

# *Tenure: Why Faculty, and the Nation, Need It*

*By Henry Lee Allen*

---

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** In 1997, Henry Allen wrote that tenure implies freedom and professional autonomy from administrators, trustees, and legislators. It's obvious, then, why tenure is so vigorously attacked. Tenure gets in the way of control. If the professoriate is to play a pivotal role in defining higher education's future, new strategies must be forged to preserve tenure, the very lynchpin of academic freedom.

---

**D**espite attempts by some critics of higher education to use tenure as a scapegoat for a plethora of institutional shortcomings, there is no persuasive evidence that tenured faculty aren't doing their jobs.<sup>1</sup>

Nothing in the data on faculty workload and performance, gathered across all types of postsecondary institutions, suggests that faculty with tenure neglect teaching their students, rest on their laurels and no longer produce relevant research or scholarship, promote dangerous ideologies in the classroom or anywhere else, or act as stumbling blocks in decision-making.

For instance, there is no empirical data to be found in the latest National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93), conducted by the National Center on Education Statistics, that substantiates the notion of declining faculty productivity among tenured faculty—as measured by the number of hours faculty work per week or the time they allocate to their teaching responsibilities.<sup>2</sup>

Higher education continues to be characterized by tenured faculty members who direct their professional efforts toward teaching, research, administration, and public service. The evidence shows that most tenured faculty are more

---

*At the publication of this article, Henry Lee Allen was an associate professor in the Sociology Program/Behavioral Sciences division at Rochester Institute of Technology. His research interests had included mathematical sociology, the sociology of higher education, academic labor markets, and the academic professions. He had been a regular contributor to the NEA Almanac of Higher Education and was at work on several articles explaining the structure and dynamics of academic systems via mathematical models.*

***Tenure is a small reward for years of perseverance against enormous odds to acquire an area of expertise.***

---

productive than ever in this era of tighter resources.

Furthermore, evidence suggests that the organizational conditions associated with an institution's mission or location, not tenure, are the defining factors affecting how faculty pursue their work.<sup>3</sup>

The battle over tenure diverts attention from the failure of some postsecondary institutions to clarify their missions, come to terms with their changing student populations, or make the institutional adjustments that are necessary to educate their students and fulfill their mission.<sup>4</sup>

To put it another way: If we take as our collective goal to make colleges and universities better organizations for all humans to use in reaching their intellectual potential, we should stop blaming tenure and begin to concentrate on the real problems.

Tenure evolved in higher education in concert with the professionalization of faculty.<sup>5</sup> It codifies a permanent, professional relationship between faculty members and their institutional employers, rewarding those who fulfill the terms of their probation.

Tenure must be earned by performance exceptional enough to earn the approval of senior colleagues in an academic department or unit. Once awarded, tenure gives a semblance of security to those

faculty who have sacrificed other more lucrative career possibilities to pursue the life of a scholar.

Obviously, tenure, like any privilege or right, can be abused by those who confer it or receive it. But those who berate tenure fail to appreciate the tremendous trade-offs required of anyone who pursues an academic career in a society where financial status is the measure of a person's worth.

**T**he academic career has always been fragile and risky for most of the professoriate.<sup>6</sup> Faculty, over the course of many years, invest disproportionate economic, psychological, and other resources to obtain their positions. They do so with little prospect of ever attaining the wealth that flows to professionals in more lucrative fields such as law or medicine—regardless of their effort, merit, or productivity.<sup>7</sup> Tenure is a small reward for a professor who perseveres for many years against enormous practical odds to acquire a particular area of expertise.

Academic careers have an inherent vulnerability, too, since producing knowledge or innovations often entails criticizing or rejecting conventional explanations or beliefs. Faculty have always been dependent on benefactors for support of their work,

---

***Tenure became even more important to academic freedom as research became more prevalent in the universities.***

---

whether these sponsors are students, legislators, philanthropists, or religious institutions.

Professors have always faced the prospect of dismissal whenever their ideas or studies threaten the established order. In short, the very livelihood of a professor is threatened whenever conflicts or disagreements occur between faculty members and their benefactors.

Tenure protects professors from reprisals from reactionary individuals or groups in society. Before the institutionalization of tenure in academic organizations, faculty careers were vulnerable to popular pressures, administrative whims, political pragmatism, and social pressure—regardless of the merits in a dispute. Faculty could be dismissed with reckless abandon, without due process, whenever powerful administrators, benefactors, politicians, or board members desired.

