This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

On Teaching English in the Two-Year College: Essays

presented by

E. Keith Kroll

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in English

Diane Bruner

Major professor

Date 26 April 1996

ON TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE: ESSAYS

By

E. Keith Kroll

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1996

ABSTRACT

ON TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE:

ESSAYS

By

E. Keith Kroll

Community college English faculty constitute a sizable percentage of full- and part-time faculty at community colleges. English courses form a significant percentage of the credits offered by community colleges. In the 1960s and early 1970s, community college English faculty and curriculum received more attention than any other academic discipline. Since the early 1970's, however, English faculty and curriculum have been largely ignored by the English profession. In addition, despite their increasing number, little has been written about part-time English faculty.

This study examined English faculty and curriculum at public and private community colleges in the nineteen-state Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC). The study identified 411 community colleges in the CNCTYC. Each department chair was sent a letter requesting the participation of the college's English faculty in the study and the number of full- and part-time faculty winter term 1993.

The study questionnaire was designed to gather data in nine areas: formal education; academic rank, tenure, and teaching experience; present teaching experience; scholarly activities; curriculum; teaching practices in developmental and first college-level writing courses; institutional environment; and classification data.

Seven hundred seventy-seven usable surveys were returned. The sample consisted of 426 full-time faculty (55%) and 351 (45%) part-time faculty.

Based on the sample described in this study, full-time English faculty teaching at public and private community colleges in the CNCTYC appear relatively unchanged from English faculty 30 years ago. They teach approximately 15 credit hours per semester, primarily writing courses, and express a need for (additional) training in the teaching of writing. Overall, current full-time English faculty appear quite satisfied with their careers. Pedagogically, there now appears to be more emphasis on teaching writing as a process.

The greatest change in the English faculty is the growing reliance on part-time faculty. While the profile of part-time faculty developed in the study reflects well on those individuals teaching part-time, their lack of active involvement in their respective departments, institutions, and profession, raises serious concerns about the future development and direction of the community college English profession.

To Lisa, Andy, and Nick

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I tell my writing students, while writing is at times a very solitary act, it is also at times a very communal act. This dissertation is such an example. It owes a great deal to my reading of and discussions with writers such as Arthur M. Cohen and Florence Brawer (UCLA and the Center for the Study of Community Colleges), George Vaughan (North Carolina State University), James Palmer (Illinois State University), Kevin Dougherty (Manhattan College), Nell Ann Picket (Hinds Community College), Ira Shor (CUNY Graduate Center), Howard Tinberg (Bristol Community College), Mark Reynolds (Jefferson Davis Community College), Sue Hollar (Kalamazoo Valley Community College), Raelyn Joyce (Kalamazoo Valley Community College), and especially Robert Haight (Kalamazoo Valley Community College) and Barry Alford (Mid Michigan Community College).

In addition, I would like to thank Vice-President Helen McCauslin, President Marilyn Schlack, and the Board of Trustees at Kalamazoo Valley Community College for awarding me a faculty sabbatical in support of my research, and for continually supporting my teaching and scholarship. The sabbatical provided the time necessary for conducting the research and analyzing the data that is presented in the following chapters. In addition, the office support staff at KVCC, especially Alice Moote, provided assistance in typing the numerous materials—survey instrument, mailing labels, etc.—during the research project. I would like to thank the Council of North Central Two-Year

Colleges and the North Central Association for awarding me a 1992-1993 research grant, which supported the research documented in this report. Without the Council's financial support, the research project would not have been possible.

English faculty at Mid Michigan Community College conducted a pilot study on the survey instrument and provided valuable feedback in preparing the final survey instrument. In addition, Barry Alford (Mid Michigan Community College), Robert Haight (Kalamazoo Valley Community College), Marybelle Keim (Southern Illinois University), Irving Lehmann (Michigan State University), Jim Palmer (Illinois State University), and Mary Jean Whitelaw (Carnegie Foundation) provided valuable feedback in preparing the survey instrument.

I owe a great deal to the department chairs who took the interest and time to distribute the survey instrument to their faculty and to the over seven hundred two-year college faculty members who took the time to complete and return the survey instrument. The study could not have been completed without their cooperation.

My doctoral committee, Professors Diane Brunner, Marilyn Wilson, Jay Ludwig, and David Wright, has provided unending support during the several years it took me to complete this work. I would also like to thank Professor Dean Rehberger, my "outside" reader. It was Professor Brunner who also introduced me to ethnographic research and to the work of scholars who have had the greatest influence on my teaching and research: Ira Shor, Henry Giroux, and Michael Apple.

Finally, I want to acknowledge my biggest supporter and best critic, Lisa Wininger.

PREFACE

I was rescued from the "Maybe Pile." In 1986, after sending out over sixty applications to community colleges located anywhere from Tierra del Fuego to Baffin Bay for adjunct or tenure-track teaching positions, and after receiving fifty-eight rejections and one interview--I finished second--I finally landed a full-time teaching position in the Communication Arts Department (CAD) at Kalamazoo Valley Community College (KVCC) in Kalamazoo, Michigan. It was a homecoming of sorts: I had grown up on the "other side of the state" in Detroit (southeastern Michigan) and had passed Kalamazoo and the exit for Kalamazoo Valley Community College many times while traveling with my family to Benton Harbor (in southwestern Michigan) to visit relatives. On these family trips during the 1960s, KVCC would not have been there—like so many community colleges, it opened during the period of rapid expansion between the late 1960s and early 1970s. But even during our many trips past Kalamazoo in the 1970s, I don't remember ever noticing the Exit 72 sign for the college. Most references to colleges in Kalamazoo included Western Michigan University (where my oldest sister attended) or Kalamazoo College, a well-known and highly-selective liberal arts college.

Nonetheless, it was at KVCC that I landed fresh out of graduate school—the Communication Arts Department's first new faculty member in ten years. In fact, most of my colleagues in 1986 were

already teaching at the school during those times I passed by with my family. And I wouldn't have arrived at all if not rescued by Patricia Baker and Bill Lay from the "Maybe Pile."

Like many—but by no means all— of my current students, I enrolled in a community college—Mt. San Antonio College (Mt. SAC) in Walnut, California—after a rather poor academic career in high school. I was not a very good high school student, and the community college would be for me, like for so many students, a chance at a college education and the opportunity for transferring to a four-year college or university and/or the opportunity to learn a skill. After two years at Mt. SAC, I transferred to the University of California at Davis; I picked Davis because I loved its campus rather than for any particular academic major. I do remember indicating on my application that animal science was my major. In fact it wasn't, but by so doing I greatly increased my chances of being accepted--only Davis among UC campuses offered animal science.

As I discovered years later, I was one of the lucky ones. The statistics for the students entering a California community college in 1976 and then transferring to the UC system in two years—although I had completed six semesters at Mt. SAC by attending summer school for two years— was something on the order of 1,000 out of 1,000,000. Many of my friends at Mt. SAC did go on to four-year colleges and universities, but I always have wondered about the others, particularly after reading what critics of the community college called its "cooling out" mission.

I became an English major at Davis only after taking a course in American literature from Professor James Woodress, a man whom I consider my mentor. James Woodress was genuinely a gentleman and a scholar. After graduating from Davis with a degree in English, and after the prerequisite time spent in the world of work —technical writer, bookstore clerk, construction worker, greenhouse worker—I returned to graduate school at the University of California at Riverside. I attended Riverside more out of proximity to my wife's work than any other reason, but it turned out to be a fortuitous choice. I earned a master's degree in English, which at Riverside required coursework in all literary periods, something I actually didn't want to do—when I enrolled nineteenth-century American literature was my "specialty." (As I learned later, however, community colleges are much more interested in hiring generalists rather than specialists.) More importantly, with some extra effort, I was able to gain a teaching assistantship after my first quarter of graduate coursework. The assistantship involved teaching first-year composition and required a couple of (pass/no pass) courses on teaching composition. Again, luck was on my side. It turned out that the director of the writing center—rather than the director of the teaching assistants, a Shakespearean scholar—taught the composition method courses. Rather than having a professor trained in literature and assigned to direct TAs teach the composition courses, they were taught by Professor Rise Axelrod, someone actually interested in the scholarship and teaching of Composition. It was from Rise Axelrod and from engaging in endless and productive office and hallway discussions with my office mates (Barbara Laughton and Gladys Craig) and fellow teaching assistants—

Paul Van Heuklom, Laurel Hendrix, Tom Giannotti, Dan Pearce, and the late Kris Scarano--that I learned how to teach writing.

Like a lot of two-year college teachers, I had no idea when I went to graduate school that I would become an English instructor at a two-year college. I had never heard of a master's degree in teaching English in the Two-Year College, although such a degree was offered at some colleges and universities. Instead, I had entered Riverside intent on earning a Ph.D. in English—and before I left I was accepted into the Ph.D. program—and gaining a tenure-track position at a four-year college or university teaching nineteenth-century American literature. But after two years and a master's degree, I had lost my love for reading and for literature —it took me a couple of years after graduate school to get it back—but, more importantly, I had gained a new interest in composition theory and rhetoric and in the teaching of writing.

I applied, then, to community colleges having been a community college student but not having really known much about community colleges. I read a few articles and books about community colleges to discover that an interest in teaching, especially the teaching of writing, was essential, but neither a Ph.D. degree nor an interest in scholarship was necessary. I knew there was a journal called Teaching English in the Two-Year College, but had only ever glanced at it. I had never taken a class on either the history of community colleges or teaching English in the two-year college. Neither was offered at UC Riverside in the English department, and I had never thought to check while earning my master's degree. (I'm sure I asked myself at that time whether teaching composition at a community college would

be any different than teaching composition at UC Riverside?) To this day, I'm still not finally, completely sure why my two future colleagues rescued me from the "maybe pile" when over sixty other community colleges--including Mt. SAC--passed me over. I am sure, however, that I'm forever thankful that they did.

As I settled into my teaching position at KVCC I became both more and less comfortable. I was comfortable in that I had found a tenure-track position teaching both composition and literature courses at a well-respected and supportive institution during a period (that continues today) when even the best and the brightest of English Ph.D.s were having trouble finding tenure-track teaching positions. That said, I also began to wonder about my own graduate training and whether or not that training had prepared me for teaching in a community college. (To answer the question posed earlier, teaching composition at a community college would certainly not be the same as teaching composition at U C Riverside—and for a variety of reasons, both good and bad.) My graduate training had prepared me for teaching writing—and yet it hadn't. The courses I had taken with Rise Axelrod at U C Riverside had been a good start—I had read and studied the classical rhetoric and had discovered the Writing Process and such theorists and practitioners like Donald Murray and Peter Elbow. But during my first year at KVCC, I realized that I wanted and needed to learn more about the teaching of writing and about community colleges. So, after one year at KVCC, I enrolled as a Lifelong Learning student at Michigan State so I could take courses in the English department specifically related to composition and rhetoric. The first

course I entered was English 970: English Education, which that semester was taught by Professor Stephen Tchudi and focused on Classroom-based Teacher Research. Enrolling in these courses also provided a group of students and faculty with whom I could discuss these topics. Sadly, it became quite apparent after only one year at KVCC that only a few of my colleagues in the CAD were interested in studying and discussing composition and rhetoric.

As a writing teacher, and after completing a course in classroom research at MSU with Professors Stephen Tchudi and Marilyn Wilson, I began to believe more and more that writing teachers should be writers themselves and to wonder why community colleges did not encourage—in fact, the literature on community colleges that I read seemed to suggest that they actually discouraged—writing teachers to write and publish professionally. I began to wonder about the growing number of courses listed "staff" at my own college, and even more so about the part-time faculty who taught these courses and about the conditions under which they worked. (As a community college student I had been told by other students to avoid the classes listed "staff," and I remember looking in the Mt. SAC catalogue to find my instructors' names and degrees.) I wondered about the history of two year colleges and began to read more about them, discovering, however, that a history of two-year college English departments did not exist outside of individual autobiographical essays and research reports and that for the most part higher education ignored community colleges. (At this point, only an occasional essay in TETYC was written by a two-year college teacher.) I wondered about colleagues at other community colleges whom I met at conferences

and in my classes at Michigan State. Were their experiences similar to mine? Different?

This dissertation--which as the title suggests is a collection of essays-- grows out of my own personal experiences over the past ten years as a community college English teacher[1] and out of my research—in particular to the research study I conducted of two-year college English faculty, both part- and full-time faculty, in the North Central Association of two-year colleges (described below)--of two-year college faculty, particularly English faculty, during past the ten years. For that reason there is unavoidably some degree of overlap: statistics are mentioned more than once; some ideas are repeated in various chapters. The individual essays represent my thinking—and the thinking of many other two-year college faculty and scholars—on the various topics I have described above: the history of the two-year college English department, faculty issues including faculty development and scholarship, and part-time faculty.

Research Study

Funded by a grant from the Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC), my study examined English faculty, both full- and part-time, and curriculum at public and private community colleges in the nineteen-state CNCTYC. The CNCTYC provides a diverse range of community college systems, covers a wide geographical area, and includes 35% of all public and private community colleges (Mahoney & Jimenez, 1992, pp. 58-61). Using both the PMLA "Directory" (1992, pp. 967-978) of two-year colleges and the Community, Technical, and

Junior Colleges Statistical Yearbook (Mahoney & Jimenez, 1992), I identified 411 community colleges in the CNCTYC. Each department chair was sent a letter requesting the participation of the college's English faculty in the study (See Appendix A), the number of full- and part-time faculty teaching at least one literature or writing course during the Winter term 1993, and the name of a contact person willing to distribute the questionnaires.

