserved.

The "closed" nature of the decision struck many of us self-described academics as inappropriate at best, and, at worst, completely unacceptable in a collegiate environment. The Board and the President managed to effectively cover their actions by using the old stand-by phrase: "It's a personnel matter that we cannot discuss." Their argument essentially, was that the "lawyers had tied their hands." Reality, however, tended to indicate that their hands were unbound, and instead it was their collective unwillingness to accept responsibility that bears less witness to the condition of their hands than it did of the condition of their spines. [For a discussion of the increasing use of "secret justice" that prevents the details of legal settlements from reaching the eyes and ears of the public, and that allows those with adequate resources to avoid public scrutiny, I suggest an article by John Gibeaut entitled "Secret Justice" in the April 1998 edition of the *American Bar Association Journal*].

Rosenzweig (1998) wonders aloud "can a university be part closed, the characteristic stance of bureaucracies toward the use of information, and part open, the required stance for successful scholarship and teaching?" (p. 170). While there is no doubt that a college or university might withstand such conflict for the short-term, there can be equal certainty that long-term

damage will be deep without an eventual reconciliation among and between the parties. In an open environment, such reconciliation might occur; in a closed environment, the wounds will only grow deeper, and while they may be hidden beneath the surface for some time, they will ultimately emerge and the ensuing infection may be too grave to cure.

In a course of events that could only be described as taking members of the board and the President completely by surprise, many faculty members were taken aback at such dictatorial happenings and considered a proposal (eventually toned down and later rejected completely) to issue a "no confidence" message to the President. Illustrating the lack of understanding that surrounded this "corporate firing" on the part of those who played a role in it, and those who seem to have had no problem with it, were subsequent attempts by the board and others to have the faculty issue a vote of "confidence" in the President's leadership. Illustrating the faculty's collective lack of self-esteem and fear of presidential leadership, as well as perhaps a clear lack of knowledge concerning "leadership," the faculty considered the request. It was clear, even from the President's own words, that the questioning of his actions had led to personal misery for his family and himself. Again, we were told, as a faculty, that a good faculty does not question the administration, and when in fact we might ask probing questions, we can and do cause personal and professional heartache. [At later faculty meetings, our President even informed us that giving to the college was down "due to the publicity received." Talk about damned if you do, damned if you don't, there we were, as a faculty, never before given any credit for outside fundraising when in good times, taking yet another hit for our collective responsibility for it in bad times.] While our collective shame for these transgressions was great, my individual shame was minimal. I was no doubt assisted by my role as a professor of criminal justice, which enabled me to contemplate the similarities between what was happening on campus and our system of criminal justice in which we often had a knack for allowing the perpetrator to become the victim, while we allowed the victim to become the perpetrator. Whether the actions of the President and board were genuine or

whether they were a disgusting (however successful) attempt to blame the victim and deflect criticism were open to interpretation (at least in silence). Those of us not cast as loners by nature, nevertheless began to become less and less comfortable around our colleagues and more and more isolated both collectively as faculty members and individually as human beings with a sense of social justice.

The gravity of the crisis was perhaps best exemplified by the willingness (after two weeks of a deepening crisis) of the board to meet with faculty and "clear up" the matter. Eagerly taking my place awaiting the answers that I had so longed to hear, I was repelled again as the Chairman of the board took the opportunity to express his displeasure in the faculty for having disappointed both him and the entire board due to its collective "unprofessional conduct." It was, we were not particularly subtly informed, "unprofessional" in his mind, to question any act engaged in by either the President or the Board of Trustees. Mustering up what I presume to be as much dictatorial and paternalistic venom as he possessed, we were informed in no uncertain terms that he could only be proud of us if, like children of a bygone era, we spoke only when spoken to. I vividly remember my angst, as I felt like a child rapproached by his father, both angry on the one hand and powerless and pathetic on the other. In the Chairman's eyes it was as if I (and many others) were the sons and daughters who had broken their father's hearts with ungrateful, impolite, and insolent attitudes. The chairman had, after all, in previous rhetorical flourishes considered us such a good faculty, such a decent faculty, and now we had shown our gratitude by questioning him. One could see the genuine anger within him, but more striking was the genuine bewilderment he displayed.

According to Minow (1997) the denial of differences can be, and often is, an assertion of majority superiority. It was quite clear that the "denial" and outrage exhibited by the trustees was a clear assertion of their superiority. Faculty members were to put *their* differences with administrators aside for the good of the institution, while board members could express *their*

differences with the faculty without fear of reprisal. My understanding of administrative and organizational behavior was again reaffirmed, as I saw that which I already believed to be true: as always it is easier to diminish or deny entirely the value of different viewpoints and appeal to "community" when one commands the power, whether that power comes through control of majority numbers, control of the pursestrings, or control of the thought process.

Whatever anger the faculty might have had toward the condescension and arrogance on display...it seemed to be less powerful than the fear and pathos that accompanied a group of people without power dependent upon their "masters" for benevolence. By the end of the session, in which the trustee offered nothing more than it was a "personnel matter that couldn't be discussed," he was met with a rousing ovation and our enduring thanks. Our gratitude was expressed for the display of the Chairman's "courage" and "forthrightness" that it appeared most of deemed must have been necessary for him having made the decision to leave his corporate workplace and take time from his schedule to come to see us. What questions and misperceptions that may have been answered were lost upon me, but not apparently upon a majority of the faculty who now, no doubt with some degree of relief, could put the matter behind them having a level of understanding about what happened. My inferior reasoning abilities had unfortunately and inopportunely reared their ugly heads again, and my level of understanding remained at a dangerously low level. I sat silently for a moment, rendered mute, as much by my peers' inability in overcoming their pathetic fears and insecurities, as much as by my own inability to overcome my fears and insecurities.

The chair of the board of trustees, and other board members, magnanimously shared the position that our anger (although entirely wrongheaded in their view) should be directed toward the board and not our President, whom the board lauded no less vigorously than society mourned the late Princess of Wales. Given this magnanimous position adopted by the board (a body that can essentially be unchallenged...with no faculty access to meetings) I decided to turn my

attentions away from the actions of the President, whom it appeared only acted with either full cooperation of or at least full cooptation of the board, and instead attempt to find out a little about what should be expected of a board. Interestingly, no less an authority than Donald Kennedy (1997) describes a board of trustees as "legal owners...a body that is essentially fiduciary: they own the assets and are responsible for their management on a sustainable basis. The day-to-day management tasks are delegated to a president, who appoints various deans and other administrative officers" (p. 25). Chait, Holland, and Taylor (1996) describe most boards as "just drifting with the tides. As a result, trustees are often little more than high-powered, well-intentioned people engaged in low-level activities" (p. 1). (Richard Chait, the co-author of the study cited above, should know of what he speaks, as he was retained as a consultant by the University of Minnesota Board of Regents during its recent "tenure wars" with its faculty, chronicled in an article by Fred L. Morrison entitled "Tenure Wars" in September 1997 edition of the *Journal of Legal Education*).

While I had then and continue to have now, grave personal concerns about the adoption of the type of corporate mentality that that board has had and continues to have, (all too familiar to those with knowledge of the "tenure wars" at the University of Minnesota) it seems appropriate given their corporate stance on academic issues, that we evaluate them from a corporate perspective. In doing a cursory examination of the literature available on boards of directors, I came across an article from *BusinessWeek* (December 8, 1997), not a periodical with which I had great familiarity, entitled "The Best and Worst Boards: Our Special Report on Corporate Governance." In examining that article, I was able to identify means of evaluating corporate boards as *BusinessWeek* had done. The article assessed board members based on their "independence, quality, and accountability to shareholders" by studying their "composition, director's stock ownership, attendance records, and other criteria" (p. 98).

Given these standards, largely unknown and unknowable by a lowly faculty member such

as myself, assessing the ability and success of a governing board is necessarily problematic. Nevertheless, however problematic it may be, it is not impossible. To that end, it is possible to examine the Board based on these identifiable criteria. First, independence. Having no means to assess what actually occurs at meetings, (closed, unlike shareholders meetings), it is difficult to determine if any independent judgment is exercised. Taking the chairman of the board at his word, and laying the blame for a firing upon the board, it must be ascertained that they are independent of the President. *BusinessWeek* viewed independence as stronger if the board occasionally met without the President...something none of us had any way of knowing about at that particular institution. (Perhaps most disturbingly, either way is troubling given the make-up of the board, for if they don't meet without the President, it shows a lack of independence; but if they do, having little to no educational backgrounds and tight corporate connections, one can only speculate about what they might talk about and what actions they might pursue without the President to "guide" them. It does make it seem at least possible that such a seemingly spur-of-the-moment decision to fire the chief ranking academic officer and not talk it over with the faculty or let the faculty in on the process in any way could have been the unilateral action of the Board). The second criteria is "quality"... impossible to judge, who's to say...I wish we had some educators rather than all business executives...but my quality is not necessarily the best predictor of everyone's version of quality. Last, comes accountability which seems to be negligible. Only after the crisis seemed to boil over, did the board ever address its ranking "shareholders" (faculty), and only to tell us that they couldn't tell us anything, and never did the board address its ultimate "shareholders" (students).

For those of us not entirely enamored with *BusinessWeek* as a source, Harpool (1996) identified the majority view of the courts and of statutory law as holding trustees to two primary fiduciary duties owed to the college: the duty of care, and the duty of loyalty (p. 262). The Board's compliance with these two duties seems to depend on one's definition of the college. The board

members were certainly loyal to the President, but given the events discussed, they appeared as anything but entirely loyal to their staff, at least high-level staff. Their loyalty to the students and faculty was in serious doubt, and consequently their loyalty to the college was largely a matter of definition. To some (the President) they were unswervingly loyal, to others, no duty was apparently owed.

Perhaps most troublesome of all during the course of these events, had been the acceptance on the part of educated and thinking people that responsibility for this act could be passed around like so many plates on the end of a juggler's stick. The President said "the agreement" requires no disclosure of personnel matters. The Board said it was their responsibility, but that they are constrained by "the agreement" from talking about it. Did that mean it was some lawyer's fault? A lawyer who would not be named by the administration, having written an agreement that couldn't be seen, much less analyzed by the faculty. Did the buck stop nowhere?

It seems, we were told, that we should not be upset at the President, nor the Board, and instead our anger should be directed at some nameless, faceless document dreamed up apparently by someone with authority over both the President and the Board. This leads to only one inescapable conclusion: God fired the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. Our anger must be toward our God. If so, then this chapter should be read less as a criticism, than as a prayer for mercy and grace.

Where the responsibility ultimately rested, I guess, remains subject to one's interpretation of "God." In this case, it seems inescapable to me, that the fact that the faculty "knew nothing" about the firing of the vice-president, as well as the fact that it was continually referred to within the power structure as a "resignation," was due to the unbridled power of the President and trustees. Power that could not be reigned in by a weak and fractured faculty. As I lay awake at night during the crisis contemplating the latest events of each given day, I worried that if the administration sought to implement policies that might tend to disfavor faculty, that seemed like a

good time to do so. Kicking a collective body while down, while perhaps not particularly savory, seemed to make good administrative sense. The faculty's weakness when confronted with a show of strength was surely the lasting legacy of this episode. We not only blinked, we shut our eyes in fear and cowered in the corner until we were told it was safe to meekly reemerge from the shadows. When we finally reemerged, we apologized for having asked such difficult questions in the first place. What kind of good little soldiers were we after all?

Our faculty's collective paranoia may well have been well-founded (especially given the rather abrupt dismissal of our chief academic officer). Jackson (1998) cited historical evidence as emphasizing that the most powerful authorities are threatening both because of what they can cause to happen and because of their remoteness from those they affect.

> "This remoteness makes them mysterious: what their interests are and how they will be pursued are not obvious. The combination of power and uncertainty generates apprehension which lends potency to the bureaucracy using it, affects the way in which that bureaucracy is itself likely to be perceived and frequently reflects a subtle form of persecution not always clearly perceived as such by the persecuted" (pp. 127-128).

At the college where all of this occurred, the faculty had an unprecedented opportunity to come together in a united condemnation of the act. We muffed it. Inevitably, and as predicted by the most fatalistic of us, decisions coming shortly after this nightmare reflected the powerlessness of the faculty. A faculty that never supposed it had power and/or any level of shared decision-making capabilities, yet never before had so brazenly displayed such a total lack of commitment to any cause. Such powerlessness and complacency illustrated a complete inability to challenge any dictatorial decision that might be made. It didn’t take long for the President to take advantage of his newly displayed power coupled with his faculty’s newly displayed ineptitude.

Decisions that affected faculty welfare, the merits of which the administration would have

at least previously sought faculty input, rhetorically if not realistically, were now made more swiftly than ever and without even a trace of misgiving. One such example concerned the decision to close the campus copy center and outsource the printing duties. Faculty were now expected to increase their lead time in knowing when they might need copies for class or other purposes. The ability to ask for "special" assistance from on-campus printing staff was eliminated. Consistent with the past practice of the faculty, the decision to close the copy center was met with mere grousing about in the halls but no formal condemnation from the faculty senate or any other organized body that might have shown even a modicum of power.

The administration's remoteness coupled with its power made for excellent and fertile soil into which paranoia could take ample root. An atmosphere in which it would seem all too certain that something as "trivial" as an unwarranted dismissal of an untenured professor would not bring about much passion. Perhaps the unwarranted dismissal of a tenured professor might have invoked passion? Perhaps the conversion of the college into "The Institute" or some other "for-profit" corporation? Perhaps the abandonment of any pretense of providing a liberal arts education? How about the elimination of tenure in an attempt to create a more "flexible" workforce? Based on faculty meetings held contemporaneously with all of these many events, it appeared that, and I don't mean to overstate this, it appeared that no matter what act the President did, we would merely meekly ask for an explanation at most, and then go about our business, whether or not any explanation was forthcoming. We had shown the President and the Trustees what courage we had, and how willing we were to take a stand in the interests of that college and those students. One could only imagine the laughter at faculty expense that must surely have occurred at the next meeting of the board of trustees.

> "Stress produces controversy, controversy produces factions, the struggle between factions produces winners and losers, and the absence of authoritative and legitimate decision-making structures makes the acceptable resolution of disputes difficult to achieve" (Rosenzweig, 1998, p. 113).

Our stresses remained, largely due to our inability to govern ourselves effectively and "legitimately." We now had "winners" (those staunch protectors of the status quo) and "losers" (those seeking explanation and accountability) that had further accelerated fissures between faculty departments and individual faculty members. While we all hoped that future disputes won't occur, we all knew that they would, and our inability to handle our past disputes with any legitimacy tended to make us cringe about what the future might bring. Like our larger society, when things are going well, when faculty receive raises, when enrollments are growing, and outside disruptions are minimal, the system moves along. It is when a crisis arises and stress is introduced to a complacent environment that weaknesses in decision-making structures are exposed. It appeared that academic decision-making, like sausage-making, was better left unseen. Accepting poor performance, and failing to question why or how things happen, however, tends to go against the grain of a professoriate trained to question and improve performance (in theory at least, if not in reality).

"The Incident (This was no Accident) Waiting to Happen"

Soon after our "crisis" occurred, one of our faculty members, a long-term tenured professor prone to speak at all meetings, expressed his opinion that "if we didn't realize that our president was dictatorial to this point, we have only ourselves to blame." This expression was, I guess, made in order to quiet those of us outraged at recent actions taken unilaterally by the administration (apparently we should've expected them). Being a relatively new faculty member and an outsider (if only in my own mind), I took his comments to be an indictment of himself and others like him who have been complacent and willing partners in allowing such a dictatorial governance structure to take firm root. My personal knowledge that his comments seldom tended toward self-effacement and indeed had a tendency to be "other-effacing," meant that his actual

willingness to share in the "blame" was highly unlikely. He simply seemed to be above the entire debate, and his comments made it quite apparent that it was going to be up to those of us who hadn't been there so very long to fight for genuine shared governance and a college that resembled a college community in fact and not just in word. Faculty members (like other members of our political society) can take an active role in the governance of "their" institutions, or they can sit back and chastise others for failing to understand that "that's the way it's always been." Put most simply, we can vote and complain, or we can choose to ignore the political process which may limit our rights to complain. It seems that the popular bumper stickers proclaiming "Don't blame me I voted for...." may have originated in the collegiate setting, and might be paraphrased "don't blame me, none of this is my fault." While one vote may seem (and probably is) quite insignificant in our political structure; one vote, and one tenured vote at that, can carry great weight in a collegiate environment. It is when those who might have power abdicate any responsibility that our system loses and loses most profoundly.

My perceptions, right or wrong and for better or worse, were that such attitudes, no doubt honed over the years, on the part of tenured faculty made this a governance environment which was "an incident waiting to happen." Much of what is "learned" in college is gained outside of the classroom, and our students were certainly learning a great deal about governance in a dictatorial "corporate" workplace, about the difficulties inherent in pursuing collective action, and about the rather pliable spines of the faculty.

What We Have Here is A Failure to Communicate

It is an amazing paradox in the world of higher education which seeks honest and open communication, and a search for truth and knowledge, that many (I risk saying most) boards are comprised of persons with completely polar opposite beliefs that correspond to their completely polar opposite corporate lifestyles. Paper shredders, while a necessary (I suppose) and accepted

appliance in corporate offices, need not be present in institutions of higher learning. We should be open about what decisions we make and why we make them. Explaining one's rationale should not be threatening, but indeed, freeing. Donald Kennedy, the former President of Stanford University wrote in the preface to his 1997 work entitled *Academic Duty*, that

> "universities are societies without rules...much of what goes on behind the walls is deeply mysterious to those outside." No doubt, Kennedy is correct, still, perhaps the larger issue is the mystery that exists even among those of us on the "inside."

"Board members must come to grips with the fundamental fact that it is impossible to be effective directors merely by attending regularly called board meetings" (Jacobs, 1991). A board must understand an organization's culture, context, and the motivations of those within the organization. Despite the fact that many corporate leaders on boards would not consider hiring directors of their own corporations unless they had a thorough understanding of the organization, these same leaders quite willingly sit on boards of trustees of colleges, having little relationships with collegiate culture beyond attending an occasional sporting event, donating money, or socially interacting with high-level administrators. Just as education is the role of a college, educating trustees about the colleges they control should be seen as vital to the long-term health of an institution. If that means interacting with faculty members, students, and even devoting a day to sitting in on classes, so be it.