Tenure became even more important to academic freedom as research became more prevalent in universities. Many modern discoveries or controversial ideas that have changed our world for the better might not have been possible without tenure.

One example: The academic careers of many professors whose sociological research exposed the prejudicial attitudes of racist leaders in the South during the Civil

Rights era could not have been sustained without the link between tenure and academic freedom.

Tenure shields the academic profession from jingoistic pressures to compromise the pursuit of truth on the altars of ideological, political, social, and economic expediency. Faculty professionalization and tenure are, as a result, closely intertwined, even at teaching institutions.

**N**or is a tenure the sinecure critics claim it to be. The tenure process is controlled by the institutions that award it. Tenure does not make faculty immune from market forces or the consequences of malfeasance since it can be revoked under certain conditions involving incompetence, moral turpitude, or retrenchment.

Since the official codification of tenure under the auspices of the American Association of University Professors in 1940, virtually all quality institutions of higher education have recognized its benefits. Indeed, Philo Hutcheson reported in the spring 1996 *Thought & Action* that the number of faculty with tenure has remained relatively stable for the past two decades.<sup>8</sup>

Tenure has proved instrumental to the maintenance of faculty culture and morale; it brings cohesiveness to academic organizations. If the trust or privileges tenure confers have been abused in systematic

***Is it reasonable to conclude that all faculty are predisposed to neglect undergraduate teaching?***

---

ways at one institution or another, we should look for organizational reasons why this abuse took place, not rush to shift the discourse to the institution of tenure.<sup>9</sup>

In short, tenure is essential because it fosters stability and productivity in academic organizations. For faculty, tenure serves as the institutional sign of acceptance.

Abuses attributed to tenure often reflect poor recruitment and screening policies in hiring, inadequate professional development, or the absence of mentoring programs. Questionable accountability procedures, poorly designed incentive or opportunity structures, and organizational cultures that don't promote excellence also contribute to tenure abuses.

**R**ather than scapegoat tenure for these abuses, more attention needs to be devoted to making academic institutions into places where faculty can reach their potential in an atmosphere that encourages continuous learning, innovation, and productivity at each career stage.

Those who dismiss the value of tenure do so from nebulous theoretical and methodological premises. They typically advance four principal arguments.

Critics charge that tenured faculty neglect teaching and their students, rest on their laurels and fail to

be productive, use tenure as a shield to promote dangerous ideologies, and, finally, resist the changes that would improve higher education.

The underlying perception among critics seems to be that most tenured faculty are arrogant, unreasonable, and defiant. These perceptions are rarely challenged, and, as noted earlier, critics routinely ignore, underestimate, or even distort any positive impact that tenure may make.<sup>10</sup>

The first criticism—that tenured faculty neglect undergraduate teaching—is neither supported by the evidence or conceptually sound. Invariably, this criticism lacks analytical precision or appropriate specificity. It fails to delimit which faculty are involved and where they are located.

Critics of tenure fail to distinguish between the existence of tenure as an institutionalized practice and the role of tenured professors. It should be obvious—on logical grounds alone—that no simple stereotype can characterize the work performance of all tenured professors.

Secondly, the criticism does not specify how many tenured faculty purportedly conform to this stereotype. Is it reasonable to conclude that all faculty from all cohorts are predisposed to neglect undergraduate teaching? On what basis can such a claim be made?

***Critics have long assailed tenure  
with little more than bogus arguments  
and specious evidence.***

Valid criticism would identify exactly which tenured faculty in what professional disciplines, academic ranks, or types of institutions are implicated. Lacking these specifics, this criticism ignores the organizational differences that have historically existed between the missions of different types of academic institutions.

A blanket statement imputing guilt obscures our thinking more than it enlightens. Clearly, college and university professors are not subject to the same circumstances in their respective disciplines, ranks, and departments. The accusation that tenured faculty neglect undergraduate teaching suffers from the fallacy of an exaggerated comparison.

Those who chide tenured faculty for failing to teach undergraduates effectively neglect to inform us how this situation has come about. What specific organizational stimuli or conditions diluted the instructional performance of tenured faculty members? Which behavioral mechanisms and social processes were involved, under what conditions?

This criticism does not convincingly explain either why or how the possession of tenure triggers inattention to undergraduate education. What ubiquitous transactions could even control the decisions of all

possible cadres of professors or mysteriously constrain their predilections to teach?

How could the acquisition of tenure inhibit teaching for someone who has spent a probationary period of seven years in the pursuit of exactly that goal?