The questionnaire (See Appendix A) was designed to gather data in nine areas: formal education; academic rank, tenure, and teaching experience; present teaching experience; scholarly activities; curriculum; teaching practices in developmental and first college-level writing courses; institutional environment; and classification data. The questionnaire was reviewed by a group of experts, and a pilot study was conducted at Mid Michigan Community College.

One hundred and sixty-nine community colleges responded to the letter and requested a total of 2, 852 surveys (an average of 16.8 instructors per department, with a range of 1 to 80). Seven hundred seventy-seven usable surveys were returned. The sample consisted of 426 full-time faculty (55%) and 351 (45%) part-time faculty. (A random sample of 178 public and private community colleges in the CNCTYC reported the mean number of faculty per department as 18.0: 6.9 full-time faculty (38%) and 11.1 part-time faculty (62%). These numbers suggest that part-time faculty in the study were under represented.)

Note

[1] Throughout this dissertation I use the terms community college and two-year college in referring to the same institution in higher education. From their beginnings until the 1940s, community colleges and two-year colleges were popularly known as junior colleges--they typically offered the first two years (lower division course work) of the four-year college or university. Beginning with the Truman Commission Report (1947), however, the term "community college" was suggested as the best description of those institutions offering not only transfer courses (i.e., junior college) to four-year colleges and universities, but also courses in vocational and technical education and career education. Community college has become the most commonly used name, although various journals and publication use the name two-year college, and a few two-year colleges still refer to themselves as junior colleges (e.g., Modesto Junior College in Modesto, California). I prefer to use both terms since not all faculty in my study teach at community colleges; that is, some faculty teach at two-year branch campuses of four-year institutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1 1900-1960: The Rise of Terminal English

Writing in the "Foreword" to James Berlin's Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985, Donald C. Stewart (1987) states "that ignorance of the history of our profession, particularly ignorance of the history of writing instruction, is the single greatest deficiency in the majority of this nation's English teachers. . . ." (ix). While Stewart appears to be addressing all English teachers, K-university, his claim rings especially loud for English teachers teaching in two-year colleges. As I argue in later chapters, two-year college writing faculty have remained all but invisible in the histories and studies of the English profession, including more recent studies of composition and rhetoric, for example, Berlin's Rhetoric and Reality, North's The Making of Knowledge in Composition, Elbow's What Is English? and Miller's Textual Carnivals. I am not suggesting, however, that these works are unimportant for two-year college English faculty. Two-year college English faculty can learn much from these works and share some of the same history. Nonetheless, two-year college English faculty also have their own history, a history that for the most part has gone untold. It is true that two-year college English faculty have attracted the most attention of researchers on two-year colleges of any two-year college discipline (Brawer 1975), and there have been some short personal histories of the profession by

writers like Elisabeth McPherson, Betsy Hilbert, Audrey Roth, and Richard Worthen. But most of these pieces have discussed the two-year college after 1960, when two-year colleges began their greatest period of rapid expansion: "enrollment increased from just over 500,000 in 1960 to more than 2 million by 1970. . ." (Cohen and Brawer 1989, 30). The first sixty years of the two-year college English profession--and I do believe that it quickly became a profession--has received very little attention, which is a great disservice to current faculty. If current community college English faculty are to understand and discuss the present and future conditions in which they teach, it is important that they have some understanding of the past.

Prior to the 1960's not much information exists about junior college English faculty or curriculum. What is available is mostly short essays that appear in the Junior College Journal, which began publication in 1930 as the official publication of the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC). (The American Association of Junior Colleges--currently the American Association of Community Colleges--was founded in 1920, but did not sponsor the Junior College Journal until ten years later.) These essays were written by a small group of junior college English instructors interested in writing about their profession. The essays typically describe an English course or program at the writers' respective institutions, although an occasional essay describes a research study undertaken by the faculty member. Using these essays, and other related material, for example, the occasional essay that appeared in

College English, this chapter describes the culture of the two-year college English department prior to 1960, but with emphasis on the period 1930-1940. In doing so, it is necessary to include some discussion of the junior college in general, since what was occurring within the "junior college movement" during this period greatly influenced faculty, curriculum, and students.

Perhaps the single most important thing to understand about the history of the two-year college in America, especially in its first sixty years--more important than when the first public junior college was founded (1901), where it was founded (Joliet, Illinois), or almost any other piece of information--is its original and strong connection with secondary education (specifically the American high school). No other part of its history has had as great an impact as the original connection between these two educational institutions. Deegan et al. (1985) in examining the evolution of the two-year college label the years between 1900-1930 as the "extension of the high school": "The [junior] colleges of this early period were clearly extensions of high schools. Existing school facilities were used, and teachers continued to teach very much the same way that they taught high school courses" (6). In addition, the local "junior college" was under the control of the local school board. This connection is the single greatest factor in understanding the development of the two-year college in America. With respect to the English profession, it is likely that the first two-year college English instructor to walk into a junior college English classroom had previously taught that day at the local high

school. The earliest junior college English instructors were often high school English teachers "moonlighting" at the junior college. The training they had as high school teachers--often a master's degree--made them "qualified" to teach in the junior college. In fact, the two-year college English class may well have been held in the same classroom as a high school class.

While early leaders of the junior college movement debated the purposes and mission of the junior college--a debate that continues even today-- it is clear that they desired a close association with secondary education rather than higher education. In describing the very early years of the junior college, Witt et al. (1994) note that

> Many junior colleges had started as high school extensions, and their representative leaders felt very strongly that the junior college should not separate in its funding and administration from the parent high school. In effect, they regarded junior college education as secondary, not higher education. (79)

Many of these "representative leaders" and many of the first junior college presidents had come from secondary and elementary education backgrounds. Others, such as University of Chicago president William Rainey Harper, saw the junior college as way to separate the first two years of undergraduate education from the more important third and fourth years and from graduate education.

> The work of the freshman and sophomore years is only a confirmation of the academy or high school work. It is a confirmation not only of the subject matter but of the methods employed. It is not until the end of the sophomore year that university methods of instruction may be employed to advantage. (Harper, qtd. in Brint and Karabel 1989, 24).

There was, however, disagreement between those at the national level of the junior college movement and those at the local level over the purpose of the junior college.

At the national level the ideology surrounding the junior college is best exemplified in the work of Walter C. Eells, a national leader who believed in the separation of the junior college from higher education and in the accompanying idea of "Terminal education" as the main purpose of the junior college. "Eells was tireless in the advocacy of his vision of the junior college. As speaker, writer, editor, and committee chair, he acted as interpreter and promoter of the vision. . . . Before 1940 . . . he was an authoritative spokesman for the leadership" (Frye 1992, 51). For Eells and other national leaders it was through terminal education--generally defined as career education or semiprofessionalism--that the junior college would establish its position in education:

> For the national leaders, the idea of terminal education promised the junior college increasing enrollments, and hence, growth. Further, it described a program that reinforced the higher status of the universities, guaranteeing their neutrality if not endorsement. (Frye 1992, 53)

The national leaders had decided that if the junior college was to establish its place in American education--and during the first thirty years of the junior college movement this was not yet certain--it would be primarily through offering terminal education rather than transfer education. The emphasis on terminal education, however, was not as well accepted on the local level.

At the local level, city and town officials appear to have been in general agreement with national leaders regarding the junior college's connection to secondary education, often it was the local school board that governed the newly-founded junior college. In addition, however, they often considered the establishment of a junior college in their town or region as providing both access to a four-year college or university or as a means to new occupations outside those in the declining agricultural industry. For example, the establishment of Fresno Junior College in Fresno, California --the second continuously operating junior college-- resulted from the lack of access to higher education for local high school graduates: "When Fresno took advantage of the law to establish a junior college in 1910, one of its presenting arguments was that there was no institution of higher education within nearly 200 miles of the city" (Cohen and Brawer 1989, 15). In addition, despite the agenda of the national leadership, students during this period continually expressed a preference for the transfer function of the junior college over the terminal education programs (Brint and Karabel 1989, 43-46; Frye 1992, 115).

And faculty, although drawn from the local high school, were also often at odds with the national junior college leadership over the idea that terminal education should be the central mission of the junior college.

The junior college's connection to secondary education and the corresponding debate between the terminal and transfer functions of the junior college are central in understanding the history and role of

English faculty and of the English curriculum in the junior college during this period. It was the high school and high school culture that the earliest junior college English faculty were drawn

> The argument that the freshman and sophomore years were part of secondary education rather than 'higher education' substantiated the junior college's claim to have a special role in teaching that set its staff apart from the first two years of the baccalaureate college or university. (Frye 1992, 49).

In other words, the reference group for junior college faculty was to be secondary education--high school teachers--and not four-year college or university faculty. And it was the English faculty that was charged with developing the terminal and transfer English curriculum.

English Faculty

English faculty and courses, composition and literature, played a prominent role from the very outset of the junior college. During the 1921-22 academic year, Koos reported that English courses made up 7.9% of total course offerings, fourth highest among all courses (qtd. in Cohen and Brawer 1989, 287)--foreign languages, social subjects, and science courses ranked one , two, and three respectively. Interestingly enough, at this early stage of the junior college, literature courses accounted for more than half of the courses in English. In a study of "The Junior College Instructor," Conley (1938, 510), a Dean at Wright Junior College, reported 179 of the 1020 instructors in his study were English instructors (17.5%), by far the largest number of faculty in the sample. Perhaps the best evidence concerning the junior college English department is offered

in the essays written by junior college English faculty for the Junior College Journal and (less frequently) for College English.

One of the earliest studies of strictly English faculty is offered in Diel's "A Portrait of The 'Typical' Instructor of English in the Junior College" published in College English in 1942. While his study does not include the California community college system, which by the early 1940's was already the country's largest, it does provide the first detailed examination of English faculty. His study is based on the responses of eighty-seven English instructors in seven western states in fifty-two public junior colleges. Diel found the "typical" English instructor had a master's degree--only one person held a Ph.D. In fact, Diel (1942) writes that "a majority of the presidents and other administrators either are only lukewarm in their advocacy of the Ph.D. or actually frown upon it" (47). (As I point out in later chapters the master's degree remains the most common degree for community college English faculty and the debate continues over the Ph.D. for community college faculty.) The typical instructor is female (60%); previously taught at a high school and, in fact, is likely to still be teaching at a high school; holds no rank or title beyond instructor; works about 37 hours each week; and teaches on average 135 students (Diel 1942, 48). In addition, the typical instructor is not actively engaged in research and does not publish. Diel (1942) believed this was the case "in part [because] the average junior college instructor is not a research scholar as is the professor in the university, the emphasis of the two types of institutions being in entirely different directions in present practice" (49).

Joyal, in an essay published in 1932 in the Junior College Journal entitled "Problems of Class Size and Teaching Load, " reported that a typical junior college teaching load was fifteen semester hours per week, consisting of five courses with three preparations. It should not be surprising that the number of semester hours and the number of courses more closely approximated the teaching schedule of a high school teacher than that of a four-year college or university professor. It should also not be surprising that these were the recommended teaching requirements of junior college administrators, because it appears that historically junior college faculty (much like secondary education faculty) have had less authority in their own departmental and college governance and administration than faculty at four-year colleges and universities.

A study of English faculty published thirteen years later in 1955 in the Junior College Journal echoes both Diel and Joyal's findings and makes it quite clear that the early structure and culture of the junior college once set in motion would be hard to change. In an essay entitled "Teaching Load and Class Size in English Composition," Marvin Laser (1955), a former faculty member at Wilson Junior College, reported that the typical teaching load still consisted of fifteen semester hours per week with a typical class size of between 25 - 29 students. A more subtle yet interesting and telling finding reported by Laser was that by the mid-1950's the junior college English instructor now taught more writing courses than literature courses. Literature no longer occupied over half of the English curriculum. By the mid-1950's, teaching writing had already become the main work of the junior college English instructor. The

teaching of literature was now secondary--a far cry from the origins and traditions of the English profession and from the central status that it has always held in the four-year college and university English department.

Why the teaching of literature failed to maintain a prominent place in the two-year college English department is not completely clear, although a couple of reasons can be offered. First, with its close connection to secondary education, the junior college, and thus junior college disciplines, never closely identified with four-year institutions. Thus while two-year college English departments offered literature courses as part of their curriculums, English faculty rarely engaged in the study of literature as a profession. Put another way, one won't find any discussion of two-year college English departments in Graff's (1987) Professing Literature: An Institutional History, and two-year college English faculty are all but invisible in the Modern Language Association. The culture of the "traditional" English department, then, never developed in the two-year college. (As I discuss in a later chapter, it is significant in understanding the development of the two-year college English profession to know that most two-year college "English" faculty do not teach in English departments.) That is, it would have been highly unusual for a junior college English instructor to be active or known as a literary scholar. Second, the junior college's early emphasis on terminal education may have portrayed literature as unnecessary. Gosch (1939) raises this very concern:

> Although English is still the most important subject taught in American schools, there may be a question about the importance of English literature in junior colleges, in many of

> which the English instructors must keep in mind the needs and desires of terminal and vocational students, as well as those who plan to continue work in professional. . . . Unfortunately there are many students who cannot see the usefulness of literature. (194)

Very early in the junior college English department's history, literature became somewhat of a "luxury" course not central to the work of junior college English faculty. For junior college English faculty interested in teaching literature--and as the junior college evolved more and more faculty came from traditional English departments in four-year institutions-- the preservation of literature course offerings within the department and college became an ongoing struggle that continues even today. As is pointed out in a later chapter, literature courses now make up only a small percentage of community college course offerings.