Ultimately, understanding each other might lead to more reasoned debate about such "controversial" issues as time spent in class, tenure, and academic freedom. Issues and concepts that may eventually be eliminated, less for the right reasons, than for political purposes. It is a concern, at least, that these beliefs tend to run counter to much of what corporate America tends to hold dear. Beliefs such as the virtue of "flexible," if not disposable, workforces, tremendous pay differentials between "administrators" and "workers," and a good soldier mentality that limits dissent in favor of "focus."

Given a corporate environment which in recent years has frequently emphasized downsizing of the workforce even in the face of record profits, it is hard to fathom a group of trustees shifting their beliefs in order to ensure that monies are put back into academic areas and budgets reflect academic values and needs, rather than an intense focus on just the "bottom line." Academic decision making should not and cannot be constrained by profit-maximizing goals if educational progress is the goal (Dilts, et al., 1994, p. vii). While it is unfair of me, I suppose, to presume that these people would be incapable of such a turnaround, there seems to be little to no evidence to support their collective ability to do so. Perhaps the dichotomy in thought is best explained by the contradiction in expectations placed upon colleges by those on the "outside" with those of us on the "inside." Kennedy (1997) writes:

> "whereas those within the system generally believe that their mission is to produce graduates who can think well and work effectively, and who are able to understand, analyze, and reflect upon their culture and upon the natural world, much of the world outside sees higher education as a credentialing device: a way of estimating, for employment or other purposes, the comparative worth of individuals" (p. 7).

The question becomes: Are the trustees more like those on the "inside" or the "outside?" Kennedy asserts that "the very heart of the institution's academic duty to society is the work of its faculty" (p. 15).

> "Sometimes the conflict is between different values that coexist, often without harmony, inside the university. More often it is between institutional values and a changing society. The latter struggle represents a powerful challenge to the university, which desperately needs both its independence from the society around it and the support and understanding of that society" (p. 15).

According to Bowles (1997) "reflection is brought about principally by suffering, hence it is sometimes stated that suffering is the fastest road to wisdom" (p. 801). That particular college community, of which I was a part, has now suffered through what we hope were the "worst of

times." From such suffering might come wisdom...if, and only if, we might allow ourselves to reflect upon what has led us down this road and how we might avoid a return trip. Examining the road taken need not be left to historians, but should be open to all faculty members intent on bettering the future of this institution and others that may face similarly rocky paths toward genuine academic progress.

Still, despite our role as intimately involved players, faculties by and large remain loathe to challenge administrative decisions, and the process surrounding how and why those decisions are made. Consequently, there is a reluctance that borders upon complete inaction in questioning governing boards, and even complacency in attempting to find out what happens at board meetings...what might be discussed, how decisions are reached, if debate is allowed or if it is stifled. All of the things it would seem would interest faculty, seem to be lost on a largely powerless group of individuals seemingly more worried about their individual futures than the future of the academy. While it is hard to deny the role of self-interest in all of our lives and all of the decisions we make, our interests in maintaining and even improving the integrity of the academy should also be considered. The environment in which we toil, while certainly a factor in the quality of our lives, also shapes the lives of those whom we teach, and those for whom the future is largely dependent upon the education they receive and the experiences they take from their collegiate years. O'Brien (1998) considered the faculty to be a community defined by their continual search for truth, and the college to be the setting for that search. "A moral value essential to the academic enterprise is truthtelling" (p. 55).

Glassick, et al., (1997) wrote: "scholars must have the courage to risk disapproval in the name of candor" (p. 65). A willingness to defy convention is the mark of some of our "best" scholars. In that same vein, it should not be considered courageous to take a stand, seek answers, and even, in some cases, to challenge decisions that are made. Nor should it be courageous to seek answers to questions that impact the academic realities on campus. It should merely be a

reality of full participation in academic life from which these questions are expected. It is not courageous, but merely an extension of our own varying levels of commonsense, intellectual consistency, and simple senses of fair play, that we encourage in ourselves that which we encourage in our students. What we expect of our students is the ability to think, and not blindly accept that which is read, heard, or even imparted upon them by "superiors."

College teaching, after all is said and done, involves very little heavy lifting, and any courage we might show should not be compared to the courage shown by so many in desperate straits in our society. It is not courageous to engage in our mission, and do that which we are supposed to do. It is, however, the antithesis of courage (I think the word is cowardice) as it is truly pathetic to sit idly by and allow colleges and universities, long among the success stories of this country to be coopted into another arm of corporate America, much in the same fashion many of us now believe our government is controlled by corporate and wealthy individual donors rather than the "people." We the people might want to consider what our colleges have done, and where we want them to lead us. We the faculty members must take a lead in seeking answers to questions that arise and often are effectively quashed by a powerful, faceless mass known as the "Board of Trustees." [This being said, there can be no doubt that many, probably most boards of trustees are comprised of selfless individuals serving their colleges in wholly appropriate and helpful ways. The ability to question decisions that are made should only allow those boards to flourish even more than they might in a more secretive environment in which even innocuous decisions are viewed as having been made by self-interested individuals].

If we are a genuinely self-sacrificing group of persons, less interested in personal advancement and personal rewards than we are about the success of those we impact...then perhaps we might want to sincerely consider how our actions impact others, and what type of messages we send when we silently allow others to exercise unbridled power without so much as the ability to ask appropriate questions. To paraphrase Kant (I think), "even the powerless, have

the power to judge the truth."

Chapter Epilogue

After writing the above (and again I emphasize at an academic institution in which I no longer reside), I had the distinct displeasure of attending a meeting at which the faculty, by and large, genuflected at the mere presence of the President and two members of the Board of Trustees. Again, at great risk of bringing too much passion and personal feeling into this work, which I view as largely an academic endeavor and much less a personal anecdotal account; I had never been so ashamed to be a part of a collective entity, as I was ashamed to be a part of that faculty at that moment. The "courageousness" displayed by faculty in heaping praise upon our superiors was truly something that reminded me of the hours that were consumed in my misspent youth while watching Eddie Haskell attempt to ingratiate himself to Wally and the Beaver's mother: "you look lovely today Mrs. Cleaver," Eddie would say. Our faculty senate, elected only a few months before in an effort to give a silenced faculty a voice, had themselves become largely tools of an administration that viewed leadership as compliance with the administration in concerted suppression of dissent. "You look lovely today," I could imagine them saying; "what a lovely presentation you have made," I could hear them saying. Persons I thought might lead us into a realm of shared governance had become apologists for an administration that would not share its most general thoughts let alone any issues of governance. Issues of governance which now paled in comparison to the more simple and more sinister "human frailties" that seemed to lead to initial secrecy and then an ultimate "cover-up" of decisions made in which faculty should have been better consulted at best and better informed at least. The manner in which the crisis evolved and the manner in which the faculty responded, both seemed to run counter to our mission in higher education.

In fact, complacency and complicity in the face of administrative decision-making runs

counter to the mission of any college. Edelstein (1997), among others, has written of the necessity of allowing for genuine faculty participation in academic governance: "there is a compelling rationale for the faculty's role in governance. It is only the faculty as a whole that has the necessary expertise to ensure the quality of curriculum, instruction, and research" (p. 60).

A principle of the academy is that we can hardly lay claim to the validity of an idea unless and until it has been tested against another. As John Stuart Mill notes, "He who knows only his own side of the case, knows little of that" (1956, p. 21). Thus, debate and dissent and other adversarial tools are central to collegiate culture (Bogue, 1994, p. 85). Rowley et al. (1998), spoke grandly of "democracies" within the context of higher education and the need for pluralism and openness. "They (democracies) thrive on tolerance for the ideas and rights of others, seeing these as wellsprings from which freedom arises" (p. 30). Edelstein (1997) views faculty criticism of administration as a "god-given right" (p. 60). While I am reluctant to place God's stamp upon criticism, it does seem antithetical that in a place devoted to truth-seeking, in any place devoted to truth-seeking, that criticism should come with risk attached.

Presently, it is, unfortunately, a collegiate culture that is kicking and screaming and gasping for a last breath of air in a hostile and less and less oxygenated atmosphere. If dissent in certain colleges dies, does the administration win? Or does the academic environment die? There are, I guess, two sides to the argument...I was saddened that I could debate them only in my own mind and in the sanctity of my own thoughts and selected colleague's offices far removed from the "heartbeat" of the college where their validity might be considered by all and their worthiness or lack thereof might either sink them or bring them to the surface. First Amendment scholars refer to the "marketplace of ideas," where, it is hoped, open debate will allow reason and logic to prevail while less worthwhile words might fall and be swarmed over by the rational discourse of the day. In that college, at that time at least, it was a marketplace that had been overrun by merchants selling only their own ideas and preventing alternative viewpoints from seeing the light

of day, and having the opportunity to rise or fall on their own merits. In that sense then, it was a marketplace in a small place that was quite representative of the marketplace in which this work has focused its larger efforts: the marketplace of ideas that makes up the college curriculum.

"The Merchant of Menace"

The merchant mentality that I have written of, was vividly represented during my last formal function as a faculty member there. That spring's graduation address was delivered by our outgoing President. The address spoke of the necessity of keeping a positive attitude, a speech discordant both in its mission and as a result of the history of its deliverer. The speech, though no doubt both disingenuous and sophomoric, nevertheless quite ably if entirely unintentionally and indeed accidentally, illustrated a symptom of the problems plaguing not just that college, but much of academia. It is the problem of the ongoing corporate takeover not only of the names of our buildings, but even of our thought processes. "The corporate world, no doubt, stands poised and ready to show us how to accentuate the positive, delete the negative, and instruct our chairs 'in the complex skills of team-building and leadership" (Snider, 1999, p. A64). Such thought is not consistent with the team-building and leadership that is genuine and that we really need. Positive attitudes will not assist us in understanding the contentious issues that often divide us from one another, and that may even provide the structure of the very disciplines we are engaged in teaching. Encouraging "happy talk" and avoiding any form of open, honest, and perhaps even contentious debate is not what I became a professor to do. Snider put it quite ably: "willingness to submit to demoralizing criticism and insensitive remarks might well be written into every academic job description" (Snider, 1999, p. A64). Such a willingness is not a hazard of intellectual thought and work, it is, or at least could be, a benefit.

One does not need to be a sociologist to understand that as a general rule those who seek change tend to be those least empowered to promote that change, while those least seeking

change tend to be those with the ability to implement change. So it goes...the haves have, the have-nots want. In academia, whether such knowledge deteriorates into more than conservative policy on the one hand versus harmless academic rhetoric on the other, will be a function of the future. Whether those of us concerned with potential "civil war" are merely harmless handwringers or prophetic harbingers of the future remains to be seen.

Ultimately, the philosophical question on the lips of untenured faculty members in an environment such as the one I've described, must be "I sink, therefore I am." If I am to swim, must I sell out and be complacent in the wrongs that occur, so long as those wrongs are engaged in by my superiors? Genuine academic minded persons must be compelled to sink rather than to swim in such shark infested waters. If I swim...I am not...if I sink...I am. Some choice.

Chapter Thirteen

"Solution: Positive Interdisciplinary Interdependence"

> ***"How we imagine the future, how we conceptualize the possibilities open to us, depends upon how we interpret our present circumstances" (Grossberg, 1992, p. 11).***
>
> ***"Too many Americans know that their worlds can be better, that with encouragement those worlds are theirs and they can take charge of them. Give people a cause worth following and the dignity of a necessary role for everyone of every age and they will respond--not quickly or easily, perhaps, but if patiently gathered, they will respond" (Sizer, 1996, p. 138).***
>
> ***"Shared enthusiasm is the glue that holds the university together" (Solomon & Solomon, 1993, p. 43).***

Sullivan (1995) laments what he calls "self-inflicted negative interdependence" or the "zero-sum, adversarial relationship between and among coworkers" that "short circuits collective learning capacity." In response to this lament, a greater depth of understanding for future human service professionals (be they educators, employees in criminal justice systems, social workers, nurses, etc.) based on positive interdisciplinary interdependence (grounded in collaboration theory), may significantly increase our ability to genuinely assist learning and later, professional practice.

Positive interdisciplinary interdependence presupposes collective reflective action as identified by Schon (1983). As groups consider knowledge and practice, action and reflection are simultaneously triggered. Such events have the potential to create a synergy that supports both risk-taking and adds to learning. Trust, equity, and respect are requisite in the process of building positive interdisciplinary interdependence just as they are requisite in the process of building collaborative relationships. The strength of a crossdisciplinary program rests in the potential to form more productive interconnections with traditionally disparate groups. If positive interdisciplinary interdependence is synonomous, or at least equated with collaboration, we can

conclude with Fullan (1993) that, "...without collaborative skills and relationships, it is not possible to learn and to continue to learn as much as you need in order to be an agent for society improvement" (p. 18). Fullan and Hargreaves (1996) later coined the term "interactive professionalism" to describe their view of the necessity of collaborative dialogue between and among professional educators. While it seems so dangerously simple that indeed "two heads are better than one," we seem largely to have abandoned the concept in our desire to overspecialize and make certain that each of us can distinguish ourselves from one another in as many ways as possible.

> "The traditional learning model in an American classroom assumes that a student should supposedly succeed on his or her own. It reflects the long-prevailing American ethos that celebrates liberty and self-reliance but ignores the long-prevailing American experience that we rarely accomplish anything of social significance by ourselves" (Brown, 1995, p. 155).

Pragmatists within the disciplines of women's studies, ethnic studies, criminal justice and teacher education (and aren't we all pragmatists in these disciplines) might look toward focusing upon increased interdisciplinarity as a means of inclusion into the academic mainstream. In this sense then, increased focus upon interdisciplinarity serves the dual purpose of an altruistic focus upon wide-ranging and wide-reaching problem solving; and the self-centered purpose of greater inclusion within mainstream academia. Becher (1989) wrote: "the ways in which particular groups of academics organize their professional lives are intimately related to the intellectual tasks on which they are engaged" (p. 1). I think (and sometimes fear) that the statement can be reversed to read that the way in particular groups of academics engage in intellectual tasks is intimately related to the way in which they are organized. How a person or a group organizes him/herself or themselves is a product of how they might best engage in whatever intellectual endeavor that they are undertaking. How a person or a group, however, is organized or "labeled" by others can have a profound impact upon what role that individual or that group of individuals plays within any

organization. If marginalized professors in marginalized disciplines have been effectively organized and perhaps constrained by others less marginalized within the organization, their work product will surely suffer as a result. The ability they might have otherwise have had to engage in interdisciplinary educational practices will have necessarily been severely restricted. Such organization that has been traditionally founded upon disciplinary barriers must be broken down if we are to achieve a higher level of higher education.

In our increasingly complex world, solutions to problems cannot be formed in vacuums. Likewise, individuals dealing with societal problems are members of communities, not freestanding agents. Archbishop Desmond Tutu has been credited with the quote “the fundamental law of human beings is interdependence. A person is a person through other persons.” The interrelationships we form with others are what makes us who we are. "While people survive without communities, the thinner their community bonds, the more alienated and unreasoning they tend to be" (Etzioni, 1995, p. 12). Successful colleges and universities have little room for alienation among their faculty. Colleges and universities, as "communities of scholars," should attempt to strengthen the ties that bind them. Group identification across disciplinary lines will allow for a strengthening of these ties, a more creative expansion of the "marketplace of ideas," and for the allowance of successes, like failures, to be group and collective, rather than individual.

> "We establish competitive, rather than cooperative, learning environments...our education system values individual development and is oblivious to our need to learn how to solve problems together. Our experience in organizations and communities, where little gets accomplished without collaboration with others, makes clear how few lessons of the 'real world' are included in the classroom" (Brown, 1995, p. 3).

Bok (1996) laments America's increasingly heavy dependence upon individualism, competition, and an attendant increase in suspicion of the State. I refer to these as national

personality traits, which Bok, among others, sees as traits that are inappropriate for the nurturing of the type of cooperation needed to solve, or even address, most of society's ills. Giroux (1997) writes:

> **"rather than comprehending the world holistically as a network of interconnections, the American people are taught to approach problems as if they existed in isolation, detached from the social and political forces that give them meaning" (p. 13).**

The interrelatedness of the social science disciplines in the "real world" cries out for cooperation among professionals. Such interrelatedness requires scholarly communities (the academic world) who are committed to improving educational discourse generally. Hauerwas (1988) viewed the interrelatedness as stemming from the commonality that we share as "teachers first...part of a cooperative endeavor" (p. 22).

The concept of "team teaching" is not new. The concept of "interdisciplinary interdependence," however, is an innovation that offers tomorrow's leaders an opportunity to understand the interdependence and interrelatedness of the disciplines, which will better prepare them for divergent and interdependent professional careers. Damrosch (1995) sums it up quite simply: "much can be accomplished through different forms of collaborative teaching and through the coordination and integration of courses" (p. 134). Rowley et al., (1998) cite the example of Evergreen State College, a place in which transdisciplinary teams are functionally organized to act in lieu of departments. According to the authors, "flexibility and the ability to organize functionally around problems, research interests, or evolving new fields of knowledge" are the keys to understanding the merits of such transdisciplinary attempts (p. 248). Boudreau (1998) suggests a similar broad-based transformation of the existing definitions of academic disciplines.

> **"The solution is in reconstructing the social system of higher education so that each major, more broadly defined, actively encourages the study of the complex configuration of interrelationships that are inherent in the true study of a discipline" (p. 20).**

The nature of a broad-based liberal education seeks to create in students the desire to continue their education long after their college career ends. Education, after all, takes place in the mind of the students. The teacher is the facilitator who creates the proper learning context and helps the student to take responsibility for his or her own learning (Fiske, 1991). Put another way, the job of a teacher is to "help students make connections between what they already understand and new concepts, information, or skills" (Ellwood, 1995, p. 246). Weimer (1993) identified five research-identified components of effective instruction: "enthusiasm, preparation and organization, the ability to stimulate thought and interest, clarity, and knowledge and love of the content" (p. 2).

> "You need to think of teaching as an adventure.
> It is not something to get figured out once and for
> all and then teach happily ever after. In fact,
> even though much about teaching remains the same,
> no class is ever the same" (Weimer, 1993, p. 26).