The accusation that tenure dilutes undergraduate teaching lacks specificity about the agents, tasks, or conditions that have supposedly caused tenured faculty to neglect undergraduate teaching.

But this should not surprise us. Evidence indicates that critics have long assailed tenure with little more than bogus arguments and specious evidence. Oakley, for example, has shown how attacks on American higher education have been replete with rhetorical distortions of empirical evidence that are devoid of context. Oakley demonstrates that logical flaws are inevitable where polemics against tenure are substituted for dispassionate analysis.<sup>11</sup>

Building upon Oakley, Metzger concludes that "tenure-bashing" is probably unavoidable, to the extent that mass higher education reflects the influence of popular culture. Scapegoating professors sells newspapers and engenders few reprisals.

Metzger notes several other structural and ideological reasons why the academic professions have

***The academic profession is now  
and has always been a teaching  
profession.***

---

been so susceptible to negative stereotyping. Apparently, criticizing tenure is good business for pundits in a media-crazed society.<sup>12</sup>

The idea of faculty neglecting undergraduate teaching is even harder to swallow when we recognize that the historic mission of most faculty—across all types of institutions—has always been undergraduate teaching.

Most of the more than 3,000 institutions of higher education in this nation ascribe undergraduate teaching as their sole endeavor.<sup>13</sup> There is plenty of faculty attention focused on undergraduate teaching among all these schools—and for the vast majority of academic men and women whatever their employment status.<sup>14</sup> Outside of a few select institutions, most tenured faculty cannot possibly ignore undergraduate teaching because their livelihood depends on satisfactory teaching.

Moreover, various studies have shown that—above and beyond external rewards—most faculty are intrinsically motivated to teach.<sup>15</sup> When surveyed, faculty consistently say they would like to devote more of their time to teaching. The academic profession is now and has always been a teaching profession.<sup>16</sup>

Even at research universities, few academic departments can survive for very long without teaching

well enough to attract students. Teaching is an undeniable component of faculty identity.<sup>17</sup>

Obviously, there are great variations in what makes up effective teaching since interpretations are a function of individual preferences, institutional constraints, and social contexts.

Perceptions of effective teaching at any particular institution are filtered through the history and norms of each institution.<sup>18</sup> The mission of the institution and the nature of the student body lend themselves to a variety of instructional outcomes.<sup>19</sup>

Professors and students may have convergent or divergent learning styles. Levels of sophistication, classroom composition, and student backgrounds may likewise affect the interpersonal dynamics of learning. The prism of learning has a much wider spectrum of social complications than many critics of tenure acknowledge.

The real issue is how well are faculty being trained by academic organizations and their respective departments to teach undergraduates—or anyone else.

Here, as critics have alleged, there have been problems in graduate schools. But these problems are not caused by tenure! These are organizational problems, involving the practices of professional

***Tenured faculty spend approximately the same amount of time teaching as tenure-track and nontenured faculty.***

---

associations, institutions, and academic labor markets.<sup>20</sup>

If faculty teach poorly in an academic department, the reasons cannot be reduced to tenure. Institutions and departments can make good or bad hiring decisions or offer varying levels of faculty development opportunities. All sorts of individual, group, and organizational factors may be involved.<sup>21</sup> Tenure is not and was not designed to be a safeguard for poor departmental judgment.

Moreover, tenure has no bearing on whether organizational leaders have provided sufficient resources and faculty incentives to support effective undergraduate instruction. Acquiring tenure does not transform inadequate departmental or administrative policies, nor does it revolutionize their implementation.

Qualitative differences have always existed in the professional training of faculty, as well as in the rigor of the theories and methodologies that characterize their academic disciplines. These differences affect the priorities new faculty give to the tasks of teaching, research, and service—as well as the competencies a veteran faculty member eventually develops in each domain.

Some faculty could have been socialized to de-emphasize their undergraduate teaching duties in

their particular academic institutions while others were socialized to concentrate on them. Tenure, in and of itself, does not compromise a devotion to teaching!

Recent survey data also cast doubt on the second criticism often leveled against tenure—the lack of productivity among tenured faculty. Except for a plethora of hysterical anecdotes, these accusations are not substantiated by empirical evidence either.

NSOPF-93 data reveal that tenured faculty work more than 40 hours per week at their institutions.<sup>22</sup> Secondly, these survey data also indicate that tenured faculty have not abrogated their teaching duties to others. Tenured faculty (along with tenure-track faculty) teach more courses than nontenured faculty.