Although not abundant, the information on the junior college English instructor during the first sixty years of the junior college offers a lot to those who like myself are interested in understanding the current culture and issues of the two-year college English department. Many of the issues raised in later chapters, for example, those concerning pre-service training, teaching loads, class sizes, and professional development are better understood knowing this early history. Clearly the junior colleges' original connection with secondary education and its emphasis on terminal education have played a vital role in the development of the two-year college English profession, including pre-service training, teaching loads, class size, curriculum, and professional development.

Writing Instruction

As discussed above, Koos reported in the early 1920's that over half of the junior college English department courses concerned literature. Yet, it was evident just ten years later that teaching writing not literature would be the main work of junior college English faculty. The essays published in the Junior College Journal and College English beginning in 1930 reflect this change: most focus on the practical needs of teaching writing. The impetus for this change appears to be the changing enrollment pattern of students in the junior college between the 1920's and the 1930's. While the Great Depression caused a decrease in the amount of funding junior colleges received and a decrease in the number of new junior colleges, enrollment continued to increase: "Wherever the opportunities were available, youth and adults took advantage of occupational retraining at local junior colleges. . . " (Deegan et al. 1985, 8). In a somewhat perverse manner, then, the Great Depression served as a catalyst for defining the junior college in terms of vocational and terminal education. The Great Depression was just what the national leaders needed in their quest to make terminal and vocational education the main function of the junior college. The large increase in students and the increasing emphasis on terminal education engendered the issue that would be the central focus of the junior college English departments for a number of years to come--the development of terminal writing courses.

Prior to the enrollment increases of the early thirties--between 1933 and 1939 junior college enrollment almost doubled--and to the emphasis

at the national level from junior college leaders for terminal education, the junior college offered mostly transfer courses (Cohen and Brawer 1989, 287). For junior college English faculty this meant teaching both literature and transfer writing courses. For example, Ransom (1938) quotes the Ward-Bellmont Junior College catalogue title for freshman English in 1925-28 as "'Advanced Course in Rhetoric and Composition' . . . Required for a Classical and a General Diploma'" (245), and notes it was not until 1928 that the English department offered its first "sub-English" writing course, "'English Zero,' planned solely for students whose deficiencies in the fundamentals of grammar and of sentence structure early in the year gave reasonable guarantee of their failure in the credit course" (245). The transfer English composition course was typically patterned after that of the first-year university composition course. As Cook (1933) put it, "the junior college must accede for the present to the desires of the college and the university in the composition field. . . " (315). Because the four-year institution set the standards for the admission of transfer students, junior colleges appear to have had little say in what those standards were and how they would be met. (A fact of life that still exists today.) Cook (1933) also offers a description of what the typical junior college English composition course looked like at the time:

> This [composition] course has about twenty-seven pupils, meets three times a week, and writes about one short theme (of four pages) a week and two long themes a semester. Exposition, description, and narration are studied. . . . Models from pure literature will be used. The chances are about even as to whether a rhetoric or a handbook will be used. Individual conferences are required at least two or three times a semester. A small amount of

> reading in literature will be required with the probability of a minimum of a thousand pages a semester. (313)

The above description suggests quite a writing course similar to current community college composition classes with respect to number of students, meeting times, rhetorical strategies, and conferences. The most striking differences are in the number of pages of writing and reading required in the class. Both are larger than today's requirements. In addition, one does not get from Cook's description any sense that writing as a process was taught in the course. Rather, the description suggests the course was product centered--"writes about one short theme a week" (Cook 1933, 313).

The transfer course, however, lost its central position as the writing course in the early 1930's when a different type of student began enrolling in the junior colleges. Writing in 1931, Catherine Himes, coordinator for English of the Chicago Junior Colleges, stated:

> Because of new conditions, we were asked to make some important modifications in our thinking. The first of these conditions was the changed character of our student body. Many young people were now coming to college simply because there was nothing else for them to do. The assumption was that these people would not fit into traditional junior college curriculum, planned, as it was, for students who intended to go on to the university. (86)

The faculty at the Chicago Junior Colleges were not, however, alone in their discussions concerning what was called "the changed character" of the junior college student and what this "changed character" meant for the junior college English department.

Many of the essays--written by junior college faculty that appeared in the Junior College Journal during the next twenty years--quite a remarkable length of time considering the fads that often come and go within academia--concerned the English curriculum and the development of the "terminal" writing course. A vast majority of the essays concern writing courses (but literature courses were not totally immune from discussion). As one English instructor described it, "the chief question of the English department is, 'What type of English training shall be stressed?'" (Coan 1932, 94). And the discussion was not focused in only one department--entire English associations got involved: "What are the English departments of junior colleges doing for students whose formal education will end when they complete the fourteenth year? This is one of the problems being studied by a committee of the English Teachers' Association of Southern California. . . (Stone 1939, 85).

The "terminal" writing course was intended for those students who would not continue their education after two-years (the fourteenth year) at the junior college. It was the English faculty's belief that these students were in need of a writing course different in purpose and content from the transfer course (such as the one described above). As one writer describes it, his department was attempting to "rearrange [their] work until it is suited to those students who are to have only two years of college education" (30). After stating that in fact such a course was needed, most of the writers go on to describe in very practical terms what was being done at their respective colleges to address the need for a terminal writing course. Although each college had its own specific approach, in each case

the terminal English writing course was aimed at preparing the student for life experiences or work: "Our English courses must be of the broadening, vitalizing kind that will be useful to a man in any walk of life" (Coan, 1932, 95). Other writers suggested that the terminal writing course offer students instruction in how to write letters and other business correspondence, while still other writers suggested that a literature component be included so that these students would at least have some appreciation of great literature.

On the one hand, in almost all the essays on the topic of terminal writing courses, one gets the feeling that the writers were genuinely interested in the education of their students. And the courses they typically describe often appear more interesting than the transfer course. That is, the descriptions of the terminal writing course often include the need or us of group work and collaborative work, various contemporary reading selections, no textbook, and class discussion. The terminal writing course was not a preparation course for the university. On the other hand, very rarely does the idea emerge--that nevertheless is in fact the subtext of many of these essays--that in creating such a course the writers are suggesting that the students enrolled in the course are in some way inferior to the students enrolled in the transfer writing course. That is, only one writer states what the others at least imply: Richardson (1931) writes, "We must not avoid the essential observation that we are dealing with minds which are not academic either in habit or in interests" (30). What's not stated, however, is why the writers believe this? Test scores? High school grades? Social background? Race? Ethnicity? Unfortunately,

they never critically critique their pedagogy --a charge that has historically been leveled at two-year college faculty, and with some justification.

Nowhere in these essays is there any discussion of how students came to enroll in the terminal writing course, why they enrolled in it, and who, in fact, these students were. None of the writers question whether or not a student enrolled in a terminal English writing course might in fact decide later on to transfer to a four-year institution. There is little, if any, discussion of placement tests. Only Richardson addressees--and then just briefly--the notion that terminal writing courses not only defined a certain group of students but also suggested certain behavioral patterns and clear overtones of social status. Perhaps such a critique would have been asking too much of the faculty at the time, especially considering that they were publishing in the Junior College Journal, the official publication of the AAJC, and a journal that to this day serves more as a place for promoting the two-year college rather than as a place for critical examination of it. It is not surprising, then, that the English faculty publishing in the Junior College Journal supported the need for terminal writing courses; they were simply supporting the national leadership. In fact, it was not until Clark's (1960) The Open Door College, which developed his theory concerning the "cooling out" function of the two-year college, that serious critiques of the two-year college began to appear. Only then did critics of the two-year college-- writers such as Clark, Fred Pincus, Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel, Ira Shor, and L. Steven Zwerling--begin to question

the idea of terminal education and the democratic principles that junior college leaders said were the foundation of the two-year college.

From the vantage point of 1996, it can be argued (and has been argued) that the distinction between terminal and transfer writing courses--and the very notion of terminal and vocational education--suggests that junior colleges were used--and continue to be used--as a means of maintaining social class. That is, from the early 1930's on, when students previously not part of the educational system beyond secondary education began enrolling in college, specifically the junior college--even at this time the university was inaccessible, except for perhaps a very small percentage of these students--writing instruction, perhaps the one college course that almost all college students must take, served a "gatekeeping" function. That is, it existed as a means of sorting out students who were "worthy" of pursuing a four-year education--those enrolled in the transfer writing course--from those who were to continue the working class conditions that brought them to the junior college--those enrolled or placed in the terminal writing course.

By the early 1950's, faculty finally began to question the need for a terminal writing course:

> What is the state of English composition courses in public junior colleges today? What are the chief characteristics of such courses? . . . . Are separate courses desirable for terminal students and for those planning to go on to the bachelor's degree? (my emphasis)
>
> These are some of the pedagogical questions which have intrigued many junior college teachers but which have not been explored as yet in any systematic way. (Laser 1954, 130).

Laser (1954) set out to answer his questions and conducted a survey of the 313 existing public junior colleges in 1952. From the responses of 127 English department chairs, he discovered that while a few departments still offered a terminal writing course, "most English staffs . . . [do not] believe that terminal and transfer students should be enrolled in different kinds of freshman composition courses" (141). Despite the emphasis from the national leadership on terminal education and despite essays from junior college English faculty supporting the terminal writing course, it appears that it never flourished in the junior college. By the mid-1960's it was all but gone from the two-year college, replaced by developmental or remedial writing courses.

Beginning in the early 1960's and continuing into the early 1970's--fueled by returning war veterans, the increasing availability of financial aid (Cohen and Brawer 1989, 32) and the "great experiment" of "open admissions"--the community college experienced another great increase in ennrollment: between 1960 and 1970, community college enrollment rose from 500,000 to over 2 million (Cohen and Brawer 1989, 30). With the increased enrollment came an increase in the number of students less academically prepared for college-level work: "The majority of students entering open-door community colleges come from the lower half of the high school classes, academically and socioeconomically" (Cross qtd. in Cohen and Brawer 1989, 36). In response to this changing student population, one that was less prepared academically but still interested in transferring to four-year institutions, community college English faculty argued that terminal English be replaced with what came to be called

"developmental" or "remedial" English. In the community college of the 1960's terminal English was replaced by developmental or remedial English, a nontransfer course and prerequisite to the transfer course, freshmen composition: a national study of English in the Two-Year College by Weingarten and Kroeger (1965) reported that only two schools out of 187 reported having a terminal English course.

The increase in community college student enrollment in the 1960's and 1970's saw a concomitant increase in the number of community college faculty: the total number of community college instructors increased from 44,405 in 1963 to over 151,000 in 1973 to over 213,000 in 1978 (Cohen and Brawer 1989, 77), with a growing percentage of these instructors teaching on a part-time basis. As my study of two-year college English faculty reported in the next chapter suggests, many of the English faculty hired during this period are still teaching today.

2 Faculty Profile

Community college English faculty--those whose primary teaching responsibilities involve writing and literature--constitute a sizable percentage of full- and part-time faculty at community colleges (Astin, Korn, & Dey, 1991, 51; Clark, 1987, 44; Raines, 1990, 156). English courses form a significant percentage of the credits offered by community colleges. Adelman (1992, 62) reported that "English Composition: Regular" constitute 5.2% of the credits earned at community colleges, the most credits for any single course, and that three writing and communication courses rank in the top eight of courses with the highest percentage of credits earned. In a recent review of the liberal arts curriculum at community colleges, Cohen and Ignash (1992, 54-56) reported that 22.5% of the class sections concerned English (writing) courses, 1.9% concerned literature courses, and that writing classes had the largest enrollment of all liberal arts courses, 1,317,400 students in 1991.

Faculty size and enrollment alone, however, do not explain the importance of English in the community college. Through the courses they teach, English faculty are responsible for teaching literacy (writing) skills to an increasing number of undergraduate students--over 50% of all first-year college students now enroll in community colleges (El-Khawas, Carter, & Ottinger, 1988, 11). Furthermore, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988, 15-17) recommended that the teaching and acquisition of literacy skills,

particularly writing skills, should be the community colleges' first curriculum goal.

In the 1960s and early 1970s, community college English faculty and curriculum received more attention than any other academic discipline (Brawer 1975, 27). Numerous studies, sponsored by various professional, private, and governmental groups, including the American Association of Junior Colleges, the Carnegie Corporation, Modern Language Association, National Council of Teachers of English, and the U.S. Office of Education were published concerning (full-time) English faculty training, professional development, and the curriculum (for example, Archer and Ferrel 1965; Bossone 1964; Shugrue 1970; Kent 1971; Kitzhaber 1963; Weingarten and Kroeger 1965). For the past 20 years, however, faculty and curriculum have been largely ignored by the English profession (Raines 1990, 151). In addition, despite their increasing number, little has been written about part-time English faculty.