Understanding that no class is ever the same by taking into account the contingencies of time and circumstance, is a large part of effective interdisciplinary education. Preparing students effectively for further learning requires facilitators who understand the "real world" connections between and among the disciplines. Understanding the limitations of any given discipline should contribute to an expansion of the students' ability to seek creative solutions to problems that cross disciplinary boundaries.

Connections between the disciplines and a grounding in the "real world," acknowledges the reality that society's collective views about all social institutions, from schools to colleges to prisons, tend to shift over time. Promoting within the student the ability to understand the evolutionary shifts that impact all social institutions should more easily be managed by a variety of professionals from a variety of disciplines.

The symbolism inherent in interdisciplinary study is also valuable. As the world grows increasingly diverse, with a wider variety of viewpoints becoming expressions of that diversity,

promoting an educational philosophy that recognizes the blurring of interdisciplinary differences should, symbolically at least, promote the blurring of other perceived differences. Austin & Baldwin (1991), among others, wrote of the vitality that collaboration brings to the classroom. A variety of approaches, differing perspectives, and an array of pedagogical approaches within a single classroom can only increase the intellectual growth and vigor of the students. In our complex and diverse world, a broad array of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes exist, and these multiple attributes should be encouraged and appreciated. Recognizing that differences within and among our students exist, we should facilitate a rich environment in which all are afforded the opportunity and are encouraged to effectively use verbal and written modes of communication, to think critically and logically, appreciate our cultural and artistic values and differences, to act as responsible members of the community, and use good judgment as consumers, adults, and citizens. Perhaps our most important goal should be to provide students with the opportunity and ability to continue to seek to learn and grow as productive and responsible persons, far beyond the time actually spent within the school.

Beyond these lofty aspirations, there are "real world" demands of today's increasingly competitive workplace that require students well prepared to understand the interconnections among and between a variety of fields. Placing graduates into rewarding careers in the human services, requires "interdisciplinary career planning and placement." It would be difficult to overemphasize the professional importance for students of learning the value of contacts among disciplines.

The Vitality of Interdependence

When determining the health of a patient, healthcare professionals analyze vital signs. "Vitality" becomes the definition of life itself. Without vitality, the patient has no life. Without vitality, the college, a collection of individuals, likewise has no life. Colleges without the type of

tradition that will draw students even absent any real vitality, had better constantly look for ways in which to ensure vitality on campus. Adapting the curriculum to meet the needs of the students and the community is perhaps the most logical way to ensure vitality upon the campus.

Vago (1994) described criminal justice as a "unique field in that the law is both a response to and a preemptory strike against crime. As such, criminal justice in particular, and the law generally, is both a cause and an effect of social change" (p. 224). I would submit that education and educational policy is also a cause and an effect of social change. Our increasingly violent world, with its ever more complex social issues, looks to both the criminal justice system and to our schools for solutions to complex problems. The evidence suggests that perhaps neither schools, nor the criminal justice system alone, is up to the task of lessening school and societal violence. Better solutions require cooperation and positive interdependence, and a curriculum that addresses the interconnections within our social structures and the continual changes within our society. Higher education is perhaps the only logical starting point for preparing persons for the interdisciplinary world they will enter, and for finding genuine solutions to genuine problems.

Bok (1993) spoke eloquently about the need for "partnership" responses to the challenges facing today's world. Among these responses is the need for improvement of our public schools through commitment from faculties in schools of education as well as from across the university to work in partnership with teachers, administrators, and the public. The burdens faced by our schools should not be burdens that only they and teacher-educators consider, but they should be burdens for which cross-disciplinary solutions are sought. Cross (1986) viewed the twenty-first century university as a place where it will be "increasingly difficult to tell where the university ends and the so-called real world begins" (p. 215). Shared burdens within the university might lead to better shared solutions for the "real world."

Sullivan (1995) sees the "problems" afflicting our society as problems rooted in the malformation of institutional structures as well as the fraying of moral bonds.

> **"Addressing them requires grasping their historical dimensions, and their ultimately cultural and moral nature, hence the centrality of replacing the relative isolation of the university with new relationships between it and education in its many dimensions."**

Both Bok and Sullivan, among others, have recognized the need for "replacement of the relative isolation" of the university. A truly interdisciplinary and committed faculty and administration promotes interaction with the community beyond the university that should help to lessen the "relative isolation" of the university.

Beyond "traditional" classroom experiences, faculty might also facilitate community involvement and regional conferences focusing upon the interrelatedness of divergent community services and promoting future associations. Greater interdependency among disciplines and community resources will encourage more appropriate solutions drawing upon the expertise and sound theory from professionals in a variety of disciplines.

There is a wide range of opinion on the relative importance of interdisciplinarity in the twentieth century. Some place the concept at the periphery of modern knowledge, a "tolerated margin" that is "too productive to be dismissed and too deviant to be incorporated into the mainstream." While others see it as a more significant phenomenon, a "natural healthy growth" taking root within the mainstream.

Perhaps the level at which interdisciplinarity is perceived to be taking place influences one's judgment about its value (Klein, 1990). Perhaps, in fact, placing a value upon the concept of interdisciplinarity is irrelevant, if we connect interdisciplinarity to interdependence and if we believe as Brown (1995) does that: "interdependence is less a choice than a situation that confronts us in our modern circumstance" (p. 7). Whether we "choose" to breathe or not, we cannot survive without breathing, and likewise, we might claim, whether we choose to acknowlege interdisciplinarity or not, it is as much a part of our colleges' vitality, as breathing is a part of our own.

Back in the 1920s, Charles Merriam of the University of Chicago came to think of political science in an interdisciplinary way. Merriam believed that the social sciences should "come together to consider the fundamental social problems in which they are all concerned and which cannot be effectively solved without their joint consolidation and action" (Karl, 1974, p. 118). Our modern circumstances require combining scarce but shared resources to further the end of educating the student. Such an acknowledgement and a subsequent supportive climate might be both a cost-saving and future-oriented method of advancing students and faculty alike. Merriam may have been far ahead of his time in understanding both the increasing complexity of our problems and the need for collaborative effort in reaching solutions to these problems.

Boyer (1990) has been among those who have advocated increased "interdisciplinarity" for several years. While relatively few academics have achieved the fame and reputation of Ernest Boyer, even his suggestions for improvement of the academy have been slow to gain enough widespread support to "require" implementation. Why should I presume if Ernest Boyer can't "move" the entrenched academy that I might? I don't. Still, adding to the voices and the volume seeking change within the academic institutions to promote and understand interdisciplinarity, boundary crossing, and a truly "liberal" view of general education, cannot hurt. As always in life, there seems to be a fine line between those ahead of the curve or on the "cutting edge" and those who are merely out-of-step with mainstream society. I hope to fall within the former group...but as all "academics" can attest, the given interpretation of one's standing by a given person or group is subject to numerous factors not always dependent upon the merits or demerits of one's position.

It is crucial to view interdisciplinarity as "integrative" and not merely additive. The term multi-disciplinarity has often been a description of two or more disciplines added together. The term discipline signifies the tools, methods, procedures, exempla, concepts, and theories that account coherently for a set of objects or subjects. Over time they are shaped and reshaped by external contingencies and internal intellectual demands. In this manner, a discipline comes to

organize and concentrate experience into a particular "world view" (Klein, 1990). Interdisciplinarity is difficult and must be consciously achieved. Merely putting an economist and a sociologist, or any other combination of specialists in close proximity, does not lend itself to the practice of interdisciplinarity. Every interdisciplinary course, whether it is in an academic setting, or if it is a course of treatment for an individual client involves the specific characteristics of that situation. In some senses, then, each effort must begin anew.

"It is a firmly established tenet, accepted by many teacher educators, that liberal arts curricula are more intellectually demanding and worthwhile than are teacher education (or other "professional") programs" (Weaver, 1991, p. 84). Kramer's *Ed School Follies* (1991), a work in which teacher education programs in general were soundly criticized as being inappropriate and ineffective preparers of already lesser academic students, added fuel to the fire already raging over the "inadequate teaching in our schools." It is in the face of this, and other firmly established tenets, that those of us in the margins must operate. Our tolerance of our ongoing "oppression" has not assisted our cause, and our defensiveness when questioned about the worth of our curricula has been equally damaging. Rather than continuing to assert our equality in the face of criticism, it is time, perhaps, to take the offensive and challenge all disciplines in the liberal arts to explain to us why they must be viewed as inherently superior. Reynolds (1995) explains that "teacher educators working in a college or university setting will look to their colleagues in the academic community to make personal judgments as to their worth and the value of the work they perform" (p. 216). Weaver (1991) writes: "teacher education programs, should not tolerate being relegated to second-class academic citizenship because of specious claims about different properties of knowledge" (p. 90).

Criminal justice programs should likewise not be relegated to an inferior status based on the ambiguous criteria that has historically provided for the superiority of the other more traditional liberal arts. Education and criminal justice courses alike build upon the knowledge,

skills, and perspectives that students gain from experiences in other liberal arts study in order to implement their curricula. Integration "encourages understanding of the interdisciplinary nature of study and assists in the synthesis of information across the curriculum" (Engel, 1989).

> "One of the gravest obstacles to the achievement of liberation is that oppressive reality absorbs those within it and thereby acts to submerge men's consciousness. Functionally, oppression is domesticating. To no longer be prey to its force, one must emerge from it and turn upon it. This can be done only by means of praxis: reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1970, p. 36).

While Freire spoke of the pedagogy of the oppressed, this work involves, to an extent at least, a significantly lesser important pedagogy of the depressed. While Freire wrote of transforming the world, this work speaks of transforming the significantly lesser "academic world." The marginalization that so many of us feel, and in so many ways, makes transformation exceedingly difficult. I trust, in my rare optimistic moments, that it will be all the more rewarding should we accomplish it. But alas, change, in and of itself, is remarkably difficult to achieve. In faculty meetings I've attended (at my prior institutions) there are those who proclaim that only persons having been here longer than three years "know enough" about the inner workings of the institution to properly be considered for faculty senate. The idea of the university as a community of equals or near equals is something of a joke.

> "Professors appear for class, hold a formal office hour, and disappear. The same professors may encounter each other at department or college meetings, but this is less an opportunity for camaraderie than an invitation to mutual resentment" (Solomon & Solomon, 1993, p. 223).

The fact that the above quote is not my own, can only be attributed to the Solomon's greater writing skills and/or their opportunity to have said it first, for these words have been no less true on campuses on which I've taught, than, I am sure, they are on most campuses. Our ability to preach credible refrains of community to our students must surely be hampered by their

ability to see our lack of community on campus.

Those of us on the margin or outside of the margin cannot possibly "know enough" about what matters, to matter. Would it be so, if a person with a doctorate proclaimed that only those with doctorates in educational administration, could possibly "know enough" about academic administration to serve on a faculty senate. Surely those words would've been shouted down, rightly so, as arrogance coupled with blindness to reality. Speaking grandly of "tradition," or "experience" as the best test of quality leadership however equally arrogant and blind, is met with affirmative nods, or at least polite acceptance. We fear, it seems, difference at almost any and every level, while we celebrate experience and "tradition" beyond its worth. The concept of "permissible originality" strikes again, in the most unusual of places. Faculty meetings, committee meetings, and other academic discourse allow fertile ground for anecdotes concerning the way colleges operate, and the sometimes interesting dichotomy between what is proclaimed and what really is. While I cannot entirely disagree that with experience comes wisdom, after all, I've seen it and respected it in my parents, grandparents, and others who've influenced me, it is somewhat disconcerting that with experience often seems to come both the belief in one's self and an occasional blind deference from others as to the import of one's words.

It has been my personal experience, however limited, that it is often the prerogative of faculty members, particularly those well ensconced within an institution, to most readily accept ideas that they themselves "own." While numerous anecdotes, "how to succeed" books, and other sources, have testified to the value of making others feel as though your ideas have come from them, never is it more profoundly illustrated than on college campuses. However frustrating it is for those of us on the "outside" due to our youth, inexperience, and/or "lesser disciplinary status," there is a continual need to appease those on the inside. We must continually defer to their expertise, and even abrogate ownership of our most creative ideas in order to have them accepted.

For criminal justice, ethnic studies, women's studies, and teacher education practitioners, liberation from our own schizophrenic feelings of disciplinary inadequacy coupled with our feelings of liberal arts oppression will allow us to reflect and act in order to transform our world. The depths of what I have called disciplinary inadequacy run quite deep, and are not confined to these disciplines. While I take pains to refrain from the use of anecdotal evidence in both my classes and my life, I must share an experience I had upon my former campus that quite ably represents the depths of our marginalization and oppression. In a conversation with other faculty members, among them a philosophy professor, a religion professor, and an economics professor, I was struck by their own levels of perceived marginalization. While I, as a criminal justice professor "outside of the general education liberal arts mainstream" perceived of my marginalization as somewhat "obvious," the others were somewhat taken aback by my feelings. It was they who felt marginalized. My discipline was strong (at least in number of majors) while theirs were weak. My discipline was "real world" while theirs were often perceived as abstract "fluff."

Vignettes such as the one above illustrates the level of division that exists among the faculty members even upon a small "warm and friendly" liberal arts campus. In later conversations with my friend the philosophy professor, she relayed her feelings of marginalization based upon her discipline's perceived "abstract and unusable" theory. I countered with my feelings of marginalization based upon my discipline's perceived "concreteness" devoid of theory. The stereotype would, in some ways at least, be equally marginalizing, that of a philosophy professor so busy "reflecting" that she cannot function in the real world; and that of a criminal justice professor so busy attending to the real world that he does not possess the ability to ponder "deep thoughts." Neely (1999), an author with whom I am usually in great agreement, is among those who perpetuate the myth of criminal justice as some sort of a pre-professional or vocational program when he laments the fact that "hundreds of colleges still place the name liberal arts upon

themselves, but in fact they graduate thousands of students in nursing, journalism, criminal justice, business, and almost any undergraduate degree to match a job that one can imagine" (p. 36). I have grown weary of arguing the point with those who believe a degree in criminal justice is any more preparation for a given career than is a degree in psychology or political science. My weariness notwithstanding, it is an argument that while seemingly lost can, I think, be eventually won as we continue to increase the status of our discipline through our works and our practitioners within these lamentable institutions of higher learning.

Can we all be marginalized together? If we can, then perhaps it is incumbant upon us to use these feelings to better incorporate ourselves into the academic mainstream through the use of each other in a collaborative, collective endeavor. If we simply cannot all be marginalized together, then the fact that we perceive ourselves to be reflects a significant problem brewing under the complacent and largely contented surface of academia. Perhaps greater understanding of the contributions that we must make in cooperation with our "real world" peers might help alleviate some of these feelings of marginalization.

> "The demands of our society challenge us to lend the vitality of the ivory tower to the solution of the much more difficult problems of the marketplace, where a jump must be made from the security of knowledge to the insecurity of decision" (Rees, 1976, p. 91).

With newness and change will come resistance and no small amount of groping about in the dark searching for a proper method. Carnochan (1993) challenges the long-held assumptions about liberal education as mere assumptions and not concrete fact. He cautions that we need not assume that when it comes to liberal education: "that there is only a single desirable formula and that what is good for one is equally good for all" (p. 6). The need for vitality is echoed by Applebee (1996) who spoke of the importance of rethinking curriculum in order to "foster students' entry into living traditions of knowledge-in-action rather than static traditions of knowledge-out-of-context" (p. 5). If education is largely about reaching our students, those whom

the colleges serve, then it is perhaps worth whatever risk we take if that risk better enables us to assist students in making "connections" that will enable them to benefit long-term from their specific courses, and their general education. Economists will appreciate that without risk, comes little reward, and a refocusing of our "agenda" might be every bit as rewarding long term, as it might appear risky in the short term.

Boyer (1990) viewed liberal arts colleges as "providing an especially supportive climate for the scholarship of integration. On these campuses, there is, or should be, a climate of intellectual exchange that fosters interdisciplinary studies, creative general education courses, and capstone seminars" (p. 59). What should be, however, isn't always what is. The divisions among the disciplines, discussed throughout this work, appear, in many cases, to be so deep even at liberal arts colleges, that genuine integration (in almost any sense of the word) is difficult to achieve. Difficulty in achieving a goal is, of course, no reason for abandoning that goal. It is, in fact, reason to press on patiently and diligently.

Miller (1988) writes of the difficulty of developing a successful general education program. "It requires a truly concerted effort among faculty and administrators and a shared understanding of -- and willing participation in -- goals and methods, on the part of students" (pp. 189-90). A "community of shared understanding" (p. 190) will need to develop for colleges to develop coherent general education curricula that responds both to the needs of individuals and to democratic society. When we consider general education, or "what is worth knowing" as many have described the concept, Stengel (1997) asks us to "check the direction of our gaze. Do we look first to life? Or first to academic discipline?" (p. 599).

> **"A foundational view of knowledge as essentially given and propositional in form confirms and is confirmed by a reliance on the academic disciplines as bodies of knowledge. A pragmatic view of knowledge as that which is construed in action, on the other hand, is much more at home in the messiness of everyday life" (Stengel, 1997, p. 599).**

It is the "messiness of life" that encircles both the academic curriculum and those for whom changing a curriculum either positively addresses that messiness, or more negatively, merely adds to that messiness. A more ordered society is less a goal, than is a recognition of the reality that a more ordered society has gone the way of the traditional curriculum as an appropriate response to what were once simpler and more ordered societal problems.

McFarland & Taggie (1990) identify several critical steps involved in the implementation of integrative curriculum. In their view, the most crucial are: 1) demonstrating to faculty that they will benefit personally and professionally; 2) gaining the support of the administration so that they will invest resources in such programs; and 3) selling the program to the university community (p. 229). While we professors often lament the inattention we perceive that the administration gives to genuine academic matters, the reality as McFarland & Taggie suggest, is that the greatest challenge to implementation of new programs probably lies in convincing the faculty to collectively get on board. Why would an administration get behind "radical" changes to a curriculum, or for that matter, even minimal changes to a curriculum, if a consensus of the faculty does not take an active and concerted role in support of any proposed alterations? We are our own worst enemy. We need to be our own best friends. If those engaged in the teaching of criminal justice and teacher education cannot convince their colleagues of their "equal worth" within the curriculum and within the university community, then it is we who are to blame, and not any conspiratorial oppression by the majority already in "power." Keeping in mind how difficult change is and will be, we might heed the words of Damrosch (1995):

> "To have some hope of success, proposals...must work within the parameters of human nature as it now exists, and they should ideally be pitched at a middle range, neither too global to accomplish nor too modest to make a difference" (p. 165).