**T**enured faculty spend approximately the same amount of time teaching as tenure-track and nontenured faculty. The former spend about 44 percent of their time in teaching and related tasks; the latter average 45 percent and 47 percent respectively.

Tenure-track faculty also spend only slightly more time in research than tenured faculty. Tenure-track faculty give about 27 percent of their time to research as compared to a 25 percent commitment by tenured faculty. But nontenured

***An unproductive, tenured faculty member faces social and professional impotence, akin to academic suicide.***

---

faculty devote less than 14 percent of their time to research.

When these data are examined across all institutions, tenured faculty teach as many classes on average as nontenured faculty.

**L**et me reiterate this key finding: Tenured faculty have not abandoned their classroom duties to their nontenured colleagues.

As I have written previously, a recurring analytical motif in the study of faculty workload and productivity across various types of colleges and universities remains: Institutional type defines the parameters and dynamics of a faculty career.<sup>23</sup>

In short, the organizational context in which faculty members work is the primary influence on the outcomes of their work.

In another indicator of productivity, NSOPF-93 data show tenured faculty published more than three refereed articles during the two years covered, in contrast to almost no publishing activity for untenured faculty. Tenure-track faculty managed almost three articles on average during this period.

When the total number of publications in a career are examined, tenured faculty averaged 27 refereed and eight nonrefereed articles against just eight refereed and three nonrefereed articles for nontenured

faculty. The remaining faculty had four or less refereed and three or less nonrefereed articles.

Competitive pressures within academic disciplines and social norms among immediate colleagues force nearly all tenured professors to be productive—or face serious declines in their reputations and rewards.<sup>24</sup> An unproductive, tenured faculty member faces social and professional impotence, akin to academic suicide.

Unproductive faculty will undoubtedly incur the wrath of the department chairperson, students, and administrators. They face the ridicule or disdain of their colleagues. Few human beings can withstand such an onslaught for an extended length of time, notwithstanding tenure status.

Nothing can salve the pain of being obsolete and disregarded in the academy. In short, profuse social incentives militate against lackluster performance in well-run academic departments. Abuses are most likely to occur in places with low degrees of collegiality, but these abuses are not the inevitable result of possessing tenure.

Tenure does not cause faculty to violate normal protocols, pursue selfish interests, or violate the public trust. Each of these behaviors can occur independent of tenure status.

To reiterate, rather than indict tenure, critics need to devote

***The academic role, we need to note,  
requires skepticism, criticism,  
and dissent.***

---

themselves to promoting those activities that enhance the productivity of all faculty.

The third criticism of tenure is that it provides a platform for tenured faculty to indoctrinate naive students with radical, left-wing ideas.

**F**irst, it is the nature of academic life to encourage students to move beyond complacency in their thinking. Some may judge this a radical activity. So be it. But that is not the same as indoctrinating students with a particular ideology. For one thing, research across decades has established that faculty members are not and have never been uniform in their own ideological sensibilities.<sup>25</sup>

Besides, most instructors are far too busy with their professional responsibilities to espouse radical ideas or unpopular causes for their own sake. Most are not even inclined to do so.

Beyond that, students are not entirely at the mercy of their professors' ideological endeavors. Students can and do resist attempts at ideological persuasion—as the remarkable student protests of the 1960s attest.

Students ultimately control their responses to an instructor's views or rhetoric. In any event, students are seldom exposed to radical views in most of their courses. They

also may, most of the time, select teachers who fit their predispositions, while in most cases avoiding those whose views make them uncomfortable.

Differences in class background, academic training, institutional location, and numerous other factors make unlikely any conspiracy engulfing the entire professoriate. Moreover, theoretical and methodological differences within and between academic disciplines insures a diversity of outlooks.

Some disciplines lend themselves to conservative dogmas while others do not.<sup>26</sup> Based on an analysis of data from several Carnegie surveys, Hamilton and Hargens discovered that only a miniscule number of faculty could be defined as radical (or leftist).<sup>27</sup>

In addition, students favored subjects that avoided these faculty, opting instead for moderate and conservative faculty orientations.

Other studies have found that college graduates have a good many conservative social and political biases that are a function of their educational attainment.<sup>28</sup>

Those few professors who deviate from these cultural and political norms often appear radical in contrast to their more conservative students. Tenure neither creates or alters this propensity.