"Community colleges have always employed numerous part-time instructors" (Cohen and Brawer 75)--and the number continues to increase: As of fall 1991, part-time faculty comprised 66% of all community college faculty (Mahoney and Jimenez 58-61). Departments offering writing courses employ more part-time instructors than any other. Raines reported "the overall average percentage of part-time [English] faculty per institution is 42% " (15); the data reported in this essay suggests the figure may be as high as 62%. But

> because many part-time faculty flit in and out of the shadows of institutional listings of faculty, they are an elusive group in American higher education. . . . What is certain is that part-timers slip through the cracks of national statistics in ways that cause them to be underreported. Many are "unrostered." Unless deliberately designed to find them, faculty surveys also largely miss them" (Clark 205).

So despite the increasing number of part-time writing instructors at community colleges, little has been written by or about them (Gappa 95).

There have been studies of part-time English faculty at a particular community college or in a particular state, and there is an occasional essay (e.g., Angelo and Pickett 1988; Benjet and Loweth 1989; Curzon-Brown 1988; Speer 1992) or short blurb in the "What Concerns Me" section in Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC). More likely, the image of part-time faculty develops through unfamiliar names and faces passed in hallways, stood next to in faculty mailrooms—if in fact a part-time instructor has a mailbox—heard about from students, seen through classroom windows, or sat next to at departmental meetings—though at my college part-time faculty are not paid (or encouraged) to attend meetings.

The purpose of the present study is to remedy the lack of current data and to follow-up Raines's (1990) study of community college writing programs by conducting a study of both full- and part-time English faculty and curriculum at public and private community colleges in the nineteen-state—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois,

Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota. Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming— Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC). (See Appendix A for a complete description of the study.)

Findings

Background

In this study 65% of the faculty were female: 58% of the full-time faculty and 73% of the part-time faculty. Over 70% of both full- and part-time faculty taught at public comprehensive community colleges. The full-time faculty were an experienced group; 30% had taught 20 or more years, although, full-time faculty indicated they planned to remain a mean number of 11 years in their present positions. Forty-two percent of the full-time faculty held no academic rank. While not nearly as experienced as full-time faculty, 71% of part-time faculty had taught at least one year and 37% had taught four or more years.

Formal Education

The master's degree--not necessarily in English--remains the requisite degree of employment for teaching English at a community college. Although 84% of full-time and 92% of part-time faculty reported that their teaching responsibilities were leaning toward or heavy in writing, their graduate education emphasized training in literature. For example, full-time faculty had completed a mean number of 4 graduate courses in composition and rhetorical theory compared to a mean number of 15 graduate courses in literature. Both faculty groups, however, suggested that prospective faculty

should complete graduate courses related to the teaching of writing. Only a small percentage of faculty had completed a course in either the history of the community college or in teaching English in the two-year college; and despite continued recommendations by community college researchers that current and prospective faculty complete such courses, faculty do not suggest courses in either the history of the community college or in teaching English in the two-year college (Table 1).

Table 1 Formal Education of Faculty (Percentages)

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Highest Degree		
Bachelor's	3	17
Master's	68	65
English	56	43
Other	15	21
Education	12	14
Composition	3	3
Ed. D.	3	*
D.A.	1.5	*
Ph.D.	17	4
At Least One Graduate Course in		
Composition/Rhetoric	61	45
Literature	81	70
Education	56	45

Table 1 (cont'd)

History of Community College	18	6
Teaching English in the Community College	15	7
Suggested Graduate Courses Prospective English Faculty Should Complete		
Teaching Writing	41	40
Composition Theory	20	10
Other Courses Related to the Teaching of Writing	85	60
History of the Community College	6	3
Teaching English in the Community College	5	6

Faculty Workload

Because community colleges historically have been thought of as teaching institutions, community college faculty generally have been left out of the recent discussions concerning faculty workloads, which typically concern four-year college and university faculty and the amount of time devoted to teaching as compared to research. The National Center For Education Statistics reported that full-time two-year college faculty "averaged 40 hours per week, less than at any of the four-year schools" (1990, vi). In this study, full-time English faculty worked a mean number of 51 hours per week, with a mean number of 14.25 credits per semester (four to five courses) and a mean number of three course preparations per semester. Part-time faculty worked a mean number of 25 hours per week, with a mean

number of 8 credits per semester (two to three courses) and a mean number of two course preparations per semester. How faculty spent their time is described in Table 2.

Table 2 How Faculty Spend Their Time (Mean hours per week)

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Class Presentations	12	5.5
Grading	11	6
Preparation	9	5
Office Hours	7	2
Scholarship	4	3.5
Administrative Duties	2.5	*
Faculty Meetings	2	*
Community Service	2	*
Clerical Duties	1.5	*

Teaching Practices

As indicated above, community college English faculty spend most--in some cases all-- of their careers teaching writing. Although many community colleges offer literature courses, such as American and English literature, the most frequently offered literature course was "Introduction to Literature," which was taught by 27% of the full-time faculty and 15% of the part-time faculty. In a first college-level writing course (Table 3), the teaching of essay writing through a

process method appears to be the dominant pedagogical approach. Sixty-three percent of full- and part-time faculty reported using a textbook that placed more emphasis on writing essays than teaching usage and mechanics. Both full- and part-time faculty encouraged students to write multiple drafts, delayed grading until final drafts, used peer review writing workshops, and held writing conferences with individual students. The mean number of pages of writing required per week was 2.85 (roughly 700 words) for full-time faculty and 2.67 (530 words) for part-time faculty.

Table 3 Faculty Teaching Practices: First College-Level Writing Course (Percentages)

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Course Emphasis		
Writing Essays	74	57
Writing Paragraphs	3	3
Correct Usage and Mechanics	1	4
All of the Above	17	29
Type of Essays Written		
Personal Narrative	3	7
Exposition	13	9
Argumentation	2	2
All of the above	38	34

Table 3 (Cont'd)

Encourage Students to Write Multiple Drafts of an Essay	98	96
Delay Grading Until Final Draft	77	73

Teaching writing as a process also appears to be the dominant pedagogical method used in developmental or remedial writing courses required or recommended prior to students enrolling in first college-level writing courses. The emphasis in such courses, however, is not as great on writing essays as it is on teaching a combination of essays, paragraphs, and correct usage and mechanics. In such courses, as in first college-level writing courses, faculty emphasized writing as a process (Table 4). The mean number of pages of writing required per week was 2.21 (roughly 550 words) for full-time faculty and 2.15 (430 words) for part-time faculty.

Table 4 Faculty Teaching Practices: Developmental/Remedial Writing Course (Percentages)

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Course Emphasis		
Writing Essays	14	11

Table 4 (Cont'd)

Writing Paragraphs	25	15
Correct Usage and Mechanics	4	11
All of the Above	34	38
Type of Essays Written		
Personal Narrative	11	11
Exposition	7	9
Both Types	32	33
Personal Narrative, Exposition, and Argumentation	22	24
Essays Not Written in This Course	8	7
Encourage Students to Write Multiple Drafts of an Essay	95	96
Delay Grading Until Final Draft	67	67

Curriculum

Generally, full- and part-time faculty agreed on the goals (Table 5) of a community college education. In terms of curriculum requirements, 69% of full-time faculty reported that required writing courses were "about right"; a somewhat lower number (52%) reported that required literature courses were "about right"; 40% thought there

were "too few" required literature courses. Finally, 73% believed that general education requirements were "about right." Part-time faculty responses differed slightly. Sixty-nine percent reported that the required number of writing courses was "about right"; a somewhat lower number (45%) reported that the required number literature courses was "about right"; and 37% thought there were "too few" required literature courses. Finally, 71% believed that general education requirements were "about right."

As for outcome assessment, 67% of full-time faculty "disagreed with reservations" or "strongly disagreed" that multiple-choice assessment instruments would increase the quality of community college education. Only 34%, however, "agreed with reservations" or "strongly agreed" that state-mandated assessment requirements threaten the quality of community college education, and 47% "agreed with reservations" or "strongly agreed" that state-mandated requirements intrude on institutional autonomy. Fifty-six percent of part-time faculty "disagreed with reservations" or "strongly disagreed" that multiple-choice assessment instruments would increase the quality of community college education. Only 29%, however, "agreed with reservations" or "strongly agreed" that state-mandated assessment requirements threaten the quality of community college education; and 39% "agreed with reservations" or "strongly agreed" that state-mandated requirements intrude on institutional autonomy.

Table 5 Faculty Response Toward Goals of Two-Year College Education (Percentage who considered goal "Very Important" or "Fairly Important"

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Provide an appreciation of literature and the arts	85	88
Provide students with competence in writing and reading	95	96
Enhance creative thinking	85	89
Prepare students for a career	79	82

Students

Despite the often negative statements one reads in newspapers or overhears in faculty lounges about the current state of college students, both full- and part-time faculty reported positive attitudes toward community college students (Table 6). Ninety-seven percent of full-time faculty and 98% of part-time faculty considered their relationship with students "very important" or "fairly important." Both part- and full-time faculty appear willing to meet with students and to enjoy interacting with students. This rather overwhelming support for students reflects the student-centeredness that is a vital part of the community college mission. However, both groups also expressed concern for the lack of basic skills evident in many of their students.

Table 6 Faculty Attitudes Toward Students (Percentage who "Strongly Agree" or "Agree with Reservations")

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Enjoy interacting informally with students outside the classroom	86	82
Believe most students expect too much attention	12	14
Believe students should seek out faculty only during posted office hours	14	12
Believe most students at my institution only do enough to just "get by"	46	44
Believe students are seriously underprepared in basic skills--such as those required for written and oral communication	67	72

Scholarship

Full-time faculty are more likely to attend conferences, belong to professional organizations, and read professional journals than they are to publish (Table 7). And they appear not to receive much administrative support or reward for publishing. Faculty reported spending a mean number of 4 hours per week on activities related to scholarship (in this study defined as reading professional journals, conducting research, and professional writing); moreover, 87% reported that their interests were leaning toward or very heavy in

teaching rather than scholarship. The mean number of hours per week spent on activities that might lead toward publication was 2.49. Few community college administrations appear to support scholarship leading toward publication. Only 46% of faculty reported that their administrations "approve" of their writing for publication, and 79% reported that their administrations do not reward publication.

Part-time faculty were even less involved on a professional level in scholarship than full-time faculty (Table 7). Although, slightly fewer part-time faculty (79%) reported that their interests were leaning toward or heavy in teaching rather than scholarship, they reported spending a mean number of 3.5 hours--almost as much time as full-time faculty--on activities related to scholarship; and they reported spending a mean number of 2.51 hours per week on activities that might lead toward publication, which is slightly more time than full-time faculty. (Much of this time is accounted for by part-time faculty working on dissertations.)

The lack of professional involvement in scholarship by part-time faculty appears to have more to do with time and economics than interest: they have neither the time nor the money to be professionally active. As one part-time instructor wrote, "I want to learn new techniques and publish my own writing but there has never been any time." And at a time when full-time faculty are finding it increasingly difficult to receive college funding to attend a conference or present a paper, part-time faculty are neither encouraged nor rewarded by their respective institutions to be actively involved in the English profession. As one part-time faculty member put it, "attending or

presenting at any conferences is not available to part-time faculty at my college."

Table 7 Faculty Involvement in Scholarship (Percentages)

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Currently engaged in scholarly activities that might lead toward publication	38	29
Published a professional article in the past three years	24	13
Published at least one professional article in their career	40	20
Belonged to at least one professional organization	76	51
Attended at least one national, regional, state, or local conference in the past three years	67	43
Presented at at least one national, regional, state, or local conference in the past three years	32	18
Subscribed to at least one professional journal	72	48
Read at least one professional journal	80	67

Professional and Institutional Environment

Both full- and part-time faculty appear satisfied with their academic discipline, institution, department, and colleagues (Table 8).

Table 8 Faculty Responses Toward Professional Relationships (Percentage who consider relationships "Very Important" or "Fairly Important")

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Academic Discipline	95	96
Department	90	80
College	89	80
Colleagues at college	90	79
Colleagues at other colleges	52	38

Faculty were not as satisfied, however, with their teaching load, with the intellectual climate, administration, and sense of community at their respective institutions (Table 9). While 97 % of full-time faculty reported that they had "some" influence to "a great deal" of influence on departmental policy, and while 85% reported that they had "some" to a" great deal of influence" on college policy, 44% of part-time faculty reported they had "some" influence on departmental policy, and 71% percent reported they had "none" on college policy.