Both our rhetoric concerning change and our proposals to implement change in a given setting must then be "neither too global to accomplish nor too modest to make a difference." Far

too many "reform" proposals fail because of their "global" scope and their inability to address and appropriately respond to differences that exist among and between different settings. Other "reform" proposals fail because they are not beneficial to those who are asked to implement them. Proposing curriculum changes must somehow straddle the line between those seeking radical change (a minority to be sure) and the many who cling to the status quo.

Rethinking the curriculum, to grant inclusion to criminal justice, gender studies, ethnic studies, and teacher education, or to make other changes, both radical and slight, requires the admission that our present adherence to strict disciplinary teaching falls short of allowing us to reach our capacity for collaboration and problem-solving. Rubenstein (1990) views the continuance, and expansion in many cases, of conflict within our society as evidence that our potential for collaborative problem-solving has yet to be reached. Rubenstein calls for moving beyond boundaries by building universities around "centers" rather than "disciplines" (p. 74). My first academic appointment was at such a center. Annointed the "Center for Excellence Across Disciplines," it was conceived as a genuine collaborative educational venture combining such disciplines as criminal justice, teacher education, and psychology. Given even moderate levels of administrative and faculty-wide support it could have been, in my view at least, a highly successful creation. Without such support and within a crumbling institution it had little real chance for success. It was a concept, however, that needs to be replicated at universities having appropriate levels of administrative and financial support in order to increase the odds of success. The Center for Excellence, of which I was a part, was in the right time, but at the wrong place. We must continue to call for the type of higher education integrated curriculums that will allow for Centers of Excellence to take root and grow.

> "As more people realize the global interconnectedness of all life and life-support systems, as more faculty become dismayed by their discipline's lack of pertinence to the real world, and as more citizens recognize the ineptness of our specialists in coping with today's complex issues, the pressure on our

> educational system will build until discrete institutions of integrated studies begin to be established" (Peterson, 1990, p. 221).

Whether we couch our problems in terms of a loss of community, or an over-dependence upon individualism, both of which merely reflect the changes in our larger society, the answer is to address problems collectively. Collective action is necessary whether the problems are "real world" consisting of delivering human services to troubled individuals and families, or whether they are "ivory tower" problems that threaten the future of academia. Nelson (1997) lists some of the most serious issues facing academia, including: the lessening of tenure and the attendent increased use of part-time faculty; and the diminishment of scholarly publishing. Faculties can respond by and large like society has responded to the diminishment of good jobs and the increase in "temp" work, by a collective shrug of our shoulders and by muttering something like "that can't happen to me." It doesn't take a scholar to understand the ineffectiveness of apathy, and the despair and regret to which it often ultimately leads. Grossberg cites our collective apathy:

> "For the fact of the matter is that, although people may be individually and collectively outraged, they remain largely inactive" (p. 14).

Collective action and its ally, passionate discourse, is not only the best course toward lessening the problems of an increasingly complex society, it is the only course. Bok (1990), among others, has lauded not only the past accomplishments of higher education, but its potential for addressing the problems present in today's society.

> "Universities may not have any special capacity to prescribe solutions for the nation's ills. But they are better equipped than any other institution to produce the knowledge needed to arrive at effective solutions and to prepare the highly educated people required to carry them out" (Bok, 1990, p. 11).

Usdan (1995) proclaims: "the economic problems facing our society call for unprecedented collaborations in every phase of American life" (p. 15). While the broad scope of

this statement (and Peterson's above) seems to make it ripe for under consideration, its far-reaching scope makes it no less true. Unprecedented collaboration is called for, and who better than those of us within the academy to provide a model (of both passionate discourse and real action) for others to follow. Cohen & March described colleges as "organized anarchies" in which individual faculty members and individual departments pursued independent objectives. Such a description, so appropriate on its face, and through the symbolism attached to the inherent contradiction within the two words, so appropriate to describe life on college campuses, has survived the two and half decades since it was first coined. There can be little doubt that some level of "organized anarchy" is inevitable given the composition of diverse interests and subject matters represented on college campuses; this chapter seeks not to end the inevitable, merely to consider the possibilities that exist in such a "structure" or "non-structure."

Chapter Fourteen

"The Focus Should Be on Lessening Our Focus"

> ***"There is fragmentation in the United States; there is distrust; there is deep anger -- and much of this is reflected in and acted out in universities, but none of it is caused by universities or by professors or by young people. Nevertheless, all three are easy scapegoats for problems of the larger society" (Levine, 1996, pp. 31-32).***

How do educators respond to the problems facing our society, and how do we transcend our position as scapegoats? We may ably transcend our position as scapegoats merely by responding to the problems facing our society, and we can better do that by facing up to the reality that the ever growing complexity of our problems deserves the collaborative attention of numerous scholars from divergent backgrounds. Our best and first response should be to engage in a debate, heated if necessary, about the need to alter and amend the vaunted liberal arts curriculum. We can couch these amendments as a return to the true "liberal arts" intention of increasing our attention to breadth, or as a move forward into the new millennium as an interdisciplinary response to ongoing and seemingly intractible problems.

Perhaps the reason that many students don't always find relevancy in their studies, is simply because we don't always exude relevancy. Our rigid adherence to disciplinary boundaries and archaic structures tends to gloss over the realities that exist in everyday life. Life is complicated, interconnected, interdependent, and not easily categorized into sociology, psychology, women's studies, economics, or any other single discipline. As we guard against over-simplification when we analyze the world's problems, we might be well served to guard against over-simplification in our own campus structures and curricular designs.

There are numerous "interdisciplinary studies" majors in place at colleges and universities across the country and I applaud their efforts at transcending disciplinary barriers. There are other ways as well, I think, of accomplishing real curriculum advances with less "radical" curriculum

alterations and less need for additional majors. First and foremost is through a change in the structure of our majors themselves with an acknowledgement that information outside of the discipline is as important to successful practice as is the necessary groundwork from within the discipline. Mourad (1997) argues that our philosophical foundations that have led us toward acceptance of disciplinary boundaries has "limited the capacity of individuals to make better worlds" (p. 7). The constraints that disciplinary boundaries have placed upon our intellectual capacities to consider all possibilities has been the unintended consequence of adherence to too firmly entrenched disciplinary training and thinking. That having been said, it cannot be denied that a strong foundation in a given discipline is a must for a person who hopes to effectively teach that discipline. Gardner (1999) while still a proponent of interdisciplinary study, cautions us against simply joining disciplines together without mastering either or both of them in the first place. He refers to linking mastered disciplines productively in order to seek rich answers to the essential questions. Such linking must consist of the use of disciplined thinking, not merely the collusion (collision?) of more than two disciplines in an attempt to create connections where they cannot be foundationally made. Such warnings, especially coming from someone with the stature of Howard Gardner, cannot be taken lightly as genuine interdisciplinarity is contemplated.

Giroux (1997) argues for the importance of enlarging the curriculum to reflect the richness and diversity of the students who are taught, while simultaneously, "decentering" the curriculum to allow students a voice in governance issues including setting learning goals, selecting courses, and having their own autonomous organizations. Giving students more power need not be threatening, except to those whose only power is positionally based alone. Those faculty members with "real power" over students will continue to be those whom students respect and admire for their teaching abilities and interpersonal skills. Such "real power" might best be shared rather than hoarded as positional power often is. Menand (1997) describes the purpose of education as ”empowering people and giving them some measure of control over their own lives”

(p. 15). Empowering others in the best way that we can seek "collective dominance" over institutional thinking, as much as it dominates our rhetoric in mission statements. The rhetoric of our missions often barely reflects the reality of our practices. Purpel (1999) laments his belief that colleges and universities have contributed to further legitimation of heirarchy and privilege in society, and to the "proliferation of the sin of confusing human worth with personal achievement" (p. 43). He considers a "Platonic hierarchy" which is "charitable to the lesser of us and generous to the greater of us" (p. 43). It is the legitimation of privilege that has become almost taken for granted in larger society, and now too, within the halls of academia, where some disciplines prosper and others wither.

While this book has focused, to a certain extent, upon dissatisfactions with current general education requirements within a much too entrenched and a much too unquestioningly accepted liberal arts tradition, there is ample room for a celebration of the true meaning of the liberal arts, through an expansion of these arts. Spring (1994) cited John Dewey, the great educational philosopher of a century ago, as an early advocate of developing the spirit of cooperation within students in order that they might better understand the interdependence of society. While such citations clearly identify the concept of an interdependent society as having its origins in a time long ago and far away and a time far "less complicated" than today's, our adherence to and belief in the concept of interdependence seems to have a great distance to go. Minow (1997) laments the "sorting" of persons into groups and the subsequent adherence to group-based identities. Group-based identities often lead to polarization rather than community. Professors, as scholars trained and paid to "think," might consider the possibilities that genuine interdependence and collaboration would offer to society and to themselves.

Professors struggle with the mixed messages of autonomy, loyalty, and academic freedom. "Our being as teachers is named by others--be independent, critical thinkers, but do it within the parameters and paradigm of heirarchical culture and the confines of the discipline"

(Schmidt, 1997, p. 13). For those whose disciplines are expansive enough and respected enough to allow freedom, the problem is significantly less pressing, than for those of us whose parameters, real or merely perceived, are much too confining to allow for the larger sense of academic freedom that transcends what might be occurring in the classroom.

Like most ideas, greater collaboration among disciplines has been put forth, in many forms, long before I came upon it, and long before I have written this work applauding its benefits and lamenting its limited application. Turner (1986) wrote of the academic curriculum so structured and laden with barriers as an obstacle in the path of better education.

> "The last 400 years of scientific and intellectual progress contain a giant paradox. Every great advance, every profound insight in the sciences and other intellectual disciplines, has torn down the barriers and distinctions between those disciplines; and yet the institutional result of each of these advancements has been the further fragmentation and specialization of the academy" (p. 47).

Expansion of the need for students to diversify in the spirit of the liberal arts should be seen as a celebration of the liberal arts and general education, not as a denigration of them. As an example of one potential change, we might consider allowing present majors to retain their major status but require "interdisciplinary" courses within the major. If, for example, criminal justice, psychology, and teacher education, among other examples, are in fact intimately related, (as I hope I have at least made the reader contemplate) why not require criminal justice majors to take only 7, rather than 11 criminal justice courses, and then require perhaps 2 psychology and 2 teacher education courses as part of the criminal justice major. Likewise, require psychology majors to take "introduction to criminal justice" and/or "juvenile delinquency" in order to complete their psychology major. Perhaps sociology majors could be required to take a women's studies and ethnic studies course. There is nothing sacred about the curriculum, it is, indeed, a tool for change. There could be no better way to ensure a well-rounded and well-educated person than to expand majors to include other courses, in other disciplines. To critics who would lament a major

of only 7 or 8 "disciplinary" courses...there is always the encouragement for graduate study as a method of increasing the depth of knowledge. The argument for undergraduate study, in contrast, has been and largely remains, an argument for increasing the breadth of knowledge, and for increasing students' abilities to reason, articulate, and gain a foundation from which further knowledge and further contemplation will naturally flow.

We know that most of us in higher education don't try to fill our students heads, but instead attempt to assist students' to attain their natural proclivities for learning, understanding, and questioning the world around them. Being a successful college professor is less about providing answers than it is about evoking questions. If indeed the educated person has a natural curiousity and continually seeks answers to questions, allowing for a greater introduction to some of the "questions" may provide for a more effective education than a focus upon the "answers" through focused and in-depth disciplinary training. Teaching and learning as related concepts have become to be understood, properly I think, as the "exercise of the collaborative construction of meanings and their critical interpretation" (Gordon & Bhattacharyya, 1999, p. 164). Teaching and learning are a collaborative effort; problem-solving is a collaborative effort; higher education curricula should be increasingly a collaborative effort.

Postmodernism and higher education, the approach to reconsideration written about here (at times at least), seeks "rational solutions in a world that increasingly distrusts reason as a legitimate approach to problem solving" (Bloland, 1995, p. 525). Reason in today's complex society, seems to dictate cooperation, a recognition of the "other," and collaborative problem solving in ways not heretofore contemplated.

> **"The error of the academy has been to deny, by means of its metaphors of demarcation between fields, the intimate connections, the continuous and omnipresent relevance of other fields at every stage of investigation" (Turner, 1986, p. 50).**

Too much dependence upon specialization has made us both the producers and the

product of an academic environment, like a corporate environment, in which hard and pat answers are favored over difficult and probing questions.

> **"Like Adam Smith and Karl Marx, Dewey believed specialization in the factory had negative effects on workers" (Spring, 1994, p. 24).**

Perhaps our recent efforts to "corporatize" academics stems in part from our inability to understand and contemplate complex concepts advanced by such diverse thinkers as Adam Smith, Karl Marx, and John Dewey. We have allowed "corporatization" to impose upon us a Ronald Reagan like approach to problem-solving of the simpler the better. This approach has allowed for the specialization that has become so much a part of academia, as well as our society as a whole. Specializing in a "smaller" discipline is and has been seen as preferable (and more profitable...since specialists tend to cost more), to seeking general knowledge. Nussbaum (1997) writes eloquently about the difficulties in promoting dialogue (even complex and sometimes painful dialogue) across disciplinary boundaries, and of the tendency for colleges to address their perceived and real markets by lessening the influence and existence of humanities disciplines in favor of more marketable "real world" and more vocationally minded pursuits.

> **"It now seems to many administrators (and parents and students) too costly to indulge in the apparently useless business of learning for the enrichment of life. Many institutions that call themselves liberal arts colleges have turned increasingly to vocational studies..." (p. 297).**

Assembling our faculties like factory workers specializing in one piece and only one piece upon an assembly line churning out students prepared to take their places in business is no doubt preferable to business than would be the churning out of thinkers who might challenge both their individual places and the well ordered place of workers in society generally. Sadly, it has become increasingly apparent that encouraging "thinking" even among faculty members is something that frightens our less confident administrators. Perhaps it is preemptive strikes against collective action or "unionization" that leads so many administrators to fear the creative capacities of faculty

members less prone to accept the status quo. Greene et al., (1998) concluded that:

> "current systems of preparing professionals in a myriad of areas: education, criminal justice, social work, and public administration, to name a few, are guilty of perpetuating a system in which the professional feels more comfortable to work alone than collaboratively" (p. 9).

Barriers and compartmentalizations have long prevented much of the reconceptualization necessary to most effectively meet the demands of a changing society. Becoming "team" players ourselves, while we teach others the need for team play, is more than mere rhetoric, it is a mandate for the future that, like most mandates, falls necessarily upon the laps of those of us in education. Fundamental and structural changes in order to implement genuine "interdisciplinarity" are necessary both inside and outside of educational environments. Competition, individualism, and paranoia, while components of every social environment, and every higher education environment, must be minimized if we are to truly meet the demands of our society, and if we are to protect ourselves from further business encroachment, and a further diminishment in faculty status and power.

"Was it Murder or Suicide?"

While in the course of writing this, I had occasion to read and enjoy Miller's *As If Learning Mattered*; an enjoyment that is reflected by frequent citations within this work. I do not, nor could I, dispute much of what he has said, and yet I do hope for a more radical vision than he deems practically possible, and am not yet entirely prepared to wave my own white flag in surrender despite the wisdom of his words:

> "Conceding the essentially bureaucratic nature of academic work demands...an acknowledgement that making hortatory declarations about what must be done and extended critiques of what has been done is not, by any stretch of the imagination, the same thing as engaging in the entirely unglamorous, often utterly

> anonymous work of figuring out what *can* be done within a given institutional context, where one is certain to run up against extant, competing, undoubtedly unreasonable, and unquestionably unfair constraints" (Miller, 1. 22).

Still, despite the reassurance that such "reality recognition" might bring with it and the freedom it may bring from participating in calls for and actions concerning social and institutional change, there is simply too much at stake for too many to abdicate responsibility in favor of cynical despair. If we continue to stand pat and ignore the continuing tendency within the mainstream media and corporate America, to bash the professoriate specifically, and the academy generally, our demise as a "profession" may be inevitable. If we are divided, our demise may be likened much more to suicide than to murder, regardless of the "murderous" intent that we can easily infer from the conduct of many administrators, trustees, and other inside and outside influences. Katz (1987) listed academic freedom and tenure as the "great barriers to the total victory of the marketplace and the state" over the universities (p. 179). Cohen (1998) wrote: "As the rise in employment of part-time and non-tenure-track instructors has revealed, there is no need to make a frontal assault on the professors. Institutions can simply stop replacing them as they leave" (p. 443). At both of my prior academic stops, such a pattern and a policy, while unstated, was becoming more and more simply the way of doing business. A Vice-President at one of these places assured the faculty that replacing tenure-track positions with non tenure-track persons was merely "a way of exercising caution, since the persons who fill tenure-track positions might stay twenty or more years." Fair enough, except that the approach was not to exercise careful searches, but rather to delay and delay and wait for attrition within the majors and a dwindling of interest on the part of faculty until such time as the hiring of part-timers and non-tenure-track persons became accepted in full, and hardly even noticed by most. It seemed as though complacency, long the bane of professors in their rhetoric, had become part and parcel of professors' responses to administrative initiatives. Perhaps having been "beaten" long enough,

it is understandable that those receiving the beatings eventually wear down and do their best to disassociate. Understandable and justifiable, however, remain different concepts.

If we do not even mount a defense when these two last bastions of academia (tenure and academic freedom) are threatened with extinction, then the assimilation will be complete, and the working conditions and learning conditions of professors and students will be severely threatened. Kolodny (1998) wrote of underestimating her college's culture of "complaint and resistance" and its subsequent entrenchment and seeming incapacity for change (p. 8). It should be clear by now, to even the most entrenched among us, that our strategy of "complaint and resistance" has not served us particularly well, either as a profession, or as members of given institutions attempting to adapt to changing political, social, and even academic environments.