The academic role, we need to note, requires skepticism, criticism,

***Professors should be the ‘gadflies’ of any society, espousing ideas at variance with powerful interests.***

---

and dissent.<sup>29</sup> To some extent, the avant garde nature of academic life favors a kind of radicalism in certain domains of inquiry. Indeed, this is why academic freedom is necessary in the first place. No apology can be offered for the radical nature of some academic fields, even at the risk—in the eyes of some—of corrupting the young.

Historians have shown repeatedly, across generations, that professors who were depicted as radical for their times tend to become the icons—or perhaps, the fools—of later times.<sup>30</sup>

In short, student exposure to radicalism is unlikely and non-threatening at best.

The fourth criticism—the lack of faculty accountability—emerges out of a consumerist agenda and is inflamed by a misunderstanding of academic work.<sup>31</sup>

Colleges and universities assume a certain degree of collegiality between faculty, administrators, and their sponsors.<sup>32</sup> Within this context faculty members can and should, on occasion, disagree with the views and policies of their colleagues.

Too much supervision or too many legislative mandates would likely breed mere compliance rather than promoting creativity or productivity among faculty.

An unhealthy preoccupation with ideological or political jockeying will probably not yield much

professional substance. Tenure implies academic freedom and professional autonomy from administrators, trustees, or legislators.

Some critics envy the professional autonomy faculty have to pursue their craft, especially when this autonomy gives them the ability (or audacity) to disagree with or expose dominant ideologies.

**B**ut professors *should be* the “gadflies” of any society, espousing ideas at variance with powerful interests. There is simply no alternative to this role.<sup>33</sup>

Faculty must have the right to dissent, exercise their First Amendment rights, and enjoy the protection of academic freedom—all of which are protected by tenure. Abuses are possible, but the price of censoring intellectual ideas within and outside the academy has been far worse historically.

Dangerous movements engulf societies that disregard this vital faculty role—as the calamities of Nazi Germany, McCarthyism, and Soviet totalitarianism aptly illustrate. Moreover, innovation at the very highest levels of advanced knowledge requires considerable autonomy and risk.<sup>34</sup>

Some critics reason that the faculty autonomy—a byproduct of tenure—causes professors to resist innovations like Total Quality Management (TQM).

***The overwhelming majority of professors work hard, far out of proportion to what they earn.***

---

Again, organizational development may be the real culprit, not tenure. Faculty may resist trendy measures for several reasons, including inadequate explanation, inappropriate fit, or hasty implementation. In short, faculty may not trust or have confidence in administrators who propose TQM as a panacea for communication or resource problems.

In sum, empirical findings refute the main criticisms directed against tenure. Tenured faculty are not taking life easy, coasting along in their job security. They are not abusing the public trust; rather, most tenured professors are painstakingly earning their salaries with the integrity of productive labor.

No evidence supports the charge that tenured faculty work appreciably less or are less productive than their colleagues who have yet to attain it. Tenured faculty, having acquired tenure as the baseline reward in a very competitive career, do not suddenly become indolent. Social pressures within the academic profession, employing institutions, and departmental pecking orders insure that almost all of them must be productive.

It is true that tenured faculty could conceivably abuse their privileges, given their freedom and autonomy from direct supervision, but the evidence indicates that they don't.

Most are far too preoccupied with their work for intrinsic reasons.

Modern professors are inundated by the demands of teaching, research, and service—including class preparation, advising, assessment, grading, committee work, special presentations, and keeping up with developments in their respective academic disciplines.

**E**vidence across the past few decades indicates that the overwhelming majority of professors work hard, far out of proportion to what they earn.<sup>35</sup> For them, tenure is the reward of an academic career.

Oakley has described the mythological character of the current jeremiad against higher education. He has exposed the lack of systematic evidence and faulty reasoning behind it. Much energy that could have helped tenured professors has been wasted as critics have deflected attention away from the real problems of instructional productivity and organizational development.

Still, tenured professors must address the concerns of a worried public.<sup>36</sup> If we want to regain public trust, we must, first, change the image of the academic profession. We need to tell people what professors actually do for a living.

Faculty unions, professional associations, and academic institutions

must demonstrate the value of the academic work we do. The academic profession is in an urgent “public relations” battle with other institutions that compete with it for fiscal support.<sup>37</sup>

Second, faculty must police their ranks more effectively by exposing misfits and unqualified instructors. We must take the lead in implementing the organizational changes necessary to make academic departments more productive and responsive to the needs of students.<sup>38</sup> The long-term impact of mediocrity and incompetence in the faculty ranks is harmful to the profession and to the entire academic enterprise.