Table 9 Faculty Ratings of Institutional Environment (Percentage who responded "Excellent" or "Good")

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Own Salary	66	19
Teaching Load	39	45
Intellectual Environment of Institution	43	46
Administration at Institution	41	50
Sense of Community at Institution	49	50

Comparisons, Trends, and Discussion: Full-Time Faculty

Differences in sample size and in survey items exist among the various studies of English faculty and curriculum, and community colleges are diverse institutions. Nevertheless, comparing the studies offers insights into the development--or lack of development--of the community college English profession during the past 30 years provides a catalyst for discussing the future direction of the profession. With respect to full-time faculty, the percentage of females and males in the study was similar to that reported by Raines (1990, 156), 52% women and 48% men; Shugrue (1970, 7) reported 56% males and 44% females. The National Center For Education Statistics (1990, 6) reported that males represented 62% of all faculty at public community colleges. The master's degree remains the requisite degree for employment. In their respective studies of community college

English faculty, Weingarten and Kroeger (1965, p 62-63) reported that 76% of faculty had a master's degree, Shugrue (1970, 6) reported 84% and Raines (1990, 156) reported 75%. In this study, 68% held the master's as their highest degree. Finally, faculty still indicate a need for graduate courses in the teaching of writing and compositional theory and rhetoric. Seventy-one percent of faculty in Shugrue's (1970, 9) study reported a need for such courses, while 85% of the faculty in this study reported the need for various courses concerning the teaching of writing. This is not surprising: although faculty completed much of their graduate work in literature, the main focus of their teaching continues to be the teaching of writing. Raines (1990, 155) reported that faculty teach 3.52 writing courses per term. Shugrue (1970, p 7-8) reported that 75% of faculty taught at least one composition course and 18% taught at least one developmental or remedial writing course; in this study, 84% of faculty currently taught college-level composition. More faculty now teach developmental or remedial writing courses: 37% of faculty in this study were currently teaching such a course and 45% had taught such a course. This reflects the continued growth in developmental or remedial English courses offered by community colleges (Cohen and Ignash, 1992, p 52-54).

It is difficult to draw comparisons among teaching practices--not only over time but also among individual faculty and classrooms--because of differences in terminology, teaching methods, and intended outcomes. Examining the types of textbooks and delivery styles used in writing courses, however, does provide one helpful form of comparison. Weingarten and Kroeger (1965, 29-50) reported that, in

college-level composition, 74% of faculty reported using a reader, 57% a grammar handbook, and 56% a rhetoric, and that 88% reported "a combination of lecture and discussion" as the teaching method, with expository and argumentative prose the most common types of writing taught. This study suggests a continuing movement away from grammar -based drill instruction (in both college-level and developmental or remedial writing courses) toward teaching writing as a process, and the addition of the personal narrative as a type of required writing.

Within the current redefinitions of scholarship (Boyer 1990; Palmer & Vaughan 1992; Sydow 1993; Vaughan 1988; Vaughan & Palmer 1991), English faculty are active. They continue to belong to professional organizations, attend conferences, and read professional publications. Shugrue (1970, 7) reported that 76% belonged to at least one professional organization, with 40% belonging to National Council of Teachers of English NCTE), 24% belonging to NCTE-Regional groups, and 23% belonging to the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). In this study, 77% belonged to at least one professional organization, with 40% belonging to NCTE and a slightly lower percentage of faculty belonging to the NCTE-regional groups (18%) and the CCCC (20%). Shugrue (1970, 7) reported that 57% of faculty were likely to read professional publications, 54% were likely to attend regional meetings, and 25% were likely to attend national meetings. In this study, 72% subscribed to at least one professional journal, including College English (47%), College Composition and Communication (36%), and Teaching English in the Two-Year College (32%); and 80% reported reading at

least one journal, College English (54%), College Composition and Communication (41%), and Teaching English in the Two-Year College (40%). However, English faculty do not actively publish despite calls for them to be active scholars and writers (Knodt, 1988; Kort, 1991; Kroll, 1992; Reynolds, 1991). Kent (1971, p 74-75) reported that 70% of English faculty had never published a professional article or a book. Similarly, 60% in this study had never published a professional article, and 76% had never published a book. In this respect, English faculty resemble other community college faculty (Keim, 1989, 37).

In this study, English faculty viewed their profession and institutions in much the same way as other community college faculty. For example, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989, p 93-120) reported that 98% of all community college faculty considered their discipline "very important" or "fairly important," 93% considered their department "very important" or "fairly important," and 52% thought the intellectual environment on their campus as "fair" or "poor." In this study, 95% of English faculty considered their discipline "very important" or "fairly important," 90% considered their department "very important" or "fairly important," and 56% thought the intellectual environment on their campus as "fair" or "poor."

Part-Time Faculty Profile

The profile of part-time English faculty emerging from this study is that of a fairly experienced female instructor with a master's degree (less than half earned the degree in English), working at a public comprehensive community college, and teaching one or two writing courses using pedagogical methods associated with teaching writing

as a process. Beyond teaching, the part-time instructor is typically engaged in another occupation (72%) and not necessarily able, willing, or desiring to move to a different state to gain a full-time teaching position (68%). This person values her relationships with students, her academic discipline, and her colleagues. She is not active in scholarship in terms of publication and presentation but is more likely to belong to a professional organization or to read a professional journal, or both. In many, but certainly not all, respects, she appears satisfied with her position.

While the above profile is helpful in understanding and discussing the complex issues concerning part-time English faculty at two-year colleges, it is important to remember that these faculty are a diverse group with diverse backgrounds and motives for teaching part-time.

Comparison with Full-time Faculty

Part-time faculty appear quite similar to full-time faculty. The master's degree is the most common degree for both groups; and although part-time faculty are less experienced than full-time faculty, both have more training in literature than in teaching writing. In their teaching of writing both groups emphasize methods associated with the teaching of writing as a process. That is, both groups emphasize essay writing over mechanics and punctuation instruction, and both groups encourage students to write multiple drafts, don't necessarily grade rough drafts, use peer review-writing workshops, and hold writing conferences. Some of this, of course, may be a result of part-time faculty being required to follow departmental policy. However, of those faculty citing at least one "composition theorist" (55%), both

groups cited Peter Elbow (36%) and Donald Murray (20%) as the two "composition theorists" most influencing their methods for teaching writing.

Full-time faculty appeared to have a greater involvement than part-time faculty in activities identified in this study as scholarship.

Conclusion

Based on the sample described in this study, full-time English faculty teaching at public and private community colleges in the CNCTYC appear relatively unchanged from English faculty 30 years ago. They continue to teach approximately 15 credit hours per semester, primarily writing courses, and continue to express a need for (additional) training in the teaching of writing. A sizable percentage of faculty belong to a professional organization and read a professional journal, although far fewer faculty are likely to present at a conference or publish in a professional journal. Overall, current English faculty appear quite satisfied with their careers. Pedagogically, there now appears to be more emphasis on teaching writing as a process. Whereas writing course sections continue to increase, particularly developmental and remedial writing sections, community colleges are offering (percentage-wise) fewer literature courses (Cohen & Ignash, 1992, 52-54).

Perhaps the greatest change in the English faculty is the growing reliance on part-time faculty. While the profile of part-time faculty developed in this study reflects well on those individuals teaching part-time at community colleges, their lack of active involvement in their respective departments and institutions, and in the larger

English profession, raises serious concerns about the future development and direction of the community college English profession.

With the growing emphasis on the importance of teaching literacy skills, particularly writing skills, to community college students, and with 45% of English faculty eligible to retire by the year 2000 (Raines, 1990, 160), now is an opportune time for those interested in the community college to re-examine English faculty and curriculum and to make recommendations concerning the future direction of the curriculum and faculty training and development. For example, a gap continues to exist between how English faculty are trained and what they teach. English faculty continually report a need for (additional) training in the teaching of writing. How can community colleges ensure that faculty receive such training? English faculty remain inactive with respect to writing for professional publication. What effect has not writing for publication had on their own teaching and their relationship with the English profession? The percentage of course sections devoted to literature continues to decrease. What role does literature have in the community college English department? Finally, what are the implications of the increasing reliance on part-time faculty to teach writing courses at community colleges?

3 (Re)Viewing Faculty Pre-Service Training and Development

Pre-service training for two-year college faculty has not been a prominent issue since the late 1960s and early 1970s when two-year colleges almost doubled in number and hired newly-minted graduates almost daily. "[F]ormal in-service training, a feature of the colleges throughout their history, peaked in the 1970s as institutional expansion subsided, and as few new staff members were employed" (Brawer 1990, 50). Now, however, reports that 40 percent of all two-year college faculty will retire before the year 2000 (Commission 1988) have created concern about how future faculty will be trained. And continued reports of fatigue and burnout among two-year college faculty have led to a renewed interest in faculty development (Seidman 1985; Commission 1988; McGrath and Spear 1988, 1991; Vaughan and Palmer 1991; Palmer and Vaughan 1992).

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: first, to review past studies concerning the pre-service training and faculty development of two-year college English faculty--a knowledge of the past provides a valuable way of anticipating the future; second, to offer suggestions for the future direction of pre-service training and faculty development for two-year college English faculty.[1]

Previous Studies Of English Faculty

Between 1963 and 1971, the pre-service training and

de

att

tha

pri

Co

La

(NC

Yea

Tra

En

an

Pro

196

Jur

in

sco

Two

coll

sur

thei

trai

inst

pros

Teac

197

volu

development of two-year college faculty in English received more attention than any other two-year college academic discipline. During that period a number of studies, sponsored by various professional, private, and governmental agencies--American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the Carnegie Corporation, Modern Language Association, National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and the U.S. Office of Education--were published: The Two-Year College and the Teaching of English (Kitzhaber 1963); The Training and Work of California Public Junior College Teachers of English (Bossone 1964); English in the Two-year College (Weingarten and Kroeger 1965); Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College: Proceedings of the Tempe Conference 1965 (Archer and Ferrel 1965); The National Study of English in the Junior College (Shugrue 1970); and A Study of the English Instructors in the Junior and Community Colleges (Kent 1971). Although the scope and breadth of these studies varied, for example, English in the Two-year College surveyed 479 English faculty at 239 two-year colleges and The National Study of English in the Junior College surveyed over 2,700 English faculty at almost 1,000 two-year colleges, their findings and recommendations concerning the pre-service training and faculty development of two-year college English instructors were quite similar.

In addition, at least one handbook-like text written for prospective and current English faculty in two-year colleges appeared, Teaching English in the Two-year College (Barton and Beachner 1970). In the "Preface," the authors state that the book "is a single-volume treatment of the many concerns of the teaching of English in

the two-year college" (vi). They spend much of the book describing various teaching techniques and curricula for a variety of English courses.

Pre-Service Training

By the early 1960s, it was already apparent that teaching writing would be the main task of two-year college English faculty. In describing the two-year college English profession at the time, Elisabeth McPerson writes, "Meantime, we'd gotten a clearer notion of what it meant to teach English at a two-year college. We knew, most of us, that we were probably going to teach some kind of composition, and very little but composition, for the rest of our professional lives" (1990, 93). Unfortunately, most faculty were unprepared for such a career, having been trained as traditional literature teachers and/or as elementary or secondary school teachers, and they continually expressed the need for graduate course work in the teaching of writing. English in the Two-year College reported that "many teachers wish they knew, or had known when they started teaching, much more about teaching composition" (Weingarten and Kroeger 1965, 73). One beginning English instructor stated, "I do feel . . . that my training should have included some graduate courses in the teaching of composition. . . . After a year of graduate study of literature, there is a startling jump to the teaching of freshman composition" (Quoted in Gaj 1969, 3). The National Study of English in the Junior College reported that 71 percent of faculty surveyed listed "Techniques in teaching composition" as the item "most needed to improve instruction" (Shugrue 1970, 9). Not surprisingly, then, each study found the "traditional" master's degree in English, which offered courses in

literature and rarely in composition theory and which did not typically offer experience in teaching writing, inadequate pre-service training for English faculty. "One certainly cannot call the typical M.A. program of most institutions with its over-emphasis upon literature realistic when one considers that a typical English assignment . . . is mainly the teaching of Remedial English and composition" (Bossone 1964, 23). The studies recommended that prospective faculty complete graduate courses in composition theory and gain actual experience in teaching writing, preferably at a two-year college, perhaps through an internship. At the time, very few graduate programs, even those offering specialized degree programs or courses in teaching English in the two-year college, offered supervised teaching or internships in two-year colleges (Gaj 1969).

Finally, the studies found current faculty unfamiliar with the philosophy, mission, and culture of the two-year college--an open-access institution with a heavy emphasis on teaching offering both transfer and vocational courses and enrolling a diverse student population. Few faculty had attended two-year colleges as students and few had taught previously in a two-year college (Kent 1971). The studies recommended that prospective faculty complete a course in what English in the Two-year College called "'The Teaching of English in the Two-year College'" (Weingarten and Kroeger 1965, 84). The authors of the studies believed that by completing such a course prospective faculty would at least gain some knowledge of the philosophy, mission, and student population before beginning their teaching careers.

Since few graduate English programs at the time were prepared

to train prospective two-year college English faculty, many of the studies encouraged and recommended the continued establishment of specialized graduate programs tailored for students seeking to teach English in two-year colleges. (Gaj listed twenty-five such programs already existing in 1969.) For example, The National Study of English in the Junior College recommended that graduate English departments "develop and coordinate with other departments within the university special graduate programs for prospective two-year college English instructors" (Shugrue 1970, 16). In 1970, in response to such recommendations, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Executive Committee authorized the preparation of guidelines for specialized graduate programs. A year later, CCCC published "Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs" (Cowan 1971).

Guidelines

The Guidelines Committee intended the guidelines "to serve as a checklist against which the suitability and value of training programs, both existing and proposed, can be measured" (Cowan 1971, 304). They described twenty-one "attributes and abilities" that all prospective English faculty should possess: including the ability to understand the variety and skills of two-year college students, to teach communications and introductory and world literature courses, and to exhibit flexibility in pedagogical practices. They also outlined how two-year college English faculty should gain "competencies" in linguistics, literature, and rhetoric, and "skills" in areas such as writing, reading, and speaking. Finally, in support of the previous studies' recommendations, they too recommended that

all graduate programs for training English faculty include a teaching internship.