Charles Sykes indicted the profession of the professoriate in his book *Profscam*, by stating: "the story of the collapse of American higher education is the story of the rise of the professoriate." As I sat writing the bulk of this work, a faculty member at a small, midwestern, and private college, I could only laugh as a means of warding off tears. My increasing cynicism borne of heightened and ever heightening exasperation. If my colleagues and myself had risen and our rise had contributed to problems on that campus...I could not see it. We were not empowered in any sense of that now commonly used term, including being lowly compensated in both real terms and relative terms when compared to administrators on that campus and beyond, and to professors at similarly situated institutions. We didn't need the rhetorical beatings we received from Sykes and others, and our "professional status" should not have prevented us from responding. Our reluctance to respond to attacks had made us seemingly complicit with the hateful things said about us. Our dependence upon information provided to us by the administration tended to create an ability only to react, and not to act. Our tendency to see the world as individuals should not have been compromised by the professional necessity within today's "marketplace" of collective action and a collective voice in the affairs of our workplaces.

Workplaces that are gradually becoming less enshrouded in mystery, and in which they might be seen less as ivory towers than as dingy dungeons where hard work is extracted for little compensation.

Whether a college should function as a collection of individuals who sometimes collaborate or as a genuine "community of scholars" who are intent on furthering the lives of their students is a choice that we face. Boudreau (1998) eloquently put it:

> **"every campus can and should endeavor to become a true community of committed scholars who provide mutual support and encouragement to all in the common effort of gaining an understanding of the knowledge and mystery of human existence" (p. 146).**

However well intentioned our plans for further collaboration among and between faculty and "outside" interests, we must remain aware that collaboration in itself does not reach the level of a true community of scholars. We cannot always collaborate, but we can be a part of a community in which even our individual efforts can be a part of the institution and better utilized by the institution, or as Boudreau put it, we can practice "integrated individualism" (p. 149). When we do collaborate, we must combine that sharing and "interdependence" with a willingness to face up to the "ugly" aspects of intraagency competition and interagency paranoia. When we divide ourselves into factions in academia, we may leave an enduring and abiding distrust as our legacy. Many of us in academia are all too familiar with how difficult it is to overcome the distrust that has sometimes been sown by our predecessors. In the marginalized disciplines, any amount of enduring distrust is made even more difficult to overcome given the inherent cynicism with which many in the more established disciplines already view us. By consciously working to prevent these divides, we might better acknowledge, as well as achieve, the beautiful aspects of genuine interdisciplinary thought and work.

> **"Great groups are undeterred by obstacles and setbacks. Instead, they are buoyed by positive illusions that they can break new ground or succeed where others have failed. The leaders of such groups**

> are purveyors of hopes, not necessarily voices of reason. The leader is often the one who believes most passionately" (Bennis & Biederman, 1997).

It is difficult to reconcile the "optimism" of Bennis & Biederman with the "realistic pessimism" so prevalent on most college campuses, and so eloquently written about by Cary Nelson and others. While the pessimism within this piece cannot be hidden, it has hopefully been overshadowed by the optimism that must be inherent in espousing genuine change and in relentlessly seeking to better succeed in rethinking a curriculum which is littered with the proposals and optimism of those who've tried before.

Perhaps most frightening, is society's recent tendency to accept that the status of persons is based upon the self-righteous belief that American society is basically fair as it now stands and that those relegated to the bottom are there simply because they deserve to be. This argument took a genetic turn with Murray's and Herrnstein's *The Bell Curve*, which although by now widely discredited, struck a popular chord within many in our society who were seeking “standing” with which they might more openly assert their questionable and divisive views. If indeed those of us at the bottom economically, politically, and culturally, deserve to be, then there is little that those at the top can do to better our lot. If those of us bottom feeders academically cannot raise our status, perhaps we have no one to blame but ourselves, or perhaps we are indeed victims of an academic society which has far more in common with the "outside" world than most academicians are willing to admit.

Afterword

"*Administrators are from Jupiter Faculty Members are from Saturn*"

> *"The university is so many things to so many different people that it must, of necessity, be partially at war with itself" (Kerr, 1963, p. 18).*
>
> *"I do not think that many faculty members would challenge the notion that their universities are run by people who are primarily managers and not academics" (Yates, 1999, p. 45).*

It has been and remains the wars within the university that compelled me to write this book. Those who remain soldiers in the battle for greater equality within the academy are sometimes divided into two camps: those who wish to pressure the established disciplines into allowing assimilation and equity; and those who find themselves so disgruntled that separatism is their only goal. The war may never be won, and the smaller victories in campus battles here and there may be less than what we had hoped. The question for those doing the fighting and for those choosing neutrality, concerns the future direction of American higher education generally, and the condition of the faculty particularly. As I write this, the state of the faculty is sound...the future, however, is more uncertain.

The war within academia begat this book, the smaller battles and conflicts within my own thinking on these matters compelled me to write this afterward. As a member of a college community, I have experienced many discussions (some enlightening, a few illuminating, and many downright depressing) concerning the appropriate place of certain disciplines within the college curriculum. My sense of place as the product of many factors, most internal to me, but many external and associated with my environment, is in no small part a product of my discipline's place within the curriculum. The "place" in which my discipline rests, and the value placed upon it within the college curriculum and thereby within both the

real and symbolic nature of our little piece of the higher education world necessarily impacts my thoughts, and colors my perceptions. It is this "place" that has inspired my work. It is this "place" that, to borrow and slightly alter Paulo Freire's wonderful work, I might refer to as my *pedagogy of the depressed*. Staring squarely down the double-barrels of redundancy and flippancy, I might have used the phrase "the depressed academic," to entirely describe this work. Flippancy to a great extent, and redundancy to a lesser extent, not being particularly academic traits (at least relative to cynicism, paranoia, and self-loathing) I chose not to mislead the reader (at least in that direction).

The direction of this work changed radically from its earliest drafts in which the use of humor (or my own brand of humor) made this an effort in the comedy of errors that sometimes is academe. The more this work consumed my thoughts, the more the humor became more suited to the gallows. Humor of that sort is altogether too dark to illuminate anything, least of all the many contradictions present within the academy. In a desperate search for illumination then, humor has been largely replaced by a greater amount of consternation. Consternation that has shaped the work as much more a hand-wringing (and hopefully thought-provoking) essay into the evolution of academia, and the sense of "place" or the lack of that sense on the part of many of us teaching on or along the margins of the mainstream academy.

When I bring up the concept of "academic marginalization" at the many conferences I have attended, it is generally met with one of two rather divergent responses. The first response (the one that I enjoy the most) is that of "allelujah...it's about time someone publicly brought forth this issue!" The second response (far less enjoyable and far less effective in building my own self-esteem) is one that lessens the marginalization and instead focuses upon my own and my brethren's shortcomings (both real and perceived). "If you'd only try

harder...perhaps write more...perhaps set yourself and your discipline apart from the others, you'd gain respect at your institution." This latter response, I believe, tends to come from those "established" and often tenured individuals who are either reluctant to criticize the academy that has embraced them, or perhaps, who are simply too tired to fight on anymore. While I see their point, and setting oneself apart from one's peers is indeed a good and proper method of advancement...am I simply too cynical to believe in such an idealistic approach? As we in academia study organizations in which merit is often (usually?) trumped by connections, and in which genuine achievement is often (usually?) overshadowed by other less grand institutional realities, it is difficult to be so idealistic. While writing the great American novel, or the great American higher education curriculum piece may advance my own individual career...I'd still like my odds more if I were the favored nephew of the Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

"If only I (we in criminal justice, ethnic studies, women's studies, teacher education, and the other marginalized disciplines) would try harder....surely we'd not be marginalized anymore." I am willing to keep trying...but I don't buy it, I genuinely believe it's a larger problem than that. I genuinely believe that other marginalized peoples need to do more than simply "try harder." Entry into existing institutional structures requires more than effort...though it surely requires that. Entry into these structures requires effort on the part of the one seeking entry, just as it requires an open-minded awareness and tolerance on the part of the gatekeeper charged with overseeing access. Effort on the part of the uninitiated without tolerance and acceptance on the part of the gatekeeper won't get us in. All of which brings me to still more philosophical questions: Is paranoia born to us, or has it been thrust upon us? Might we be paranoid, even as the larger academy really is out to "get" us? Whether we are paranoid and our "marginalization" is less real than it is perceived; or whether we are on to something

here...is again, an issue for the reader to determine in his or her own mind and taking into account how these disciplines have been treated in his or her own experiences.

While one cannot diminish the impact of paranoia upon one's sense of "place," there are, without question, other factors which have relegated not only me, but those in similar situations, to our relatively low place within the academic pecking order. Wisniewski (2000) cited the "initiation process" that all new faculty members undergo, both informally and formally. Professors learn to "behave properly" within an academic culture which speaks in glowing terms about change, while it resists change as ably as most vocations. Aronowitz (2000) wrote of a "sordid history of academic exclusions" that requires us to revisit the intellectual merits of the "so-called multicultural curriculum movements" (p. 131). Revisiting the intellectual merits of marginalized disciplines as well as established disciplines may bring us closer together than some might want to admit.

Gaff (1991) points to the large numbers of faculty hired in recent decades in professional areas established by colleges as market-responsive career-oriented programs play an ever more central role on college campuses. New faculty members in "suspect" fields necessarily invoke defensiveness on the part of faculty long part of old "regimes." The relationship between defensiveness and an unwillingness to change existing structures needs no further elaboration.

Having now read this work (I hope) the reader of this afterword might share with me the ultimate dichotomy of thought that may lead them toward understanding this authors' academic schizophrenia. Much of this work has been angry, much of it hopeful. Much of it has been a plea for collaboration, much of it an angry attack upon "respected" institutions. Please understand that this dilemma has not been lost on me. I hope that this work exemplifies my belief that we cannot merely accept all "conventional wisdom," and that much of that wisdom, though

wrong, is so entrenched that a shovel with a rather sharp edge must be used to overturn it. Rosenzweig (1998) proclaims:

> "dissent from conventional wisdom is an essential part of reaching for truth, and that dissenters are not only to be protected from sanction but listened to, because truth is often found in unlikely and unlovely places" (p. 175).

As so many writers believe, or at least proclaim to believe, (and at the risk of merely adding to the already overworked "writer as alien" cliche) I began this work feeling somewhat alienated from my surroundings. Such alienation is based partly on my pretentiousness, and more fully upon my perceptions of self that have come from my role as an untenured faculty member in what I perceive to be a rather untraditional, unprestigious and "marginalized" discipline within an academic environment strongly entrenched in tradition. These perceptions have been both heightened and challenged by my participation in numerous campus committees and during an interview process several years ago, which involved a then new opportunity much more within the "mainstream."

Several years ago, and during the initial phases of writing this book, I was invited to interview as an "inside candidate" for the position of Executive Director of my then college's "Institute." The Institute was a newly created "outreach" arm of the college. While my tenure as a professor had been brief, my educational background and rhetorical ability to persuade others of my worth beyond its genuine value were impressive enough, I guess, to warrant consideration (or, my rather unthreatening status as a relatively new and young faculty member could be a way in which the administration might appear to "consider" a faculty member, without genuinely "considering" allowing such an important position to go to anyone other than a businessperson). Having perceived of myself as an "active" faculty member utterly supportive of faculty rights, faculty bargaining, and faculty issues generally, the opportunity to move into an administrative post, would,

I assumed, be both a blessing and a curse, both a "sell-out," in negative terms, and an "infiltration" of college governance by a true blue faculty member, in more favorable terms.

The invitation to interview for this position from the present administration was therefore either a sign that they did not know where my academic heart lied, or that they felt I was the person who could most effectively lead the Institute (or, as was also the case, that their first choice, a person from outside the institution, withdrew his name). In any event, I had no desire to be a "traitor" to the cause of greater faculty empowerment. If I accepted such a position, was I, like so many before, merely abandoning my students for a better salary, larger office, and some level of "power," in which the dreams of enabling institutional and positive change would soon be dashed by the realities of an entrenched bureaucracy, or could I oversee and direct genuine and positive change for the betterment of my college and my community? Beyond the fear of "selling out" and the natural fear of the unknown, lay my satisfaction with the known (I genuinely liked teaching and the daily interaction with students it allowed). Wright (1986) mused: "the profound contradiction between faculty and administrative responsibilities almost certainly makes this dichotomy the most vexing source of role strain in the small college" (p. 35). And so strained, was I.

Still, my fears notwithstanding, having preached the virtue of "interdisciplinarity" and collaboration in my writings and my discussions with faculty, it was perhaps now time to put up or shut up, and attempt to unite faculty, students, staff, and as yet untapped community members together as members of a larger and diverse "learning community." Whether or not my dreams and visions could actually happen in the real world of a market-driven competitive society, how could I pass on the opportunity to be on the ground-floor of a new academic initiative? If I did pass, would such a chance come my way again?

My non-business background, and unionist and academic roots, made me wary of the very concept of an "Institute," largely conceived within the business department, and in which business and business interests would no doubt play a vital, if not exclusive, role. In informal and off-handed pollings of faculty members and students, the Institute concept was negatively viewed as a precurser to the end of the liberal arts tradition of the college and the beginning of an even greater focus on business as a means of increasing college visibility and ultimately, revenues. Clearly, perceptions would need to be altered, mine among them, if the Institute were to be a success, and if the academic environment were to be enriched. Would I be able to look my colleagues in the eyes and assure them that I would be part of a strengthening of the liberal arts and not a weakening of them; that I would be part of the solution and not part of the problem?

As this book addressed, I had and have grave concerns about the continuing encroachment of business interests into academia (concerns that probably would have been better left unstated during the interview process). Had the invitation to apply for this position created merely another "coopted liberal," or was I on the verge of gaining access to decision-making that might allow my "academic views" and the liberal arts generally, more focus than it otherwise might receive? I had I thought, few delusions, I was acutely aware that it was easier to be a liberal who embraced change, both politically and intellectually, when one was "poor" and "outside," than when one was "rich," and an inside member of the power structure. Would I find first-hand that once a person becomes a well-paid administrator, one naturally must lose the values of a poorly-paid teacher? Would my community spirit and belief in collective action evaporate in the face of individual rewards I sought, but to which I had not grown accustomed? I was accustomed to raising questions and probing doubts within my students, but I was more than a bit uncomfortable with the questions and doubts that were playing table tennis

in my mind.

> "Nothing on earth is more contagious than affluence. And few things more corrupting can be found on earth --especially in those areas of function that are by their nature utterly unprepared to deal with it" (Nisbet, 1971, p. 87).

Despite the ideological distance between my ideals and this potential career track, I had rationalized in my own mind at least, that I would not necessarily have to compromise my beliefs if I became a somewhat "willing participant" in the corporatization of the college. My criticisms would be more effective from the inside. As further armor against my thoughts and fears of my own hypocracy, I was certain that whether I was ideologically for or against this developing position, there was nothing I nor any other faculty member could do to prevent the Institute from becoming a reality. After all, I had assured myself, the concept had been blessed by all the administrators and trustees of the college, and would be going forward, with or without me, and with or without faculty support. A director would be hired, whether or not it was me. Moreover, were it not me, I hypothesized, it would likely be someone more sympathetic to business and less ready to defend the traditional integrity of academia. And what about what I owed to my employer? Kluge (1993) in his work *Alma Mater*, attempted to comfort the President of the institution about which he would chronicle, as to why he should be the one to write about the college: "I was better than those more loyal, and more loyal than those who were better." So too it is with me, for my combination of loyalty and ability (in differing and shifting degrees) makes me, if not the best person, at least the best person available, for this work.

If I truly sought change, how better than to become a member of the executive council of the college? Surely I could have more positive influence as an administrator than as a lowly untenured faculty member in a "marginalized" discipline. And so, my odyssey from the "outside" to the "inside" began in my professional life. This

work, as a result, has addressed my hopes that such an odyssey might take place within those disciplines "on the margin," and a true reevaluation of liberal arts education might naturally ensue. In that light, I have already positioned myself as an effective spinmeister, for if no changes occur from a debate over greater inclusion of the "marginalized disciplines," at least the attention garnered from the debate might pave the way for future generations of academic practitioners to enact the changes that my generation suggested.

We're No Longer Even the Masters of our Own Domain

This section's heading is stolen from a classic Seinfeld episode entitled "The Contest" in which the characters challenge one another to tests of will concerning a certain pastime that has nothing whatsoever to do with academia (at least I think it does not). Still, the phrase "master of my domain" came to be a catch phrase from that episode and applies to an article written by Yates (1999) who expressed the academic's now common lament concerning the managerial belief and need for "control" over the workers. The workers, or the human element, remains the one element that is most likely to impede the ability of management to control its domain. Being the masters of our own domain, the sacred province of professionals everywhere, is ever more being usurped by a managerial style more suited to production lines than to any academic endeavor.

Having read *Leasing the Ivory Tower*, and having lived not an entirely sheltered academic existence, I was quite well aware of the ongoing "corporatization" of universities. The ongoing nature of the transformation toward corporate dominance has been long-standing, as is illustrated by remarks made nearly three decades ago, in which Nisbet (1971) was already referring to the "corporatism" of the university as a long-standing part of higher education's history. By the time this book was written, Yates (1999) had confirmed the dying relationship between

scholars and administrators:

> "our administrators have never been scholars and no more so than at present when the very titles so common to academe have been changed to reflect the managerial and business like role those who hold these titles are expected to play. We do not go to the Dean's office but to that of the Vice President for Academic Affairs" (p. 45).

Young (1997) lamented the increased competitiveness in colleges while he acknowledged such an increase was merely a reflection of our larger capitalistic society. Our "superiority as a culture is based on the triumph of some individuals over others, and the degree of their triumph is measured by the booty they bring home" (p. 132). While we must understand such individualism, we need not be willing participants in our academic enclaves. Competing with one another for resources is not only unseemly, it is an extremely ineffective way with which to most appropriately serve the needs of all students.

As a faculty member, I wanted to be on the side of those practicing continued vigilance against the "corporate takeover" of academia. My wishes to remain vigilant can continue, as I did not receive the job I've discussed above...instead it went to a former IBM corporate relations specialist, a person, whom I have no doubt is better qualified for this "sales" position than me. So while one cannot completely discount the potential for bitterness when describing a position one did not receive and/or for a person who was awarded a job I had sought; there is still a sincere and tremendous fear on my part that the more ties to corporate interests that we pursue, the less we function as independent scholars and the more we function as indentured servants pursuing corporate interests both inside and outside the academic setting. Recent concerns about "admissions standards" on that campus, for those entering the Institute have led to a certain defensiveness on the Director's part (rightly or wrongly) and a reluctance to seek and/or respect faculty input outside of business department members closely aligned with the Institute and

its programs. Could this have been predicted...only by anyone with eyes not completely closed to the realities of the encroaching influence of business and corporate interests over academia.