Third, incentives—whether social or material—need to encourage instructional, research, and service productivity that lead to the highest degree of service to students, the institutions, and the community.<sup>39</sup>

**F**inally, tenured faculty must be in the forefront of sponsoring research on improving performance within the academic profession.

Without an adequate theory of academic systems and their components, the determinants of

productivity remain a mystery for all faculty, regardless of tenure status. We still know very little about the organizational and interpersonal dynamics of effective teaching in classes with great diversity and complexity in learning conditions.

What we do know is that the vast majority of faculty work extremely hard at their craft.<sup>40</sup> Faculty are intrinsically motivated to pursue their craft. In essence, they love their work, despite the attendant woes. They cherish their roles in the academy, having been themselves intelligent, successful students.

Rather than attacking tenure, those who wish to improve higher education should concentrate on assessing and improving institutional productivity and providing more and better faculty development opportunities.

Tenure should not be immune from constructive criticism. But proposals that call for abolishing tenure without the support of rigorous evidence and without presenting viable alternatives that represent an improvement over tenure cannot be considered serious proposals for improving our colleges and universities.■

---

### AUTHOR'S POSTSCRIPT

The debate about the viability of tenure has escalated in the few years since my 1997 article appeared in *Thought and Action*. Most importantly, the published discourse has shifted toward prescribing incremental alternatives to tenure (Chait 1998). Along this line of attack, several developments are especially noteworthy.

First, some scholars imply that contract systems—in use in a tiny minority of actual institutions—may evolve as a substitute to tenure (Chait and Trower 1997). While acknowledging that institutions without tenure systems are outside the mainstream, these investigators use this research to legitimize alternatives to tenure, using anecdotal remarks from supportive faculty and administrators to add credence to contract systems.

Chait and Trower cite a list of academic organizations without tenure systems, but they fail to detail the organizational conditions at work in such

places. In fairness, even these scholars—who write with an implicit managerial mindset—admit that contract systems alone are not a panacea for the organizational problems attributed to tenure systems.

Chait and Trower have created a massive database with the appointment policy documents of 241 institutions of higher education. Known as the Faculty Appointment and Policy Archive (FAPA), established under the auspices of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, this database allows an investigator to peruse topics or policies such as tenure, workload, productivity, and related concerns.

The stratified random sample of institutions included in this database is assumed to be representative of American higher education. From this database, a content analysis of tenure policies is possible, yet, once again, very little attention is given within this database to the organizational issues affecting workload, tenure, or productivity. Furthermore, several of the colleges and universities included would not be considered the most exemplary institutions in their respective category.

A second development that has emerged much more prominently in the aftermath of my 1997 article is the attempt to monitor academic work even more meticulously than before.

The tenure debate is symptomatic of a larger public concern with how to ensure that faculty—particularly, senior tenured faculty—remain accountable to institutional authorities, benefactors, and constituents.

Related to this debate, albeit indirectly, is concern over performance measurement, mainly at public colleges and universities (Allen 1999). Here, the idea is to assess faculty performance in order to mandate benchmarks that faculty are expected to achieve—especially in the realm of undergraduate education or teaching. Failure to meet performance indicators might influence budgetary allocations.

Some states have invited a few faculty representatives to collaborate in selecting performance indicators, but the gist of the approach seems to be increased regulation of faculty activities at a time when policies favoring deregulation prevail in other industries and markets.

A final disturbing sentiment that has increased since my article on tenure is the preoccupation with establishing virtual universities as an alternative to classroom-based postsecondary education.

Some writers have suggested that virtual courses are equal or superior in quality to traditional higher education.

With an audacious jingoism that supercedes the many legitimate claims of those who need or prefer distance education, the most naïve or sinister advocates of virtual higher education imply that this electronic format may be a viable replacement for courses emanating from interaction or real contact with a professor.

Of course, faculty should incorporate technological advances, where appropriate, into their teaching, but the implication that professors are less than central to the educational enterprise is a ridiculous pretention at best.

Since—as social scientists have discovered—knowledge must be filtered through a social context involving symbolic interaction or social exchanges, assertions that faculty are rudimentary cogs that can be jettisoned away from a quality education are somewhat bogus, even if such sentiments are trendy.

Surfing the Internet or clicking electronic Web sites will not develop the critical acumen necessary for the highest levels of cognitive learning (Perkins 1995).

In sum, tenure faces many encroachments from those who misunderstand its role in higher education. Few tenure studies have examined how complex organizational dynamics affect tenure's function over time within an array of institutions.