The "Guidelines" were timely, well intentioned, well received, and influenced the creation of specialized graduate programs. "In English studies we have listened carefully to Gregory Cowan and his Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) committee members, whose Guidelines for English Teacher Training Programs were widely discussed in 1970-1971 and have since been an essential guide in the development of graduate programs" (Green and Hellstrom 1975, 98). Yet, as will be discussed later, these specialized graduate programs never flourished.

Faculty Development

While the studies concentrated on the pre-service training of English faculty, they also examined faculty development.[2] As one study stated, "the lack of in-service training [was] widespread and lamentable" (Kent 1971, 109). They found that current faculty felt inadequately prepared for the students and courses they were expected to teach and only vaguely aware of what it meant to be a two-year college English teacher. [3] They found that because of heavy teaching loads and large class sizes, two-year college English faculty were not professionally active and did not have a voice in the English profession. That is, two-year college English faculty typically did not belong to professional organizations, rarely attended professional conferences, and rarely published professional writings. In addition, the studies concluded that despite being hailed as "'democracy's college of this century'" (Gleazer, quoted in Weingarten and Kroeger 1965, 79), two-year colleges were not fostering a climate of democracy

in terms of faculty involvement in faculty development activities. The studies encouraged and recommended that two-year colleges create an environment in which faculty "participate in the governance of the college as a whole" (Shugrue 1970, 13).

To improve English faculty teaching conditions, the studies recommended various faculty development activities, including developing in-service training programs for current English faculty concerning instruction, specifically as it related to teaching writing. One study recommended that "departmental meetings and workshops [be] devoted to the problems involved in the teaching of English" (Bossone 1964, 29). In addition, the studies recommended that English faculty be directly involved in curricular decisions concerning the English program. "The two-year college English instructor must play an active role in determining the educational goals of his [or her] institution as well as of the English program within that institution" (Shugrue, 1970, 13). They recommended changes in the organizational development of the two-year college in order to improve English instruction: smaller teaching loads--four courses instead of the standard five or six courses per term (Kitzhaber 1963; Bossone 1964; Weingarten and Kroeger 1965; Kent 1971); smaller class sizes--twenty to twenty-five students in each composition class rather than thirty or thirty-five (Kitzhaber 1963; Bossone 1964; Weingarten and Kroeger 1965; Kent 1971). Finally, they recommended professional development activities that would encourage English faculty to have a greater part in the English profession in higher education. They recommended that English faculty be "encourage[d] to write professionally--not on the 'publish or perish' basis--but on the basis

that it is natural for them to profess in an articulate manner" (Bossone 1964, 27); that English faculty "should be made aware of the importance of their membership in the major professional organizations" (Kent 1971, 110). Inherent in all of the studies' recommendations was the belief that two-year colleges must establish faculty development activities which engendered a culture that empowered English faculty in their teaching, in the governance of the college, and in their professional discipline.

Looking Backward

The vantage point of a 1993 (re)view of the past studies of two-year college English faculty evokes a sense of disappointment and anger. Despite the hard work of many individuals, groups, and organizations to empower English faculty and to improve two-year college English programs through pre-service training and faculty development, the culture of the two-year college remains little changed from twenty-five years ago. Many of the problems the studies identified concerning pre-service training and faculty development still exist. Many of their recommendations concerning pre-service training and faculty development have never been implemented.

Pre-Service Training

Various reasons can be given for the failure of specialized graduate programs for teaching English in two-year colleges. First, it is possible that graduate students in English desired and/or sought teaching positions in four-year colleges or universities rather than in two-year colleges (London 1980), or they considered the two-year college English master's degree as limiting their teaching options. Second, perhaps as undergraduates they were discouraged from

pursuing a master's degree specializing in English in the two-year college. "Standard English department prejudices and antagonistic colleagues can portray the two-year college graduate program as second drawer when compared to the purely literary program" (Sparrow and Fearing 1980, 10). Third, just as many specialized programs began, the academic job market, especially in disciplines like English, soured. From a very practical standpoint, the dismal job market may have scared students away from a two-year college teaching career. Fourth, the growth in the field of rhetoric and composition beginning in the early 1960s (North 1987) and "reach[ing] full flower in the years since 1975" (Berlin 1987, 183) may have made specialized programs seem unnecessary to graduate students; they could complete graduate courses in rhetoric and composition theory as part of their traditional master's work and could gain experience in teaching writing while serving as a teaching assistant and/or as a part-time instructor at a two- or four-year college. Finally, the hiring practices of two-year colleges have never encouraged or required prospective faculty to hold a specialized degree. During the years of rapid growth, the traditional master's degree came to serve as the requisite degree for employment. By the time most specialized graduate programs were up and running, two-year colleges were no longer hiring as many full-time faculty despite growing enrollments, but were increasingly using part-time faculty. Requiring a specialized master's degree as a condition for employment would have made it virtually impossible for two-year colleges to find part-time faculty.

Some graduate programs still offer specialized training for prospective two-year college English faculty, for example, master's

degree programs that offer an option in teaching English in the community college, such as those at East Carolina University and Michigan State University, or the Doctor of Arts degree in English offered at universities such as Idaho State University and the University of Michigan. Rather than serving as major sources for the pre-service training of English faculty, however, these programs typically serve current English faculty seeking additional training and/or an advanced degree.

Finally, at least one recent study of two-year college full and part-time faculty suggests that faculty still remain unfamiliar with the history, mission, and literature of the two-year college (Keim 1989). Reminiscent of past studies, this study proposes that "perhaps a formal course on the community/junior college should be a requirement for all faculty" (Keim 1989, 41).

Faculty Development

With some exceptions, the faculty development model proposed by the past studies has yet to gain a hold in two-year colleges. In fact, Brawer claims that "faculty development has not become a high priority in community colleges" (1990, 51). The faculty development that has occurred in two-year colleges has emphasized instructional development. The emphasis on instructional development reflects the traditional mission of the two-year college as a teaching institution and has received the support of two-year college administrators, researchers, and faculty. For example, in the first New Directions For Community Colleges volume, Toward a Professional Faculty, Cohen argues that instruction become the "central discipline" for two-year college faculty (1973). Historically, two-year college faculty have stated

a desire for faculty development focusing on instruction. As discussed earlier, English faculty have expressed the need for additional training in teaching writing. More recently, a survey of two-year college faculty in Washington state found that a large majority desired faculty development that concerned teaching and learning (Seppanen 1990). Considering the current culture in which faculty teach, the need for instructional development activities in some form is warranted. However, instructional development in its present forms has been ineffective and has had adverse effects on the faculty culture at two-year colleges.

In The Academic Crisis of the Community College, McGrath and Spear argue that "the familiar staff development processes utterly disregard the sociocultural condition of the faculty" (1991, 147). Rather than creating an academic culture, current faculty development has instead disengaged faculty from their academic disciplines and created "generic teachers" (McGrath et al. 1992). As a result of such faculty development, two-year college faculty "are pushed toward a marginality that virtually cuts them out of the academic profession" (Clark 1987, 260) and, consequently, curricula become disordered, and teaching and learning are diminished (McGrath and Spear 1991; Richardson et al. 1983).

The most recent study of two-year college English faculty revealed that faculty still typically teach five courses per semester--four writing courses and one other literature or English-related course--and slightly over one hundred students per semester: more courses and more students than recommended in the early studies or in subsequent reports by the NCTE and CCCC (Raines 1990). English

faculty in 1993 are concerned about the same issues as faculty twenty years ago: heavy teaching loads, large class sizes, successful pedagogical theories and methods for teaching a diverse population of students, and a lack of time for professional development, especially scholarship. The increasing use by two-year colleges of part-time faculty, especially in teaching writing courses, is perhaps the one issue now addressed that was not a concern twenty years ago. In addition, two-year college English faculty are further disenfranchised by an English profession that continues to debase the field of rhetoric and composition and the teaching of writing. It is this disengagement from the academic discipline and marginalization from the larger academic community that has engendered the poor intellectual environment that the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges discovered during its study of community colleges and that has perpetuated the identity crisis that plagues English faculty.

Looking Forward

If looking backward evokes a sense of disappointment and anger, then looking forward evokes a sense of hope and optimism. Despite the current educational climate which appears unfavorable toward teachers (at all levels)--many educational reformers, in response to the current crisis in American education, suggest reforms that ignore or weaken the authority of classroom teachers by imposing pre-packaged curricula that turns teachers into technicians and assumes that all students learn the same way in all classrooms (Aronowitz and Giroux 1985)--there are events occurring that augur well for the future of pre-service training and faculty development for two-year college English faculty: the publication of the Commission on

the Future of Community Colleges' Building Communities (1988); the previously unparalleled calls for changes in the faculty culture at two-year colleges (Seidman 1985; Vaughan 1986, 1988; McGrath and Spear 1991; Vaughan and Palmer 1991); the reconsiderations of scholarship's role in higher education (Boyer 1990; Palmer and Vaughan 1992); and the very fact that two-year colleges have the opportunity to hire over the next eight to ten years a large number of full-time faculty. Raines (1990) found that 45 percent of current two-year college English faculty will be eligible to retire by 2000. [4]

Pre-Service Training

Despite the failure of specialized English graduate programs to become a major source for training faculty, the competencies, skills, and teaching experience outlined in Cowan's twenty year-old "Guidelines" should not be readily dismissed. The "Guidelines" argue strongly for training that empowers teachers by teaching them, for example, to be involved in changing the academic system, to recognize the diversity of two-year college students, and to value the knowledge and interests that students bring to the classroom. And as the "Guidelines" suggested, faculty need a strong background in the discipline: knowledge of composition and rhetorical theory, which should include some coverage of basic writing, literacy, ESL theories, and business and technical writing. Course work in literature should include sufficient coverage to allow faculty to teach introductory literature courses through the sophomore level and should incorporate introductions to literary theory and theories of reading. This course work should, of course, reflect the latest knowledge of gender theory, multiculturalism, and canon revision, which will be

evident in future textbooks. Appropriate training should also include applications of the new technologies to the teaching/learning of reading and writing, particularly computer assisted instruction (CAI). Even the "Guidelines'" recommendation for including a teaching internship as part of pre-service training should be reconsidered. Full and part-time faculty still often begin teaching at two-year colleges without prior teaching experience at a two-year college.

Since faculty still remain unfamiliar with the mission, history, and literature of two-year colleges, a required graduate course on the topic is still necessary. At least one two-year college, Miami-Dade Community College, is beginning to require such a course. At a minimum, prospective (and current) faculty in all disciplines should be required to have read widely in the literature about two-year colleges.[5] While the pre-service training described above is important for individuals seeking to teach English in a two-year college, it finally serves only a limited purpose. Ultimately, faculty development plays the most vital role in faculty careers.

Faculty Development

Faculty development activities should always be directed toward empowering faculty within the classroom, curriculum, college, and profession. As McGrath and Spear (1991, 1992) argue, however, current faculty development activities have typically disenfranchised faculty from their academic disciplines by creating "generic teachers. " They suggest that "community colleges should work seriously toward constructing activities which encourage and sustain academic practices among the faculty as a collegiate body" (1991, 154), thereby creating an academic culture. While an academic model for faculty

development should be established, two-year college faculty, especially English faculty, should not abandon the idea of membership in professional disciplines. Eighty-one percent of two-year college faculty rated the importance of their academic discipline as "very important" (Boyer 1989, 117). Because they do spend a majority of their time teaching writing, two-year college English faculty have the opportunity to be an important part of the community of professional writing teachers--those who " intend to put [their] primary energy into the teaching of writing and into research that informs the teaching of writing . . . "(Hairston 1985, 281). English faculty should take advantage of the symbiotic relationship between the teaching of writing and the study of writing:

> Composition studies have been and must be closely tied to the teaching of writing. Most of the researchers [surveyed] indicated that their initial contact with the theory of composition came as a result of teaching composition classes, and the enthusiasm for further research is based on the continuing challenge of writing instruction. The symbiotic relation between teaching and research seems much more important in this field than in traditional literary studies in English (Chapman 1987, 45; my emphasis).

Realistically, then, since two-year college faculty spend most of their time teaching writing, and since 93 percent of two-year college faculty state their "interest lie primarily in . . . teaching" (Boyer 1989, 43), faculty development activities should be organized around what Boyer calls "The Scholarship of Teaching" (1990, 23).

An instructional model of faculty development based on "the scholarship of teaching" nurtures faculty members as classroom-based teacher-researchers. As described in chapters five and six,

classroom-based research by teacher-researchers empowers classroom teachers by helping them gain ownership of pedagogical theory, by increasing their involvement in curriculum development and evaluation and in institutional assessment, and by encouraging continual re-examination of teaching approaches in a quest to find those that are most effective. In addition, the classroom-based research instructional model also democratizes the classroom by changing the manner in which knowledge is constructed and by valuing the knowledge of teacher-researchers and students (Kort 1991). A growing number of two-year and four-year scholars have argued for this model as a way to study writing (Odell 1976; Myers 1985; Goswami and Stillman 1987; Daiker and Morenberg 1990; Tinberg 1990).