Many colleges today, are looking toward the internet and "distance education" to expand their reach into previously untapped markets. Such outreach programs necessarily mean an increased reliance upon part-time faculty members and technology, and threaten to turn professors into what Fox & Sakolsky (1998) describe as "easily replaceable information providers" (p. 13). A future, however different, and however intellectually bleak, is again easily predictable by all but the most eternal optimists and those suffering from industrial sized denial.

Just as you think it is safe to reenter the fray, even more vivid life experiences tend, sometimes anyhow, to challenge one's academic morality as well as one's sanity. As I neared the end of my days as a faculty member at that previous institution, my work as a member of the admissions committee charged with making admissions decisions on "marginal" students was nearing an end. This work, while somewhat tedious, was generally of minimal intrusion into mine and the other members' lives. The other members consisted of the admissions director, the director of enrollment management (one of a proliferation of vice-presidents in our evolving corporate workplace), a student, one other faculty member and myself. Like at most colleges, I am sure, many students who sought admission to that small, midwestern college, simply did not initially present themselves as clear cases for either admission or rejection. Instead they present themselves on paper as a mass of contradictions and conflicting qualities that often require the committee to balance high test scores against low grades, or low community involvement against extracurricular achievements. Should we admit, defer, or reject? My two year experience on that committee always left me somewhat troubled, as our standards for admission early in the year seemed to fly out the window as summer approached and admissions quotas

needed to be reached. Students with frighteningly low standardized test scores seemed to be getting in with greater regularity and without much discussion, and in fact, as April showers beget May flowers, rejection letters seemingly ceased to be written altogether. It seemed, yet again, that academic integrity and long-term thinking gave way to a need for numbers at seemingly any cost.

What does my service on the admissions committee have in common with the rest of this book? I think, sadly, plenty. My arguments about the "value" of not accepting every student who applied to that particular private college tended to fall upon deaf ears bent only on preserving enrollment projections. Whether it was the ambition of the vice-president for enrollment management and his reluctance to ever give bad news to a group of trustees bent upon increased enrollment, or whether it may have been more simply a self-driven motivation to "succeed," our standards were declining not only before my very eyes, but seemingly against mine and others, very objections. I thought about the long term perceptions of a place in which others were surely going to know, through word-of-mouth in high school corridors alone, about a growing reputation as a place into which entry was not particularly difficult.

Miller (1998) has apocalyptically described our times as "the twilight of the academic profession" (p. 33). Despite such bleak (realistic?) assessments, perhaps there is time before the sun entirely sets upon academia, as many have come to know it, and others of us have come to envision it despite such worthy obstacles as entrenched bureaucracy and everyday realities. Just as I bemoan the tendency in so many to ignore reality and cling unreasonably to arguments that have been proven incorrect, I have my own tendencies in viewing higher education as a last bastion of hope for intellectual debate, vigorous support of reforms and vigilant protection against retrenchments in education and society generally. These tendencies may diminish my standing intellectually (and you should know

that on a given day, these tendencies diminish my intellectual standing even in my own mind), yet nevertheless, these are tendencies I feel compelled to protect before I go the way of so many who use "reality" to silently complain, lament, and despair, instead of loudly acting, reacting, and fighting for the integrity of the professoriate and by extension, of academia. Snider (1999) spoke of "reserve and intellectual timidity masquerading as good manners" (p. A64). Risking confrontation, long the province of professorhood, is seemingly going the way of a "C" grade standing for "average" work. The open exchange of ideas, or as constitutional first amendment scholars might say "the marketplace of ideas," is in danger of closing for good. Changes that might come about, inside and outside of academia, can only be those which don't challenge anyone's "place."

O'Brien (1998) in lamenting the dominance of business as a major on many colleges, and the concomitant lack of political science, philosophy, English, and other more "traditional" majors, came upon the rather painful conclusion that "many 'liberal arts' colleges have become 'business schools' without changing the label" (p. 115). Non-business disciplines, at some places, have as much relationship to the ongoing life of the institution as the ancient words that grace entrances to buildings. One wonders if we exist only to fill out our college catalogs and allow our business schools the luxury of credibly proclaiming their "collegiate" status in their rhetoric and institutional advertising.

Bracey (1997) concludes, in his discussion of the public schools, that "having gotten control of the government, business now looks to the schools as the only thing left to dominate" (p. 163). Certainly, this work has spoken of the corporate domination of workers (both rhetorically, and philosophically) and the corporate domination of policy within the academic sphere. Not all "corporatization" goes unresisted, as a recent grade strike by Yale graduate student teaching assistants illustrated. The strike polarized the Yale campus and briefly propelled the crisis

in graduate education into the spotlight. The strike was, as most strikes are, an employee response to perceived oppressions in the workplace. In the case of Yale, oppressions that included wages too low to allow graduate assistants a life above the poverty level in New Haven, and a complete lack of an institutional voice. In short, the strike was an effort to gain respect and fairness. An effort that, according to Nelson (1997), among others, was met with Yale's increasingly aggressive corporate ideology that expects more of its workers, while treating them with less and less respect and assuring them of their "replaceability." The Yale strike may be compelling evidence, that at many campuses, the "family atmosphere" that is often lauded in collegiate brochures is in reality better suited for a dysfunctional portrayal on the *Jerry Springer Show* rather than a more functional portrayal ala *The Waltons*.

Rowe (1998) cited the importance of critical theory and cultural studies as a means of "effective resistance to the transformation of universities into technological training centers for multinational corporations" (p. 4). The emancipatory nature of critical theory calls for institutional changes that take into account the social function of education.

> "Today,... we are at grave risk of forgetting the fundamental purposes of educating students to think critically: to enable them to become active agents in creating just and diverse societies" (Rowe, 1998, p. 4).

Shor (1996) pointed out the obvious but overlooked reality that evermore plays into life in academia. Persons that have adopted a siege mentality of self-centered anxiety, impatience, and intolerance have difficulty promoting and adhering to Utopian visions of collaboration with colleagues. Separating that which is entirely irrational from that which is merely difficult, might be a laudable starting point at which to "reform" higher education. Unfortunately, as this work hopefully has illustrated, the entrenchment and paranoia that surrounds higher education as we near the turn of the century allows for very few of our intellectual

musings to transcend the barrier from imagination toward implementation. Lessening, or dare I hope even eliminating much of that paranoia, must necessarily evolve from administrations who reject recent business trends, and begin to treat their staffs as highly educated, able, and willing participants in an environment genuinely interested in shared governance, student performance, and an open and honest "search for the truth" at all levels. Solomon (1997) speaks to a professoriate "battered by institutional in-fighting, disciplinary isolation, and the rhetoric of backlash demagogues" (p. 189). Such battered and often embittered professionals, many of whom have made their livings on their ability to understand, appreciate, and even adhere to cynicysm, have much healing to do if collegiate environments can ever truly become the outgrowths of intellectual honesty and integrity that most of us imagine they once were, and many of us fear they shall never be again.

As this work illustrates, management of the academic enterprise by responding to crises as they arise, is neither productive nor even sufficient. Rowley et al., (1998) wrote about the need for "strategic planning" so that institutions of higher learning might better respond to the new information age in which those most broadly educated and best prepared will thrive. Planning strategically, by using the institution-wide human and material resources that are already available upon each college campus, might move all of us toward the more inclusive academy that most of us must surely seek.

A healing process through such simple beginnings of trust and communication between the administration and the faculty showed no sign of taking root at the institution I've described, nor I trust, at many others. Lessons that might have been learned from the anecdote shared earlier in this work seem to have been entirely lost, and decisions made in secret and with no faculty input seem not to be an aberration, but instead are becoming a widely accepted, if however loathed, "community" norm. The very fact that faculty members, a largely underpaid and

undervalued group even in the best of times, might be entirely excluded from important decisions in an increasingly corporate environment is far from surprising; that many doing that undervaluing are administrators who preach a better gospel than they deliver is not so much surprising, as it is depressing. The advent of "virtual" universities that grant degrees to students who've never set foot on any type of real "campus," while largely a regrettable and inevitable occurrence in the age of information, does have some merit in remote areas and for otherwise "distance challenged" participants. Any corollary advent of and dependence upon "virtual" faculty members, cannot possibly be viewed as serving anyone's best interests, with the notable exception of those engaged in education solely for profit.

Education, and higher education particularly, like other social entities, has historically served the reigning political and economic powers (Lisman, 1998). As such a servant, higher education has contributed to both our society's weaknesses and its strengths, and must be assessed not solely upon its successes or failures alone, but upon both in conjunction with one another. The advances made by higher education in America, far outweigh any accompanying reinforcement of inequality to which higher education may have unwittingly (perhaps?) contributed. Still, it should not be ignored that higher education and the institutions that make up various diciplines within higher education have indeed, in their own ways, reinforced existing structures not all of which have been founded upon equality and equal access. Like many books, even some in higher education I suppose, this one attempts to instill in the reader some measure of practical knowledge. While knowledge for its own sake is certainly valuable, practical knowledge that might actually further the goal of a more integrative higher education curriculum is ultimately the goal of this work. My own practical knowledge on this subject has come as a result of my own cumulative experience in coping with particular problems in higher education curriculum development. My own experiences concerning

the "politics" of higher education cannot be discounted, and are interwoven into this work, as I, like nearly everyone else who holds a job in our society, have confronted the day-to-day workplace occurrences that cannot always best be explained by logic. These occurrences have a tremendous impact upon our senses of identity, and, in higher education, upon the ultimate "place" that is assigned to us and to the disciplines in which we practice. Just as I have learned from others, I am attempting to seek and cultivate better and more effective ways of doing things, and, as a professor, to transmit this knowledge to others. This book is not the end, merely a means of relaying the knowledge that I have gained, so that others concerned with their own discipline's "place" within higher education might benefit from my experiences. Having said that, the book has also been a reflection of an academic life often lived in quiet desperation, and of a writing style borne of the natural sarcasm that frequently accompanies exasperation. The exasperation, however, is far from total. The belief that one person and/or one teacher cannot have any real effect can and does lead to cynicism, hopelessness, and inaction. This work has established, I hope, that such cynicism must be overcome and that making positive changes, even through small inroads into entrenched tradition, is completely worthwhile. Through the writing, I have hoped to engage the reader in what has become a journey of personal as well as professional transformation.

It is, I surmise, up to the reader to consider whether the fears addressed in this work are real or imagined, and whether ultimately, they are spoken out of genuine concern for academia, or by an embittered and disenchanted professor (which, by the way, if you read D'Souza, or Kimball, you might believe is the *only* kind of professor). Whether the reader agrees with my points, disagrees with them, or views them as utterly absurd, the goal is to persuade the reader not of their correctness, but of the worth of their consideration, and the need to discuss more openly that which we have tended, and still tend to ignore. Perhaps Utopia cannot be found, but progress toward more Utopian ideals can surely be

made, and hope of that progress must not be abandoned. To find that Utopia, we must do as Giroux (1997) suggests:

> "educators need to become provocateurs; they need to take a stand while refusing to be involved in either a cynical relativism or doctrinaire politics...central to intellectual life is the pedagogical and political imperative that academics engage in rigorous social criticism while becoming a stubborn force for challenging false prophets, deconstructing social relations that promote material and symbolic violence, and speaking the 'truth' to dominant forms of power and authority" (p. 268).

Amen.

References

Alcorn, A. (1997). Murder in the Museum of Man. Cambridge, MA: Zoland Books.

Allan, G. (1997). Rethinking College Education. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas press.

Allen, A.T. (1996, Autumn). The March through the Institutions: Women's Studies in the United States and West and East Germany, 1980-1995. Signs,22(1): 152-180.

Anderson, C.W. (1993). Prescribing the Life of the Mind: An Essay on the Purpose of the University, the Aims of Liberal Education, The Competence of Citizens, and the Cultivation of Practical Reason. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Applebee, A.N. (1996). Curriculum as Conversation: Transforming Traditions of Teaching and Learning. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Armstrong, F. (1980). Faculty Development through Interdisciplinarity. Journal of General Education,32(1): 62-63.

Arnold, G. & Civian, J.T. (1997, July/August). The Ecology of General Education Reform. Change,29(4): 19-23.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning. Boston: The Beacon Press.

Austensen, R.A. (1997). Faculty relations and professional development: Best practices for the chief academic officer. In James Martin, James E. Samels, and Associates, (Eds.), First Among Equals: The Role of the Chief Academic Officer (pp. 21-40). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Austin, A.E. & Baldwin, R.G. (1991). Faculty Collaboration: Enhancing the Quality of Scholarship and Teaching. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Baiocco, S.A. & DeWaters, J.N. (1998). Successful College Teaching: Problem Solving Strategies of Distinguished Professors. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Baldi, S. (1997, Spring). Departmental Quality Ratings and Visibility: The Advantages of Size and Age. The American Sociologist,28(1): 89-101.

Baldi, S. (1994). Changes in the Stratification Structures of Sociology. The American Sociologist,25(4): 28-43.

Barzun, J. (1991). Begin Here: The Forgotten Conditions of Teaching and Learning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beane, J.A. (1997). Curriculum Integration: Designing the Core of Democratic Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

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

the Disciplines. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

Bedeian, A.G. (1996). Lessons Learned Along the Way: Twelve Suggestions for Optimizing Career Success. In P.J. Frost & M.S. Taylor (Eds.), Rhythms of Academic Life: Personal Accounts of Careers in Academia (pp. 3-9). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Begley, S. (October 30, 2000). A Crucial Test for Feminism: Some Scholars think the field of women's studies is having a midlife crisis. Newsweek, 136(18): 70-71.

Bender, T. & Schorske, C.E. (Eds.). (1997). American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bennett, J.B. (1998). Collegial Professionalism: The Academy, Individualism, and the Common Good. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Bennis, W. & Biederman, P.W. (1997). Organizing Genius: The Secrets of Creative Collaboration. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Bercovitch, S. (1998). The Function of the Literary in a Time of Cultural Studies. In J.C. Rowe (Ed.), Culture and the Problem of the Disciplines (pp. 69-86). New York: Columbia University Press.

Berger, B.M. (1995). An Essay on Culture: Symbolic Structure and Social Structure. Berkeley: CA: University of California Press.

Berger, P. (1979). The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Bergin, T.F. The Law Teacher: A Man Divided Against Himself. Virginia Law Review,54, 866.

Bess, J.L. & Associates. (2000). Teaching Alone, Teaching Together: Transforming the Structure of Teams for Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Beyer, J.M. (1997). Organizational Cultures and Faculty Motivation. In J.L. Bess (Ed.), Teaching Well and Liking It: Motivating Faculty to Teach Effectively (pp. 145-172). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Beyer, L.E. & Apple, M.W. (1998). Values and Politics in the Curriculum. In L.E. Beyer & M.W. Apple (Eds.), The Curriculum: Problems, Politics, and Possibilities (pp. 3-17). Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press.

Beyer, L.E., Feinberg, W., Pagano, J., Whitson, J.A. (1989). Preparing Teachers as Professionals: The Role of Educational Studies and Other Liberal Disciplines. New York: Teachers College Press.

Blackburn, R.T. & Lawrence, J.H. (1995). Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bledstein, B.J. (1976). The Culture of Professionalism. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Bloland, H.G. (1995, September/October). Postmodernism and Higher Education. Journal of Higher Education,66(5): 521-559.

Bogue, E.G. (1994). Leadership by Design: Strengthening Integrity in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bok, D. (1986). Higher Learning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bok, D. (1990). Universities and the Future of America. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bok, D. (1993). The Cost of Talent. New York: The Free Press.

Bok, D. (1996). The State of the Nation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Botstein, L. (1997). Jefferson's Children: Education and the Promise of American Culture. New York: Doubleday.

Boudreau, T.E. (1998). Universitas: The Social Restructuring of American Undergraduate Education. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bowles, B. (1997). The Myth of Management: Direction and Failure in Contemporary Organizations. Human Relations,50(7): 779-803.

Boxer, M.J. (1998). When Women Ask The Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Boyer, E. (1987). College. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyes, W.J., Happel, S.K., & Hogan, T.D. (1984). Publish or perish: Fact or fiction. Journal of Economic Education,15: 136-141.

Brademas, J. (1986, September 3). Remarks at the Symposium on "Corporations at Risk: Liberal Learning and Private Enterprise," sponsored by the Corporate Council on the Liberal Arts in association with the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, MA.

Bracey, G.W. (1997). Setting the Record Straight: Responses to Misconceptions About Public Education in the United States. Alexandria, VA: ASCD Press.

Brint, S. (1994). In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, D.W. (1995). When Strangers Cooperate: Using Social Conventions to Govern Ourselves. New York: The Free Press.

Bruffee, K.A. (1993). Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins

University Press.

Bruner, C. (1991). Thinking Collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services (pp. 4-31). Washington, D.C.: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Cahn, S.M. (1986). Saints and Scamps: Ethics in Academia. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Caldwell, M. (1999). A Short History of Rudeness: Manners, Morals, and Misbehaviors in Modern America. New York: Picador USA.

Carfagna, R. (1997). Collaboration and Administration of the Core Curriculum. Journal of General Education,46(1): 56-68.

Carnochan, W.B. (1993). The Battleground of the Curriculum: Liberal Education and the American Experience. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Carter, G.L. (1983). A Perspective on Preparing Adult Educators. In S.M. Grabowski (ed.), Strengthening Connections Between Education And Performance. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, no. 18. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chait, R.P., Holland, T.P., Taylor, B.E. (1996). Improving the Performance of Governing Boards. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Clewett, R.M., Jr. (1998). A General Education Focus for the Coming Years. Journal of General Education,47(4): 265-281.

Clifford, G.J. & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). Ed School: A Brief For Professional Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, A.M. (1998). The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, M.N. (1998). Culture of Intolerance: Chauvinism, Class, and Racism in the United States. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Coleman, R.P. & Rainwater, L. (1978). Social Standing in America. New York: Basic Books.

Collett, J. & Karakashian, S. (Eds.). (1996). Greening the College Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Collins, R. (1979). The Credential Society. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Colman, R. (1991). Escape from Folly: Academic Standards and the Liberal Arts. In B.A. Scott (Ed.). The Liberal Arts in a Time of Crisis (pp. 169-182). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Colton, J. (1988). The Role of the Department in the Groves of Academe. In A.L. Deneef, C.D. Goodwin, & E.S. McCrate (Eds.), The Academic's Handbook (pp. 261-281). Durham,

NC:Duke University Press.