Instead, many critics envy the benefits tenure affords those professors who have met its arduous demands, through surviving the gauntlet of graduate education and across years of tenuous, probationary employment.

Tenure accentuates faculty autonomy and authority within the institutional confines of colleges and universities, providing opportunity for shared governance and professionalism in organizational leadership.

Tenure cannot guarantee institutional funds or effective policies and procedures. It is only a small, though visible, part of the total academic enterprise.

If critics of tenure would redirect their focus toward the more inconspicuous, yet salient, issues involved with establishing or maintaining excellence in academic organizations, genuine progress in understanding the imperatives of organizational leadership might perhaps be reached during the 21st century. Tenure is not the enemy of higher education, organizational ignorance is.

### References

- Allen, Henry Lee. "Workload and Productivity in an Era of Performance Measures," in *The NEA 1999 Almanac of Higher Education*, 27-44. Washington, D.C.: NEA Publishing, 1999.
- Chait, Richard and Cathy A Trower. "Where Tenure Does Not Reign: Colleges With Contract Systems," AAHE Working Paper Series, New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C., 1997.
- Chait, Richard. "Ideas in Incubation: Three Possible Modifications to Traditional Tenure Policies," AAHE Working Paper Series, New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C., 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Activism of Corporate Boards and Implications for Campus Governance." AGB Occasional Paper Series, No. 26. 1996.
- Perkins, David N. *Outsmarting IQ*. New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Trower, C. Ann. "Employment Practices in the Professions: Fresh Ideas From Inside and Outside the Academy," AAHE Working Paper Series, New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C., 1998.

### Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Bowen and Schuster, 1986.
- <sup>2</sup> Allen, 1996.
- <sup>3</sup> Bess, 1988.
- <sup>4</sup> Schmuck and Runkel, 1994.
- <sup>5</sup> Jencks and Riesman, 1977.
- <sup>6</sup> Finkelstein, 1984.
- <sup>7</sup> Bok, 1993.
- <sup>8</sup> Hutcheson, 1996.
- <sup>9</sup> Gross, 1968.
- <sup>10</sup> For a rather obvious example, see Finn and Manno, 1996.
- <sup>11</sup> Oakley, 1991.
- <sup>12</sup> Metzger, 1996.
- <sup>13</sup> Finkelstein 1984, 1995; Allen, 1996.
- <sup>14</sup> Finkelstein, 1995.
- <sup>15</sup> Finkelstein 1984; 1995.
- <sup>16</sup> Metzger, 1996.
- <sup>17</sup> Allen, 1996.
- <sup>18</sup> For a variety of relevant examples, consult Finnegan, Webster, and Gamson (eds.), 1996.
- <sup>19</sup> Allen 1994, 1995, 1996.
- <sup>20</sup> Heilman and Hornstein, 1982; Schmuck and Runkel, 1994.
- <sup>21</sup> Kuhn, 1963.
- <sup>22</sup> Tenured faculty spent an estimated mean of 53 hours per week working compared to 56 hours per week for

tenure-track faculty. Faculty who were not on the tenure track worked about 40 hours per week and those without tenure spent 36 hours at work.

<sup>23</sup> Allen 1994, 1995.

<sup>24</sup> Clark, 1983; 1987.

<sup>25</sup> Lazarsfeld and Thielens, 1958; Ladd and Lipset, 1975; Hamilton and Hargens, 1996.

<sup>26</sup> Bourdieu 1988; Gross and Levitt 1994.

<sup>27</sup> Hamilton and Hargens, 1996.

<sup>28</sup> Ryan 1981; Kluegel and Smith 1986; Duckitt 1994.

<sup>29</sup> Boorstin, 1986.

<sup>30</sup> Metzger, 1996.

<sup>31</sup> Riesman, 1980.

<sup>32</sup> Bess, 1988.

<sup>33</sup> Ben-David, 1972; Clark, 1983; Bourdieu, 1988.

<sup>34</sup> Ben-David, 1972.

<sup>35</sup> Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Bok, 1993.

<sup>36</sup> Fairweather, 1996.

<sup>37</sup> Bowen and Schuster, 1986.

<sup>38</sup> Boyer, 1990.

<sup>39</sup> Fairweather and Rhoads, 1995.

<sup>40</sup> Finkelstein, 1984.

### Bibliography

Abbot, Andrew. *The System of Professions*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988.