Two fine examples of classroom-based teacher-research are Fleckenstein's "Inner Sight: Imagery and Emotion in Writing Engagement" (1991) and Davis' "Voices of Authority" (1992). Both Fleckenstein and Davis investigated research questions that emerged out of their own classroom teaching. Davis' research question emerged from her discovery that her own idea of a good classroom discussion differed from her students' perceptions of a good classroom discussion. Fleckenstein's research question asked "Do writers who can create vivid mental images, visual and otherwise, experience intense emotions as they write?" (212). Using tape recordings of class discussions and outside readings on the topic, Davis, with the help of her students, analyzed class discussions, investigating the role gender plays, and the various roles students and teachers play, in establishing authority in classroom discussions. Fleckenstein used

both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection to investigate her research question. Both teacher-researchers used their classroom research to improve the teaching and learning in their respective classrooms. And both contributed to the larger community of scholars by sharing their classroom research at conferences and in professional journals.[6]

The role and identity of two-year college English faculty in higher education should be established primarily through a classroom-based research instructional development model based on "the scholarship of teaching." However, such a model should not be the only means for establishing the professional role and identity of two-year college English faculty. Professional development activities should also encourage and reward faculty who publish their writing (literary criticism, fiction, poetry, and nonfiction). One way for English faculty to become effective writing teachers and to become a visible and active part of the English profession is to public writers themselves. [7]

Conclusion

Faculty development that encourages an instructional development model based on faculty as teacher-researchers reconceptualizes the faculty's role in the classroom, in the college, and in the profession. Teacher-researchers, who create and revise educational theory, who assess the effects of their own pedagogy on student learning, and who ultimately own and control the theories that underlie classroom practice, achieve new and greater authority within their classrooms, within their colleges, and within higher education. All of these outcomes, which strengthen teacher and

student authority, however, are counter to the current culture in two-year colleges, and those who study and write about two-year colleges agree that changing their culture will be difficult--tradition, economics, and the place of two-year colleges in higher education all stand as barriers. But changing the current culture of two-year colleges, especially at this point in their history, is not impossible.

For the culture of the two-year colleges to change, two-year college faculty must reconceptualize their roles within the classroom, college, and profession (Kroll 1992). Two-year college administrators must also reconceptualize the role of faculty in college governance and revise their definitions of research and scholarship. While such changes may at first seem improbable, if not revolutionary, it is heartening to note that more and more community college faculty, especially English faculty, are engaging in classroom-based research. Many college leaders, including those on the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988), endorse the teacher-researcher role for faculty and support the related themes of empowering students in the classroom and of involving teacher-researchers in curriculum and program assessment. Administrators can change the current culture of two-year colleges by requiring the pre-service training of faculty as described in this chapter and by implementing, encouraging and supporting faculty development activities which reconceptualize English faculty as teacher-researchers.

As two-year college faculty face the future and confront the most diverse student population in history, and as they incorporate emerging new technologies into their teaching, and as they create innovative and varied curricula, they have both the opportunity and

the c

make

the obligation to become important and significant new knowledge makers in higher education.

NOTES

[1] The term "English faculty" is used to refer to those two-year college faculty whose teaching primarily involves the teaching of writing. These faculty are often found in departments with names other than "English," for example, Communication Arts, Humanities, or Language Arts.

[2] Faculty development typically involves instructional, curricular, organizational, and professional activities.

[3] McPherson's essay cited in this chapter and Betsy Hilbert's essay, "Coming of Age" Twenty Years of a Community College" (ADE Bulletin, no. 79, Winter 1984), describe what it was like to teach English in a two-year college at this time.

[4] Whether or not two-year colleges replace retiring full-time faculty with new full-time faculty remains to be seen.

[5] Two-year college faculty should be familiar with two-year college studies like Eells' The Junior College; Cohen and Brawer's The American Community College; Brint and Karabel's The Diverted Dream; Richardson et al. Literacy in the Open-Acess College; London's The Culture of a Community College; Clark's The Open Door College; Zwerling's Second Best; and Shor's Critical Teaching and Everyday Life.

[6] For suggestions on ways two-year college faculty can become more professionally active, see Ellen Andrews Knodt, "Taming Hydra:

The Problem of Balancing Teaching and Scholarship at Two-Year Colleges." TETYC 15 (1988): 170-74; and Keith Kroll, "Building Communities: Joining the Community of Professional Writing Teachers." TETYC 17 (1990): 103-08.

[7] For suggestions on why, how, and what two-year English faculty can publish, see Mark Reynolds, "Writing for Professional Publication." TETYC 19 (1991): 290-96.

4

Tir

The
amon
part-

-Burt

inst

to

con

De

ins

av

42

as

S

c

I

4 A Profile and Perspective of Part-Time English Faculty

"The ultimate marginal academic career is one pursued by the nomad who wanders among community colleges teaching English: For him or her the future is occasional part-time instruction in composition classes for mainly remedial students."

-Burton R. Clark, The Academic Life

"Community colleges have always employed numerous part-time instructors" (Cohen and Brawer 1989, 75)--and the number continues to increase: As of fall 1991, part-time faculty comprised 66% of all community college faculty (Mahoney and Jimenez 1992, 58-61). Departments offering writing courses employ more part-time instructors than any other. Raines (1990) reported "the overall average percentage of part-time [English] faculty per institution is 42% " (15); the data reported in this essay suggests the figure may be as high as 62%. But

> because many part-time faculty flit in and out of the shadows of institutional listings of faculty, they are an elusive group in American higher education. . . . What is certain is that part-timers slip through the cracks of national statistics in ways that cause them to be underreported. Many are "unrostered." Unless deliberately designed to find them, faculty surveys also largely miss them" (Clark 1987, 205).

So despite the increasing number of part-time writing instructors at community colleges, little has been written by or about them (Gappa 1984, 95).

There have been studies of part-time English faculty at a particular community college or in a particular state, and there is an occasional essay (e.g., Angelo and Pickett 1988; Benjet and Loweth 1989; Curzon-Brown 1988; Speer 1992) or short blurb in the "What Concerns Me" section in Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC). [1] More likely, the image of part-time faculty develops through unfamiliar names and faces passed in hallways, stood next to in faculty mailrooms—if in fact a part-time instructor has a mailbox—heard about from students, seen through classroom windows, or sat next to at departmental meetings—though at my college part-time faculty are not paid (or encouraged) to attend meetings.

One purpose of this chapter, then, is to gain a better understanding of part-time English faculty by profiling 351 faculty members teaching at public and private community colleges within the nineteen-state Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC). Statistics alone, however, are not enough. As one respondent to my questionnaire wrote, "Are you an activist on behalf of two-year college part-time faculty? I hope so—we need change far more than we need statistics." A second purpose, then, of this essay is to begin to argue that full- and part-time faculty must take an activist role both inside and outside their colleges on behalf of part-time faculty.

Findings

The overwhelming majority of part-time faculty in the study were females (73%) teaching at public, comprehensive community colleges (74%). Sixty-five percent of the faculty had master's degrees, although less

than half (46%) held the degree in English or Composition/Rhetoric. While 92% of the faculty reported that their teaching responsibilities were "leaning toward or heavy in writing," their graduate training stressed literature. Not surprisingly, then, faculty suggested additional graduate training in writing for prospective faculty. Despite repeated calls from researchers for prospective faculty to take graduate courses concerning the community college, over 90% of the faculty in this study had not taken a course concerning the community college and few faculty suggested such courses (Table 10). Finally, 72% of faculty were engaged in other occupations, including "other" (39%), teaching high school (15%), teaching at four-year college or university (9%), and teaching at another two-year institution (5%).

Table 10 Education Background and Training of Faculty (percentages)

Highest Degree	Percent
Bachelor's	17
Master's	65
English	43
Other	21
Education	14
Composition	3
Ed. D.	*
D.A.	*
Ph.D.	4

Table 10 (Cont'd)

At least one graduate course in	
Composition/Rhetoric	45
Literature	70
Education	45
History of Community College	6
Teaching English in the Community College	7
Suggested graduate courses prospective English faculty should complete	
Teaching Writing	40
Composition Theory	10
Other Courses Related to the Teaching of Writing	60
History of the Community College	3
Teaching English in the Community College	6

As a group part-time faculty were more experienced than one might first imagine: 41% had taught four or more years and only 17% were in their first year. In addition, they planned on remaining a mean number of 6 years in their present position. Sixty-eight percent were not necessarily able, willing , or desiring to move to a different state in order

to gain a full-time teaching position. Within this group, 78% were females, whose most common reason for not seeking an out-of-state full-time position was they couldn't or wouldn't move because of family responsibilities and obligations, particularly a husband's job.

Teaching Workload and Practices

As described above, part-time faculty's primary teaching responsibilities involve the teaching of writing, both a first college-level writing course (89%) and a developmental/remedial writing course (46%). When they do teach a literature course, it is most often "Introduction to Literature" (15%). Faculty taught a mean number of 8 credits per semester (2-3 courses), with a mean number of 2 course preparations. Including other activities, such as scholarship, meetings, administrative duties, and community service, part-time faculty worked a mean number of 25 hours per week in the teaching position covered by the study (Table 11).

Table 11 How Part-Time Faculty Spend Their Time (mean hours per week.)

Class Presentations	5.5
Grading	6
Preparation	5
Office Hours	2

Table 11 (Cont'd)

Scholarship	3.5

Administrative Duties	*
Faculty Meetings	*
Community Service	*
Clerical Duties	*

In teaching a first college-level writing course (Table 12), faculty teach writing as a process through the writing of essays and require a mean number of 2.7 pages (roughly 530 words) per week. Textbooks used in this course placed more emphasis on writing essays than teaching and learning mechanics and usage. In teaching the writing process, part-time instructors encourage students to write multiple drafts of an essay, use peer review/writing workshops, hold writing conferences, and delay grading until submission of "final" drafts. A writing portfolio that delays grading until the end of the course is not used as often. Teaching writing as a process is also emphasized in the developmental/remedial course (Table 12) but to a lesser degree than in the college-level writing course.

For example, in the developmental course not as much emphasis is placed on writing essays, which is also reflected in the type of textbook used. In this course, 24% of the faculty used a textbook that placed equal emphasis on essays, paragraphs, and usage and mechanics. Nonetheless, this developmental/remedial course is not strictly a grammar-based course, although an emphasis on grammar instruction still exists.

Table 12 Teaching Practices: First College-Level Course and Developmental/Remedial Course (percentages)

	College-Level	Developmental Course
Course emphasizes		
Writing Essays	57	11
Writing Paragraphs	3	15
Learning Correct Usage and Mechanics	4	11
All of the above	29	38
Textbook places more emphasis on writing essays than learning usage and mechanics	63	11
Type of essays written		
Personal Narrative	7	11
Exposition	9	9
Personal Narrative and Exposition	8	33
Personal Narrative, Exposition, and Argumentation	34	24
Essays Not Written in This Course	*	7
Encourage students to write multiple drafts of an essay	96	96
Delay grading until final draft	73	67

Table 12 (Cont'd

"Always"or "Occasionally" use peer review/writing workshops	87	75
"Always" or "Occasionally" hold required writing conferences	65	65
"Never" use a writing portfolio that delays grading essays until the end of the course	68	67

Curriculum

Generally, part-time faculty supported the questionnaire's stated goals (Table 13) of a community college education. In terms of curriculum requirements, 69% of part-time reported that the required number of writing courses was "about right," a somewhat lower number, 45%, reported that required number literature courses was "about right," and 37% thought there were "too few" required literature courses. Finally, 71% believed that general education requirements were "about right."

As described earlier, with respect to outcome assessment, 56% of part-time faculty "disagreed with reservations" or "strongly disagreed" that multiple-choice assessment instruments would increase the quality of community college education. Only 29%, however, "agreed with reservations" or "strongly agreed" that state mandated assessment requirements threaten the quality of community college education, and 39% "agreed with reservations" or "strongly agreed" that state mandated requirements intrude on institutional autonomy. These rather low percentages may suggest that part-time faculty are less in tune with the

increasing demands that states are placing on two-year colleges.

Table 13 Faculty Response Toward Goals of Two-Year College Education (percentage who considered goal "Very Important" or "Fairly Important"

Goal	
Provide an appreciation of literature and the arts	88
Provide students with competence in writing and reading	96
Enhance creative thinking	89
Prepare students for a career	82

Students

In keeping with the community college's student centeredness, part-time faculty reported positive attitudes toward community college students (Table 14). Ninety-eight percent considered their relationship with students "very important" or "fairly important," and they obviously enjoyed working with their students. However, they did express concern for the lack of basic skills evident in many of their students.

Table 14 Faculty Attitudes Toward Students (percentage who "Strongly Agree" or "Agree with Reservations")

Enjoy interacting informally with students outside the classroom	82

Table 14 (Cont'd)

Most students expect too much attention	14
Students should seek out faculty only during posted office hours	12
Most students at my institution only do enough to just "get by"	44
The students with whom I have close contact are seriously underprepared in basic skills--such as those required for written and oral communication	72

Scholarship

Part-time faculty reported spending a mean number of 3.5 hours on activities related to scholarship--defined in this study as reading professional journals, conducting research, and professional writing--and a mean number of 2.51 hours per week on activities that might lead toward publication. However, much of this time is accounted for by those part-time faculty who are also graduate students (24%) completing doctoral dissertations. As the information in Table 15 suggests, part-time faculty are largely inactive with respect to participation in the English profession. Fifty-one percent belonged to at least one professional organization, including NCTE (24%), NEA (12%), MLA (8%), and CCCC (3%); 48% subscribed to at least one professional journal, including CE (17%), EJ (17%), CCC (10%), and TETYC (8%), and 67% read at least one

professional journal, including CE (32%), EJ (32%), CCC (20%), and TETYC (15%).