Cooper, D.D. (1996, Winter). The Changing Seasons of Liberal Learning. The Midwest Quarterly,37(2): 119-138.

Costanza, R. (1990). Escaping the Overspecialization Trap. In M. Clark & S.E. Wawrytko (Eds.). Rethinking the Curriculum: Toward an Integrated, Interdisciplinary College Education, (pp. 95-106). New York: Greenwood Press.

Craib, I. (1998). Experiencing Identity. London: Sage Publications.

Cross, K.P. (1986). New Students in New Bottles. In W.A.W. Neilson & C. Gaffield (Eds.), Universities in Crisis: A Mediaeval Institution in the Twenty-first Century (pp. 215-230). Montreal, Quebec: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Cuban, L. (1999). How Scholars Trumped Teachers: Change Without Reform in University Curriculum, Teaching, and Research, 1890-1990. New York: Teachers College Press.

Currie, E. (1995). The Culture of Social Irresponsibility Causes Crime. In David Bender & Bruno Leone, (Eds.). Crime and Criminals: Opposing Viewpoints (pp. 58-66). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

Curry, R.O. (1991). Acknowledgments. In R.O. Curry & L.B. Goodheart (Eds.). American Chameleon: Individualism in Trans-National Context (pp. ix-xi). Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press.

Cyert, R.M. (1979). Governance and Administration of the University. In Clarence C. Walton & Frederick deW. Bolman, (Eds.). Disorders in Higher Education (pp. 90-117). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Damrosch, D. (1995). We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Davis, D.E., & Astin, H.S. (1987). Reputational standing in academe. Journal of Higher Education,58: 261-275.

Dawson, Nancy (Fall 1999). Limitations or Liberation: An Investigation Into the Benefits of a Master's Degree in Africana Studies, Western Journal of Black Studies, 23(3): 168-181.

Delucchi, M. (1997, July/August). "Liberal Arts" Colleges and the Myth of Uniqueness. Journal of Higher Education,68(4): 414-426.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education. (1966 reprint, New York: Free Press.

Dewhurst, D. (1997, Fall). Education and Passion. Educational Theory,47(4): 477-487.

Dilts, D.A., Haber, L.J., Bialik, D. (1994). Assessing What Professors Do: An Introduction to Academic Performance Appraisal in Higher Education. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Domhoff, G.W. (1998). Who Rules America? Power and Politics in the Year 2000 (3rd Ed). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Domhoff, G.W. (1996). State Autonomy or Class Dominance?Case Studies on Policy Making in America. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Downs-Lombardi, J. (1997). Ten Teaching Tips for Newcomers. College Teaching,44(2): 62-64.

Dubos, R. (1962). The Torch of Life. New York: Pocket Books.

Ducharme, E.R., & Ducharme, M.K. (1996). Development of the Teacher Education Professoriate. In F.B. Murray (Ed.), The Teacher Educator's Handbook: Building a Knowledge Base for the Preparation of Teachers, (pp. 691- 714). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Edelstein, M.G. (1997). Academic Governance: The Art of Herding Cats. In James Martin, James E. Samels, and Associates, (Eds.), First Among Equals: The Role of the Chief Academic Officer (pp. 21-40). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Egan, G., & Cowan, M. (1979). People in Systems: A model for development in the human services professions and education. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Egan, K. (1997). The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape Our Understanding. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ehrenberg, R.G. (2000). Tuition Rising: Why College Costs So Much. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ellwood, C. (1995). Preparing Teachers for Education in a Diverse World. In Rethinking Schools: An Agenda for Change, D. Levine, R. Lowe, B. Peterson, R. Tenorio, Eds. (pp. 246-252). New York: The New Press.

Engel, J.B. (1989, February). Preserving Quality: teacher training from a liberal arts perspective. Phi Delta Kappan,70(6): 475-477.

Engel, M. (1991). Ideology and the Politics of Public Higher Education: Responses to Budget Crises and Curricular Reorganization. In B.A. Scott (Ed.). The liberal Arts in a Time of Crisis (pp. 33-45). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Engvall, R.P. (1997). The Professionalization of Teaching:Is it Truly Much Ado About Nothing? Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Ephross, P.H. & Vassil, T.V. (1988). Groups That Work: Structure and process. New York: Columbia University Press.

Epstein, C.F. (1988). Deceptive Distinctions: Sex, Gender, and the Social Order. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Etzioni, A. (1995). The Attack on Community: The Grooved Debate. Society,32(5), 12-17.

Fagin, L. (1998). Paranoia in institutional life: the death-throes of the asylum. In J.H. Berke, S. Pierides, A. Sabbadini, S. Schneider (Eds.), Even Paranoids Have Enemies (pp. 111-124). London: Routledge.

Farley, E. (1997, February 5-12). Why Seminaries don't change: A Reflection on faculty specialization. The Christian Century,114(5), 133-143.

Finkelstein, M.J., Seal, R.K., Schuster, J.H. (1998). The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transformation. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fiske, E. B. (1991). Smart Schools, Smart Kids. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Flacks, R. & Thomas, S.L. (1998, November 27). Among Affluent Students, a Culture of Disengagement. Chronicle of Higher Education,95(14): A48.

Fox, D. & Sakolsky, R. (1998, Fall). From Radical University to Agent of the State. Radical Teacher,53: 13-18.

Freedman, J.O. (1996). Idealism and Liberal Education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Freidson, E. (1970). The Profession of Medicine. New York: Dodd & Mead Publishing.

Freidson, E. (1986). Professional Powers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: The Seabury Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change Forces. New York: Falmer.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1996). What's Worth Fighting For in Your School? New York: Teachers College Press.

Fuller, T. (1989). Introduction. In T. Fuller, (Ed.). The Voice of Liberal Learning: Michael Oakeshott on Education (pp. 1-16). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Furman, G. H. (1994, August). Outcome-Based Education and Accountability. Education and Urban Society,26(4): 417-437.

Gaff, J.G. (1991). New Life for the College Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers.

Gallagher, K.S. & Bailey, J.D. (January & March 2000). The Politics of Teacher Education Reform: Strategic Philanthropy and Public Policy Making. Educational Policy,14(1): 11-24.

Garcia, J.L.A. (1994). The Aims of the University and the Challenge of Diversity: Bridging the Traditionalist/Multiculturalist Divide. In M.N.S. Sellers (Ed.), An Ethical Education: Community and Morality in the Multicultural University (pp. 21-48). Providence, RI: Berg Publishers.

Gardner, H. (1999). The Disciplined Mind: What All Students Should Understand. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Garger, S. (1995). Bronx Syndrome. In C.L. Barney Dews & C.L. Law, (Eds.). This Fine Place So Far From Home: Voices of Academics from the Working Class (pp. 41-53). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gelwick, R. (1983). Truly Interdisciplinary Study and Commitment to Relativism. Soundings,66(4): 422-436.

Getman, J. (1992). In the Company of Scholars: The Struggle for the Soul of Higher Education. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

Giamatti, A.B. (1988). A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Gibeaut, J. (1998, April). Secret Justice. American Bar Association Journal,84 :50-55.

Giczkowski, W. (1995, July/August). Are traditional general education requirements right for adult students? Adult Learning,6(6): 12-14.

Giroux, H.A. (2000). Stealing Innocence:Youth, Corporate Power, and the Politics of Culture. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1997). Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., Maeroff, G.I. (1997). Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gleckner, R.F. (1988). A Taxonomy of Colleges and Universities. In A.L. Deneef, C.D. Goodwin, & E.S. McCrate (Eds.), The Academic's Handbook (pp. 4-18). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Glickman, C.D. (1998). Revolutionizing America's Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Gordon, E.W. & Bhattacharyya, M. (1999). Human Diversity, Cultural Hegemony, and the Integrity of the Academic Canons, In E.W. Gordon, Education and Justice (pp. 156-171). New York: Teachers College Press.

Graham, P.A. (1992). SOS: Sustain Our Schools. New York: Hill and Wang.

Granfield, R. (1992). Making Elite Lawyers: Visions of Law at Harvard and Beyond. New York: Routledge.

Greenberg, D. (1998, June 1). Small Men on Campus: The shrinking college president. New Republic,218(22): 16-21.

Greene, M.S., Lounsberry, G., Isaacs, M.L., McGaha, J.E., & Cozzetto, D.A. (1998). Interdisciplinary Partnerships: The University's Role as Change Agent. National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal,15(2): 8-20.

Grossberg, L. (1992). We Gotta Get Out of This Place. New York: Routledge.

Grossman, P.L. (1990). The Making of a Teacher. New York: Teachers College Press.

Guinier, L., Fine, M., Balin, J. (1997). Becoming Gentlemen: Women, Law School, and Institutional Change. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hacker, A. (1997). Money: Who Has How Much and Why. New York: Scribner.

Hamper, B. (1991). Rivethead. New York: Times Warner, Inc.

Harpool, D. (1996). The Sibley Hospital Case: Trustees and Their Loyalty to the Institution. Journal of College and University Law,23(2): 255-283.

Hass, A. (1998). Doing the Right Thing: Cultivating Your Moral Intelligence. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hauerwas, S.M. (1988). The Morality of Teaching. In A.L. Deneef, C.D. Goodwin, & E.S. McCrate (Eds.), The Academic's Handbook (pp. 19-28). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Havel, V. (1985). The Power of the Powerless. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Hersh, R.H. (1997, March/April). Intentions and perceptions: A national survey of public attitudes toward liberal arts education. Change,29(2): 16-23.

Hinchey, P.H. (1998). Finding Freedom in the Classroom: A Practical Introduction to Critical Theory. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr. (1996). The Schools We Need: & Why We Don't Have Them. New York: Doubleday.

Hirschi, T. (1972). Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hlebowitsh, P.S. (1993). Radical Curriculum Theory Reconsidered: A Historical Approach. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hochman, H.M. (1994, November). Economics and Distributive Ethics. Society,32(1): pp. 35-42.

Holden, R.N. (1998, March). Criminal Justice Education: In Search of a Model, paper presented to the Annual convention of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Albuquerque.

hooks, bell. (1994). Teaching to Transgress. New York: Routledge.

Houston, B. (1996). Gender Freedom and the Subtleties of Sexist Education. In A. Diller, B.

Houston, K.P. Morgan, and M. Ayim, The Gender Question in Education: Theory, Pedagogy, & Politics, (pp. 50-63): Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Houston, G.R., Jr. (1996, Fall). Bury the liberal vs. professional arts debate. Education,117(1): 12-17.

Howard, G.R. (1999). We Can't Teach What We Don't Know: White Teachers, Multiracial Schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Howard, J.A. & Hollander, J. (1997). Gendered Situations, Gendered Selves. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Howley, C.B., Howley, A., Pendarvis, E.D. (1995). Out of Our Minds: Anti- Intellectualism and Talent Development in American Schooling. New York: Teachers College Press.
Imig, D.G. (1985). Teacher Education. In J.N. Mangieri (Ed.), Excellence in Education (pp. 117-152). Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Jackson, J. (1998). Bureaucracies at Work. In J.H. Berke, S. Pierides, A. Sabbadini, S. Schneider (Eds.), Even Paranoids Have Enemies (pp. 125- 138). London: Routledge.

Jacobs, R.O. (1991). Why Boards Miss Black Holes. Across the Board,28(6): 51- 55.

Jalongo, M.R. & Isenberg, J.P. (1995). Teachers' Stories: From Personal Narrative to Professional Insight. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Johnstone, D.B., Dye, N.S., Johnson, R. (1998, Spring). Collaborative Leadership: For Institutional Change. Liberal Education,84(2): 12-19.

Jones, B.A. (1992). Collaboration: The case for indigenous community-based organization support of dropout prevention programming and implementation. The Journal of Negro Education,61(4): 496-508.

Jones, B.A. (1996). School-Community Based organization collaboratives: differentiating between "different characteristics." Educational Research Quarterly,20(2): 3-16.

Kanter, S.L., Gamson, Z.F., London, H.B., Arnold, G.B., and Civian, J.T. (1997). Revitalizing General Education in a Time of Scarcity: A Navigational Chart for Administrators and Faculty. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kaplan, R.D. (1998). An Empire Wilderness: Travels into America's Future. New York: Random House.

Karabell, Z. (1998). What's College For: The Struggle to Define American Higher Education. New York: Basic Books.

Karl, B. (1974). Charles Merriam and the Study of Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kasten, K.L. (1984). Tenure and merit pay as reward for research, teaching, and service at a research university. Journal of Higher Education, 55, 500-514.

Katchadourian, H.A. & Boli, J. (1994). Cream of the Crop: The Impact of Elite Education in the Decade After College. New York: Basic Books.

Katchadourian, H.A. & Boli, J. (1985). Careerism and Intellectualism Among College Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Katz, J. (1997). Virtuous Reality. New York: Random House.
Katz, J. & Henry, M. (1993). Turning Professors into Teachers: A new approach to faculty development and student learning. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Katz, M. (1987). Reconstructing American Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Katzenbach, J.R. & Smith, D.K. (1993). The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Kaufman, R., Westland, C., & Engvall, R. (1997, March/April). The Dichotomy Between the Concept of Professionalism and the Reality of Sexism in Teaching. Journal of Teacher Education,48(2): 118-128.

Kelley, M.R., Pannapacker, W., Wiltse, E. (1998, December 18). Scholarly Associations Must Face the True Causes of the Academic Job Crisis.
Chronicle of Higher Education, 45(17): B4-B5.

Kennedy, D. (1997). Academic Duty. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (1963). The Uses of the University. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kimball, R. (1990). Tenured Radicals: How Politics Corrupted our Higher Education. New York: Harper & Row.

Klein, J.T. (1990). Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Kluge, P.F. (1993). Alma Mater: A College Homecoming. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publising Co.

Knox, W.E., Lindsay, P., & Kolb, M.N. (1993). Does College Make a Difference? Longterm Changes in Attitudes and Activities. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Koerner, J.D. (1970). The Parsons College Bubble: A Tale of Higher Education in America. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Koerner, J. (1963). The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kolodny, A. (1998). Failing the Future: A Dean Looks at Higher Education. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kramer, R. (1991). Ed School Follies: The Miseducation of America's Teachers. New York: The

Free Press.

Kreuter, G.V.L. (1996). Forgotten Promise: Race and Gender Wars on a Small College Campus. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kronick, R.F. & Hargis, C.H. (1998). Dropouts: Who Drops Out and Why-And the Recommended Action (2nd Ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.

Kuttner, R. (1997). Everything For Sale: The Virtues and Limits of Markets. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Labaree, D.F. (1999, January/February). Too Easy a Target: The Trouble with Ed Schools and the Implications for the University. Academe,85(1): 34-39.

Ladd, E.C., Jr., & Lipset, S.M. (1975). The Divided Academy. New York: McGraw Hill.

Lamont, M. (1992). Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lanham, R.A. (1992). The Extraordinary Convergence: Democracy, Technology, Theory, and the University Curriculum. In D.J. Gless & B.H. Smith (Eds.). The Politics of Liberal Education (pp. 33-56). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Law, C.L. (1995). In C.L. Barney Dews and C.L. Law (Eds.), This Fine Place So Far From Home: Voices of Academics from the Working Class. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lawrence, R. (1995). Classrooms vs. Prison Cells: Funding Policies For Education and Corrections. Journal of Crime and Justice,18(2), 113- 126.

Lazerson, M. (1997, March/April). Who Owns Higher Education? Change,29(2): 10- 15.

Lee, A.M. (1991). The Dread of Innovation in Universities. In B.A. Scott (Ed.). The liberal Arts in a Time of Crisis (pp. 55-61). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Lemert, C. (1997). Social Things: An Introduction to the Sociological Life. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Leslie, L.L. & Rhoades, G. (1995, March/April). Rising Administrative Costs: Seeking Explanations. Journal of Higher Education,66(2): 187-212.

Levin, M. (1998). Teach me! Kids Will Learn When Oppression is the Lesson. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Levine, L.W. (1996). The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History. Boston: Beacon Press.

Levins, R. & Lewontin, R. (1985). The Dialectical Biologist. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lewis, L.S. (1996). Marginal Worth: Teaching and the Academic Labor Market. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Lewis , M.G. (1993). Without a Word: Teaching Beyond Women's Silence. New York: Routledge.

Lightfoot, S.L. (1999). Respect: An Exploration. Reading, Massachusetts: Perseus Books.

Lincoln, C.E. (1996). Coming Through the Fire: Surviving Race and Place in America. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lindskoog, D.P. (1995). The Idea of Psychology: Reclaiming the Discipline's Identity. Washington D.C.: Howard University Press.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1984). Gender Roles and Power. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lisman, C.D. (1998). Toward A Civil Society: Civic Literacy and Service Learning. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Loeb, P.R. (1994). Generation at the Crossroads: Apathy and Action on the American Campus. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

London,H.I. (1993). Introduction. In The American University,2nd. Ed., J. Barzun (pp. ix-xxxii). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lucas, C.J. (1994). American Higher Education: A History. New York: St. Martin's Press.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1987). Feminism Unmodified. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Maher, F. & Tetreault, M.K. (1999, January/February). Knowledge Versus Pedagogy: The Marginalization of Teacher Education. Academe,85(1): 40- 43.

Margolis, R. & Romero, M. (1998, Spring). The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative: The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments. Harvard Educational Review,68(1): 1-32.

Markie, P.J. (1994). A Professor's Duties: Ethical Issues in College Teaching. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Martin, W.B. (1982). College of Character. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Martinello, M.L. & Cook, G.E. (1994). Interdisciplinary Inquiry in Teaching and Learning. New York: MacMillan College Publishing.

Martinez, J.G.R. & Martinez, N.C. (1997, Winter). Academe's Secret Problem: The Tug of War between Privilege and Equal Opportunity. Journal of Thought,32(4): 73-84.

Massy, W.F.; Wilger, A.K.; Colbeck, C. (1994, July/August). Overcoming "Hollowed" Collegiality: Departmental Cultures and Teaching Quality. Change, 11-20.

Matthews, A. (1997). Bright College Years: Inside the American Campus Today. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mayhew, L.B., Ford, P.J., Hubbard, D.L. (1990). The Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the 1990s. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

McFarland, D. & Taggie, B.F. (1990). Cutting the Gordian Knot: Secrets of Successful Curricular Integration. In M. Clark & S.E. Wawrytko (Eds.). Rethinking the Curriculum: Toward and Integrated, Interdisciplinary College Education, (pp. 229-241). New York: Greenwood Press.