Allen, Henry L. "Faculty Workload and Productivity in the 1990s: Preliminary Findings," In *NEA 1996 Almanac of Higher Education*, 21-33. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1996.

Allen, Henry L. "Workload and Productivity: Case Studies." In *NEA 1995 Almanac of Higher Education*, 21-32. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1995.

Allen, Henry L. "Workload and Productivity in an Accountability Era." In *NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education*, 25-38. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1994.

Ben-David, Joseph. *American Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Ben-David, Joseph. *The Scientist's Role in Society*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Berliner, David C., and Bruce J. Biddle. *The Manufactured Crisis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1995.

Bess, James. *Collegiality and Bureaucracy in the Modern University*. New York: Teachers College, 1988.

Blau, Peter M. *The Organization of Academic Work*. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Bok, Derek. *The Cost of Talent*. New York: Free Press, 1993.

Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Discoverers: A History of Man's Search to Know His World and Himself*. New York: Random House, 1983.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo Academicus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of The Professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Bowen, Howard R., and Jack H. Schuster. *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York: Oxford, 1986.

Campbell, Frederick L., Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., and Reece J. McGee. *Teaching Sociology: The Quest for Excellence*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1985.

Caplow, Theodore, and Reece J. McGee. *The Academic Marketplace*. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Clark, Burton R. *The Academic Life*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

Clark, Burton R. *The Higher Education System*. Berkeley: University of California, 1983.

Duckitt, John. *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994.

Fairweather, James S. *Faculty Work and Public Trust*. Des Moines: Allyn and Bacon, 1996.

Fairweather, James, and Robert A. Rhoads. "Teaching and the Faculty Role: Enhancing the Commitment to Instruction in American Colleges and Universities," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 17, no. 2, (1995): 179-194.

Finkelstein, Martin J. "College Faculty As Teachers," In *NEA 1995 Almanac of Higher Education*, 33-47. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1995.

- Finkelstein, Martin J. *The American Academic Profession*. Columbus: Ohio State, 1984.
- Finn, Chester, Jr., and Bruno V. Manno. 1996. "Behind the Curtain," *The Wilson Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (winter 1996): 44-53.
- Finnegan, Dorothy E., David Webster, and Zelda F. Gamson, eds. *Faculty and Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities*, 2nd ed. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster, 1996.
- Goldsmid, Charles A., and Everett K. Wilsen. *Passing on Sociology: The Teaching of a Discipline*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1980.
- Gross, Edward. "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach." Reprinted in *Reader in the Sociology of the Academic Profession*, ed. Walter Metzger, 518-544. New York: Arno, 1977.
- Gross, Paul D., and Norman Levitt. *Higher Superstition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1994.
- Hamilton, Ronald F., and Lowell L. Hargens. "The Politics of the Professors: Self-Identifications, 1969-1984." In *Faculty and Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities*, eds. Dorothy E. Finnegan, David Webster, and Zelda F. Gamson, 2nd ed., 219-239. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster, 1996.
- Heilman, Madeline E., and Harvey A. Hornstein. *Managing Human Forces in Organizations*. Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1982.
- Hutcheson, Philo A. "Faculty Tenure: Myth and Reality 1974 to 1992." *Thought & Action* 12, no.1 (spring 1996): 7-22.
- Jencks, Christopher, and David Riesman. *The Academic Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1977.
- Kluegel, James R., and Eliot R. Smith. *Beliefs About Inequality*. New York: Aldine 1986.
- Kuhn, Alfred. *The Study of Society*. Homewood, IL: Irwin and Dorsey, 1963.
- Ladd, Everett C., and Seymour Martin Lipset. *The Divided Academy*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul R., and Wagner Thielens, Jr. *The Academic Mind*. New York: Free Press, 1958.
- McGee, Reece J. *Academic Janus*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Metzger, Walter P. "Critics of College Teaching." In *NEA 1996 Almanac of Higher Education*, 35-50. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1996.
- Oakley, Francis. "Against Nostalgia: Reflections on Our Present Discontents in Higher Education." *National Humanities Center Newsletter* 12, no. 2, (1991): 1-14.
- Riesman, David. *On Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Ryan, William. *Equality*. New York: Pantheon, 1981.
- Schmuck, R. A., and P.J. Runkel, *The Handbook of Organization Development in Schools and Colleges*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1994.
- Wolfe, Alan. 1996. "The Postmodern University," *The Wilson Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (winter 1996): 54-66.
- Zimble, L.J., *Faculty and Instructional Staff: Who they Are and What They Do?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1994.