McGuire, C.H. (1993). Sociocultural Changes Affecting Professions and Professionals, In L. Curry, J. Wergin, and Associates Educating Professionals (3-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

McLure, G.T. & McLure, J.W. (1977). Women's Studies. Washington D.C.: National Education Association.

McMurrin, S.M. (1976). The Philosophy of Education. In S.M. McMurrin (Ed.). On The Meaning of the University, (pp. 1-12). Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.

Menand, L. (1997).Re-imagining Liberal Education. In R. Orrill (Ed.). Education and Democracy: Re-imagining Liberal Learning in America (pp. 1-19). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Menand, L. (1996). The Limits of Academic Freedom. In L. Menand (Ed.). The Future of Academic Freedom, (pp. 3-20). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meyer, S.G. (2000). As Long As They Don't Move Next Door: Segregation and Racial Conflict in American Neighborhoods. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Mill, J.S. (1956). On Liberty [C.V. Shields, Ed.] Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Millard, R.M. (1991). Today's Myths and Tomorrow's Realities: Overcoming Obstacles to Academic Leadership in the 21st Century. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, G.E. (1988). The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Curriculum Paradigm. New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, R.E. (1998). As If Learning Mattered: Reforming Higher Education. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Mills, N. (1997). The Triumph of Meanness: America's War Against Its Better Self. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Minow, M. (1997). Not Only for Myself: Identity, Politics, and the Law. New York: The New Press.

Minow, M. (1990). Making All the Difference. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Mitchell, T.N. (1999, March/April). From Plato to the Internet. Change,31(2): 17-22.

Mitroff,I.I., & Bennis, W. (1993). The Unreality Industry: The Deliberate Manufacturing of Falsehood and What it is Doing to our Lives. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mohanty, C.T. (1997). Dangerous Territories, Territorial Power, and Education. In L.G. Roman & L. Eyre (Eds.), Dangerous Territories: Struggles for Difference and Equality in Education, (pp. ix-xvii). New York: Routledge, Inc.

Monk, R.C. (2000). Introduction: Issues in Race and Ethnicity. In R.C. Monk (Ed.), Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in Race and Ethnicity, 3rd Ed., (pp. xv-xxiii). Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw Hill.

Morgan, K.P. (1996). Describing the Emperor's New Clothes: Three Myths of Educational (In-)Equity. In A. Diller, B. Houston, K.P. Morgan, and M. Ayim, The Gender Question in Education: Theory, Pedagogy, & Politics, (pp. 105-122): Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Morn, F. (1995). Academic Politics and the History of Criminal Justice Education. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Mourad, R.P., Jr. (1997). Postmodern Philosophical Critique and the Pursuit of Knowledge in Higher Education. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Neely, P. (1999, Winter). The Threats to Liberal Arts Colleges. Daedulus 128(1): 27-45.

Nelson, C. (1997). Manifesto of a Tenured Radical. New York: New York University Press.

Nelson, C. & Berube, M. (1995). Introduction: A Report from the Front. In M. Berube & C. Nelson (Eds). Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics, and the Crisis of the Humanities (pp. 1-32). New York: Routledge.

Nelson, C. & Watt, S. (1999). Academic Keywords: A Devil's Dictionary for Higher Education. New York: Routledge.

Nisbet, R.A. (1971). The Degradation of the Academic Dogma. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Noel, L. (1994). Intolerance: A General Survey. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Nussbaum, M.C. (1997). Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Oakley, F. (1992). Against Nostalgia: Reflections on Our Present Discontents in American Higher Education. In D.J. Gless & B.H. Smith (Eds.). The Politics of Liberal Education (pp. 267-289). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

O'Brien, G.D. (1991). What to Expect From College: A University President's Guide for Students and Parents. New York: St. Martin's Press.

O'Brien, G.D. (1998). All the Essential Half-Truths about Higher Education. Chicago: University of

Chicago Press.

Ogloff, J.R., Tomkins, A.J., Bersoff, D.N. (1996, March). Education and Training in Psychology and Law/Criminal Justice: Historical Foundations, Present Structures, and Future Developments. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 23(1): 200-235.

Painter, N.I. (2000, December 15). Black Studies, Black Professors, and the Struggles of Perception. The Chronicle of Higher Education,47(16): B7-B9.

Palmer, P.J. (1993, November/December). Good Talk About Good Teaching: Improving Teaching Through Conversation and Community. Change,25(6): 8- 13.

Panaritis, P. (1995, April). Beyond Brainstorming:Planning a Successful Interdisciplinary Program. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(8): 623-628.

Peddiwell, J. Abner (Harold Benjamin) (1939). The Saber-Tooth Curriculum. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peterson, R.W. (1990). Why Not a Separate College of Integrated Studies? In M. Clark & S.E. Wawrytko (Eds.). Rethinking the Curriculum: Toward and Integrated, Interdisciplinary College Education, (pp. 215-226). New York: Greenwood Press.

Phipps, R.A. (1995, Fall). The Theology of Faculty: A Religion of Higher Education. Colleges and Universities, 71(2): 20-24.

Podgorecki, A. (1997). Higher Faculties: A Cross-National Study of University Culture. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Poovey, M. (1995). The Differences of Women's Studies: The Example of Literary Criticism. In D.C. Stanton & A.J. Stewart, (Eds.), Feminisms in the Academy, (pp. 135-156). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Postman, N. (1988). Conscientious Objections. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Postman, N. & Weingartner, C. (1969). Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press.

Pratt, L.R. (1997). Disposable Faculty: Part-time Exploitation as Management Strategy. In C. Nelson (Ed.). Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor inCrisis, (pp. 264-277). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Purpel, D.E. (1999). Moral Outrage in Education. New York: Peter Lang Publishers.

Readings, B. (1996). The University in Ruins. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rees, M. (1976). The Ivory Tower and the Marketplace. In S.M. McMurrin (Ed.). On the Meaning of the University, (pp. 81-101). Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.

Reich, R.B. (2001). The Future of Success. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publishers.

Reid, W.A. (1999). Curriculum as Institution and Practice: Essays in the Deliberative Tradition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Reiman, J. (1998). The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison: Ideology, Class, and Criminal Justice (5th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Reynolds, L.T. (1998, Spring). Two Deadly Diseases and One Nearly Fatal Cure: The Sorry State of American Sociology. The American Sociologist,29(1): 20-37.

Reynolds, R.J. (1995, May/June). The Professional Self-Esteem of Teacher Educators. Journal of Teacher Education,46(3): 216-226.

Rhodes, F.H.T. (1998). The University and Its Critics, In W.G. Bowen & H.T. Shapiro (Eds.), Universities and Their Leadership (pp. 3-14). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rice, R.E. & Richlin, L. (1993). Broadening the Concept of Scholarship in the Professions, In L. Curry, J. Wergin, and Associates Educating Professionals (pp. 279-315). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Riesman, D. (1980). On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ritzer, G. (1995). Expressing America: A Critique of the Global Credit Card Society. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Ritzer, G. (1996). The McDonaldization of Society. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Robins, L. (1966). Deviant Children Grown Up. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.

Rojstaczer, S. (1999). Gone for Good: Tales of University Life after the Golden Age. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rorty, R. (1995, January). Demonizing the Academy. Harper's Magazine,289(1736): 13-18.

Rosenau, P.M. (1992). Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenzweig, R.M. (1998). The Political University: Policy, Politics, and Presidential Leadership in the American Research University. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rowe, J.C. (1998). Introduction. In J.C. Rowe (Ed.), Culture and the Problem of the Disciplines, (pp. 1-13). New York: Columbia University Press.

Rowley, D.J., Lujan, H.D., Dolence, M.G. (1998). Strategic Choices for the Academy: How Demand for Lifelong Learning Will Re-Create Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rubenstein, R.E. (1990). The Limitations of Political Theory for Analyzing Conflict. In M. Clark & S.E. Wawrytko (Eds.). Rethinking the Curriculum: Toward and Integrated, Interdisciplinary

College Education, (pp. 67-75). New York: Greenwood Press.

Rush, S. E. (1994). Understanding Affirmative Action: One Feminist's Perspective. In M.N.S. Sellers (Ed.), An Ethical Education: Community and Morality in the Multicultural University (pp. 195-232). Providence, RI: Berg Publishers.

Russo, J. & Corbin, B.R. (1999). Work, Organized Labor, and the Catholic Church: Boundaries and Opportunities for Community/Labor Coalitions. In B. Nissen (Ed.), Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and International Transformations (pp. 95-111). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Russo, R. (1997). Straight Man. New York: Random House.

Ryan, A. (1998). Liberal Anxieties and Liberal Education. New York: Hill & Wang.

Sanchez, W. & Fried, J. (1997). Giving Voice to Students' Narratives: cultural criticism and education in the helping/service professions. College Teaching,45(1): 26-31.

Sanders, B. (1998). The Private Death of Public Discourse. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sarason, S.B. (1999). Teaching as a Performing Art. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sarason, S.B. (1993). You Are Thinking of Teaching? Opportunities, Problems, Realities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Sawyer, R.M., Prichard, K.W., Hostetler, K.D. (1992). The Art and Politics of College Teaching. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Schaefer, W.D. (1990). Education Without Compromise: From Chaos to Coherence in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Scheuer, J. (1999). The Sound Bite Society: Television and the American Mind. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows Publishing.

Schmidt, P.A. (1997). Beginning in Retrospect: Writing and Reading a Teacher's Life. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schneider, A. (May 19, 2000). Black Studies 101: Introductory Courses Reflect a Field Still Defining Itself. Chronicle of Higher Education,46(37): A20-A22.

Schneider, C.G. & Shoenberg, R. (1999, March/April). Habits Hard to Break: How Persistent Features of Campus Life Frustrate Curricular Reform. Change,31(2): 30-35.

Schneiderman, S. (1995). Saving Face: America and the Politics of Shame. New York: Alfred A.

Knopf

Schon, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Schuman, D. & Olufs, D. (1995). Diversity on Campus. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Schwalbe, M. (1995). The Work of Professing. In C.L. Barney Dews & C.L. Law, (Eds.). This Fine Place So Far From Home: Voices of Academics from the Working Class (pp. 309-341). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Scott, J.V. (1997, November/December). Death by Inattention: The Strange Fate of Faculty Governance. Academe:28-33.

Scott, W.R. (1995). Institutions and Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sears, J.T., Otis-Wilborn, A., & Marshall, J.D. (1994). When Best Doesn't Equal Good. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sellers, M. (1994). Introduction, In In M.N.S. Sellers (Ed.), An Ethical Education: Community and Morality in the Multicultural University (pp. 1-7). Providence, RI: Berg Publishers.

Seymour, D. (1995). Once Upon a Campus. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Sharpes, D.K. (1988). Curriculum Traditions and Practices. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Shattuck, R. (1999). Candor & Perversion: Literature, Education, and the Arts. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Shils, E. (1983). The Academic Ethic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shor, I. (1996). When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shulman, L.S. (1997). Professing the Liberal Arts. In R. Orrill (Ed.). Education and Democracy: Re-imagining Liberal Learning in America (pp. 151-173). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Sidel, R. (1994). Battling Bias: The Struggle for Identity and Community on College Campuses. New York: Viking.

Silverman, R. H. (2000, Winter). Weak Law Teaching, Adam Smith and a New Model of Merit Pay. Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy,9(2): 267-413.

Sizer, T.R. (1996). Horace's Hope: What Works for the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Smale, G.G. (1995). Integrating Community and Individual Practice: A New Paradigm for Practice.

In Paul Adams & Kristine Nelson (Eds.), Reinventing Human Services: Community and Family Centered Practice, (pp. 59-80). New York: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
Smiley, T. (1996). Hard Left: Straight Talk about the Wrongs of the Right. New York: Anchor Books.

Snider, A. (1999, May 21). Stifling the Naysayer in an Age of Compulsory Niceness. The Chronicle of Higher Education,45(35): A64.

Soder, R. (1996). Teaching the Teachers of the People. In R. Soder (Ed.), Democracy, Education, and the Schools, (pp. 244-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Soley, L.C. (1995). Leasing the Ivory Tower: the Corporate Takeover of Academia. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Solomon, H.M. (1997). "What a Shame You Don't Publish: Crossing the Boundaries as a Public Intellectual Activist." In L.G. Roman & L. Eyre (Eds.), Dangerous Territories: Struggles for Difference and Equality in Education, (pp. 179-190). New York: Routledge, Inc.

Solomon, R.C. & Solomon, J. (1993). Up the University: Re-Creating Higher Education in America. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Sowell, T. (1993). Inside American Education: The Decline, the Deception, The Dogmas. New York: The Free Press.

Sowell, T. (1995). The Vision of the Annointed. New York: Times Books.

Spring, J. (1994). Wheels in the head: Educational Philosophies of Authority, Freedom, And Culture From Socrates to Paulo Freire. New York: McGraw- Hill, Inc.

Stabile, C.A. (1995). Another Brick in the Wall: (Re) contextualizing the Crisis. In M. Berube & C. Nelson (Eds). Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics, and the Crisis of the Humanities (pp. 108-125). New York: Routledge.

Stark, J.S. & Lattuca, L.R. (1997). Shaping the College Curriculum: Academic Plans in Action. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Steinberg, S. (1995). Turning Back: The Retreat From Racial Justice in American Thought and Policy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Stengel, B.S. (1997, Fall). Academic Discipline and school subjects: Contestable curriculum concepts. Journal of Curriculum Studies,29(5): 585-602.

Stewart, J.H. & Spence, R. (1996). A New Look at Factors Related to College Faculty Morale. Educational Research Quarterly,20(3): 29-40.

Strawderman, C. & Lindsey, P. (1995, March-April). Keeping Up With the Times: Reform in Teacher Education. Journal of Teacher Education,46(2): 95-100.
Sullivan, W.M. (1995). Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Sykes, C.J. (1988). ProfScam:Professors and the Demise of Higher Education. Washington, D.C: Regnery Gateway Publishers.

Sykes, C.J. (1992). A Nation of Victims: The Decay of the American Character. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Tang, T.L., & Chamberlain, M. (1997, March/April). Attitudes Toward Research and Teaching: Differences Between Administrators and Faculty Members. Journal of Higher Education,68(2): 212-227.

Tierney, W.G. (1989). Curricular Landscapes, Democratic Vistas: Transformative Leadership in Higher Education. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Tierney, W.G. & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tom, A.R. (1997). Redesigning Teacher Education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Townsend, B.K., Newell, L.J., Wiese, M.D. (1992). Creating Distinctiveness: Lessons from Uncommon Colleges and Universities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6. Washington, DC.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Turner, F. (1986, September). Design for a new Academy. Harper's,273(1636): 47-53.

Usdan, M.D. (1995). Education for the 21st Century. In Donovan R. Walling (Ed.). At the Threshold of the Millennium (13-21). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Vago, S. (1994). Law & Society (4th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Verdugo, R.R.; Greenberg, N.M.; Henderson, R.D.; Uribe, O.; Schneider, J.M. (1997/ February). School Governance Regimes and Teachers' Job Satisfaction: Bureaucracy, Legitimacy, and Community. Educational Administration Quarterly,33(1): 38-66.

Veysey, L.R. (1965). The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Veysey, L.R. (1988). Higher Education as a Profession: Changes and Discontinuities," in Nathan O. Hatch, ed., Professions and American History. South Bend, IN: Notre Dame University Press.

Waller, J. (2000). Prejudice Across America: The Experiences of a Teacher and His Students on a Nationwide Trek Toward Racial Understanding. Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi Press.

Walton, C.W. (1979). Reflections (or Fantasies) on the University. In Clarence C. Walton & Frederick deW. Bolman, (Eds.). Disorders in Higher Education (pp. 182-206). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Walzer, M. (1983). Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Watt, S. (1997). On Apprentices and Company Towns, In C. Nelson (Ed.), Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis (pp. 229-253). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Weaver, F.S. (1991). Liberal Education: Critical Essays on Professions, Pedagogy, and Structure. New York: Teachers College Press.

Weber, S. & Mitchell, C. (1995). That's Funny, You Don't Look Like a Teacher: Interrogating Images and Identity in Popular Culture. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Webster, D.S. (1986). Academic Quality Rankings of American Colleges and Universities. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Weimer, Maryellen (1993). Improving Your Classroom Teaching. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Weinbaum, E.S. (1999). Organizing Labor in an Era of Contingent Work and Globalization. In B. Nissen (Ed.), Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and International Transformations (pp. 37-57). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Weingartner, R.H. (1992). Undergraduate Education. New York: American Council on Education MacMillan Publishing Company.

Weissbourd, R. (1996). The Vulnerable Child. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weitzer, R. (2000). Racialized Policing: Resident's Perceptions in Three Neighborhoods. Law & Society Review,34(1): 129-156.

West, D.J. & Farrington, D.P. (1973). Who Becomes Delinquent? London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929). The Aims of Education. New York: Macmillan Company.

Williams, M.S. (1998). Voice, Trust, and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Williams, P.J. (1998). Seeing A Color-Blind Future: The Paradox of Race. New York: Noonday Press.

Wilson, E. (1993). The 100 Best Colleges for African-American Students. New York: Plume Books.

Wisniewski, R. (2000, March). The Averted Gaze. Anthropology & Education Quarterly,31(1): 5-23.

Woller, G.M. (1997, September). Public Administration and Postmodernism. American Behavioral Scientist,41(1): 9-11.

Wright, J.D., & Sheley, J.F. (1995). Society Should Reduce Young People's Need for Guns, In David Bender and Bruno Leone (Eds.). Crime and Criminals: Opposing Viewpoints (pp. 186-193). San Diego: CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

Wright, R.A. (1986). Professorial Role Strains in the Small College: Issues and Opportunities. In R.A. Wright & J.A. Burden (Eds.). Teaching in the Small College (pp. 27-37). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Yates, M.D. (1999, March). Frederick Taylor Comes to College: Breaking Faculty Jobs Into Discrete Tasks. Z Magazine,12(3): 45-48.

Young, R.B. (1997). No Neutral Ground: Standing by the values we prize in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Zerubavel, E. (1991). The Fine Line: Making Distinctions in Everyday Life. New York: The Free Press.