Table 15 Faculty Involvement in Scholarship (percentages)

Currently engaged in scholarly activities that might lead toward publication	29
Published a professional article in the past three years	13
Published at least one professional article in their career	20
Belonged to at least one professional organization	51
Attended at least one national, regional, state, or local conference in the past three years	43
Presented at at least one national, regional, state, or local conference in the past three years	18
Subscribed to at least one professional journal	48
Read at least one professional journal	67

Professional and Institutional Environment

Despite being marginalized from the larger English profession and isolated at their own college(s), part-time faculty still considered their discipline, department, college, and colleagues important (Table 16).

Table 16 Part-Time Faculty Responses Toward Professional Relationships (percentage who consider relationships "Very Important" or "Fairly Important")

Academic Discipline	96
Department	80
College	80
Colleagues at college	79
Colleagues at other colleges	38

They were not satisfied, however, with their salary, teaching load, and with the intellectual climate, administration, and sense of community at their respective institutions (Table 17). In fact, 44% of part-time faculty reported they had "some" influence on departmental policy, but 71% percent reported they had "none" on college policy.

Table 17 Faculty Ratings of Institutional Environment (percentage who responded "Excellent" or "Good")

Own Salary	19
Teaching Load	45
Intellectual Environment of Institution	46
Administration at Institution	50

Table 17 (Cont'd)

Sense of Community at Institution	50

Profile

The profile of part-time English faculty emerging from this sample is that of a fairly experienced female instructor with a master's degree, working at a public, comprehensive community college, and teaching one or two writing courses using a process approach. Beyond teaching, this person is typically engaged in another occupation and not necessarily able, willing, or desiring to move to a different state in order to gain a full-time teaching position. This person values her relationships with students, her academic discipline, and her colleagues, but is much less satisfied with salary and working conditions. As one part-time instructor stated, "I'm very happy as a part-time instructor--except for pay. " She is not active in scholarship in terms of publication and presentation, but is more likely to belong to a professional organization and to read a professional journal.

While the above profile is helpful in understanding and discussing the complex issues concerning part-time English faculty at two-year colleges, it is important to remember that these faculty are a diverse group with diverse backgrounds and motives for teaching part-time.

Comparison with Full-time Faculty

Based on the criteria used in this study, part-time faculty appear quite similar to full-time faculty. The master's degree is the most common

degree for both groups (68% for full-time faculty); and while part-time faculty are less experienced than full-time faculty (30% of full-time faculty had 20 or more years of experience), both have more training in literature than in teaching writing. In this study (58%) and in Raines' study of community college writing programs (52%), females were a majority of the full-time faculty. Furthermore, in The American College Teacher, Astin reports that females currently in community college English language and literature departments represented 12.1% of the sample, second only to nursing (91). Finally, females comprise the largest percentage of part-time faculty at community colleges.

It is difficult to draw comparisons among teaching practices--not only over time but also among individual faculty and classrooms—because of differences in terminology, teaching methods, and intended outcomes. In this study, however, part-time faculty appear quite similar to full-time faculty in their methods of teaching writing—both groups emphasize teaching methods associated with the teaching of writing as a process. That is, both groups emphasize essay writing over mechanics and punctuation instruction, and both groups encourage students to write multiple drafts, don't necessarily grade rough drafts, use peer review/writing workshops, and hold writing conferences. Some of this, of course, may be a result of part-time faculty being required to follow departmental policy. However, of those faculty citing at least one "composition theorist" (55%), both groups cited Peter Elbow (36%) and Donald Murray (20%) as the two "composition theorists" most influencing their methods for teaching writing.

Full-time faculty appear to have a greater involvement than part-time faculty in activities identified in this study as scholarship. That is, 40% of full-time faculty had published at least one professional article; 77% of full-time faculty belonged to at least one professional organization: NCTE (40%) and CCCC (20%); 72% subscribed to at least one professional journal: CE (47%), CCC (36%) and TETYC (32%); and in the past three years, 53% had attended at least one national conference and 19% had presented at at least one national conference. The lack of scholarship by part-time faculty may have more to do with time and economics than interest. As one part-time instructor wrote, "I want to learn new techniques and publish my own writing but there has never been any time." And at a time when even full-time faculty are finding it increasingly difficult to receive college funding to attend conferences, part-time faculty are not encouraged by the colleges where they teach to do so. As one part-time faculty member put it, "attending or presenting at any conferences is not available to part-time faculty at my college."

Becoming an Activist

The inequities involving part-time faculty salary and working conditions will not be easily improved for various reasons, including the attitudes of community college administrators, the diversity of part-time faculty, the lack of interest by full-time faculty, and larger social inequities. If any improvement is to occur, however, it must come from both full- and part-time faculty working inside and outside their community colleges. Faculty must foster change, because it appears highly unlikely that community college administrators will act to change

the present conditions of part-time faculty. Economics, more than any other factor, drives the use of part-time faculty, especially in departments offering writing courses, and as long as using part-time faculty remains cheaper than hiring full-time faculty, administrators will do all in their power to maintain the status quo or continue to increase the number of part-time faculty.

Through documents like the CCCC's "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing" and the ADE's "Statement on the Use of Part-time and Full-time Adjunct Faculty," professional organizations have stated their position on part-time faculty. While such pronouncements are vital in publicly stating the profession's position, I wonder how many community college administrators have ever heard of them, let alone read them. And even if they have read them, there is a long history of professional reports whose recommendations concerning two-year college faculty have largely been ignored by community college leaders. For example, over the past thirty years numerous reports on the two-year college English profession have recommended smaller teaching loads and class sizes for writing faculty, yet teaching loads and class sizes typically remain higher than the reports recommended.

Achieving the active involvement of part-timers will not be easy. As the profile above indicates, part-time writing faculty have various motives and backgrounds for teaching. Not all part-time faculty seek or want a full-time teaching position. They teach at diverse two-year colleges, in departments that may have anywhere from one to seventy part-time

faculty members, and currently only a small percentage appear to belong to a faculty union or association. In addition, the isolation they experience and the fear of losing their jobs often keeps them from any type of organized political action. But as Benjet and Loweth (1989) argue, "until part-timers take responsibility for changing their underclass status, no fairy godmother will appear, and they will remain, as Heller terms them, '"academic stepchildren"' (41). Organized political action by part-time faculty, however, is not impossible. For example, Benjet and Loweth describe how the adjunct faculty association at Oakton Community College in Des Plaines, Illinois, has improved the pay and working conditions for part-time faculty at the college. Worthen describes how part-time faculty in California have benefited from their membership and participation in the California Federation of Teachers. In short, "organizing for collective bargaining is crucial" (Thompson 1992, 2) if part-time faculty are going to improve their status and working conditions.

While full-time faculty cannot play fairy godmother, we can take an activist role in the issues concerning part-time faculty. We must realize that "full-timer and part-timer interests are identical" (Worthen 1992, 7), and we must overcome an "as-long-as-I-have-my-job" attitude. By remaining silent, by not acting, we give tacit approval to an academic system that disenfranchises over 60% of its members, marginalizes the teaching of writing, and undermines the composition profession.

Full-time faculty belonging to faculty associations should work to include part-time faculty in their association, if part-time faculty do not have their own association. Including part-time faculty in faculty

associations improves their pay and working conditions ("News" 1993, 4). In addition, improving the pay and working conditions of part-time faculty will help save full-time positions by making part-time positions less cost effective. While working inside their respective colleges is the place to begin, both full- and part-time faculty must also take an activist role outside of education.

It is not surprising that females comprise such a large percentage of part-time faculty and experience the greatest inequities of community college faculty. In many respects, the inequities encountered by part-time faculty reflect larger social inequities. For example, despite recent economic gains, women on average continue to earn less than men (U.S. Department of Commerce 1993, 467) and continue to be disadvantaged by traditional gender roles. It seems naive or hypocritical to believe that improving the inequities of part-time faculty inside of education can occur without a concomitant effort to change the inequities encountered by women outside of education. As Michael Apple (1990) states, " . . . until we take seriously the extent to which education is caught up in the real world of shifting and unequal power relations, we will be living in a world divorced from reality" (viii). That is, we must become politically active in our own communities by supporting political candidates—including those seeking to be, or serving as, community college board members and trustees—who advocate women's rights and legislation that guarantees those rights. Furthermore, we must vigorously oppose political candidates who seek to disenfranchise teachers at all levels of education. (My own state has made national headlines with legislation that has seriously

limited the power of the Michigan Education Association and the rights of individual teachers.) Put simply, political involvement inside and outside of education provides us the greatest chance for fostering change.

Until they promote democratic practices inside their own academic communities, and until they promote democratic practices outside of education, community colleges cannot honestly teach "democracy through language," "build communities," or call themselves "Democracy's College."

NOTE

[1] See McConnel's "Freeway Flyers: The Migrant Workers of the Academy" for the stories of teachers who have taught part-time at California community colleges.

5 Scholarship, Tenure, and Composition Studies in the Two-Year College

The issues of scholarship, promotion, and tenure within Composition Studies have very different meanings for two-year college writing faculty than for writing faculty at four-year institutions. To be sure, some two-year college faculty, particularly those teaching at two-year branch campuses of four-year institutions, face similar issues with respect to scholarship, promotion, and tenure as those discussed in the essays in this book. But as I will argue in this chapter, most two-year college writing faculty work in academic departments—typically not English departments—and institutions where composition occupies a very different social and pedagogical space than it does in Given these circumstances, tenure and review in the two-year colleges present a different constellation of issues. Even when the terms sound familiar—research, publication, teaching, scholarship—the focus in the two-year colleges is different from senior institutions. Two-year colleges have to produce standards for tenure and review that reinforce their commitment to teaching without succumbing to the "lore" of their institutions. They must begin to construct a professional discourse that recognizes the locality of their practice without severing all ties to a broader sense of theory and practice in

Composition Studies. In short, two-year college faculty must reinvent and reimagine their own place in both their institution and their profession.

English, Composition Studies, and the Two-Year College

Most two-year college writing faculty do not teach composition in what would traditionally be considered an English department. In her study of two-year college writing programs, Raines (1990) found that "seventy-five percent of schools . . . indicated that English . . . is a part of a larger department or division" (154). It is more likely that writing faculty spend their careers teaching in Humanities, Communications Arts, Liberal Arts, and Arts and Sciences departments. "What's in a name?" For two-year college writing faculty, the answer is quite a lot. For example, one of the more visible and important issues in the English profession, particularly for composition teachers, concerns the relationship between Composition and Literature, what Elbow (1990) describes at one point in What is English? as "the damaging warfare between literature and writing at the college level" (95). Two-year college writing faculty would be hard pressed to locate themselves within this debate, except perhaps as outsiders looking in. The debate between Composition and Literature in this form has rarely, if ever, been considered at two-year colleges, and for one simple reason: Literature has never had central status in the two-year college "English" department as it has in the four-year college and university English department.

Teaching writing has historically been the main work—for some faculty it has been the only work—of two-year college "English" faculty. In the period before 1960, the Junior College Journal—perhaps the best source for studying the early history of the junior college movement—published a number of essays concerning the teaching of writing, particularly as it related to "terminal" versus "transfer" writing courses. Only an occasional essay concerned literature. It became very evident beginning in the 1960s that the primary teaching responsibility of community college English faculty would be in teaching writing--and not much else but writing. As I described in an earlier chapter, literature quickly lost its primary role in the two-year college English department. Yet two-year college faculty who teach writing continue to be trained primarily in literary studies (Kroll 1990, 40-41)—a prime example of literature's dominant position in four-year college and university English departments—they teach mostly writing courses. In one study of "English" faculty, 84% of full-time faculty and 92% of part-time faculty reported that their teaching responsibilities were "leaning toward or very heavy in writing" (Kroll 1990, 40). This is not to suggest that two-year colleges do not offer literature courses—a vast majority do (VanderKelen 35)—or that two-year college "English" faculty are not interested in teaching literature courses beyond those associated with a second semester composition course (e.g., introduction to literature or writing about literature), they are. Literature courses rarely, if ever, go unassigned in class schedules and it is not uncommon for "English"

faculty to teach a literature course as overload beyond a typical four or five writing courses per term teaching schedule. In many ways literature courses have become somewhat of a "luxury" for two-year college "English" faculty. Ultimately, however, teaching writing has always been, and probably will always be, the primary work of two-year college "English" faculty.

Despite this almost exclusive focus on composition, the fact that the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, reported that in fall 1993 two-year colleges now enroll over 50% of all first-year college students and over 45% of all undergraduates (n.p.), and that in 1991 over 1.3 million students were enrolled in two-year college writing courses (Cohen and Ignash 1992, 54), two-year college writing faculty have remained all but invisible in the histories and studies of composition and rhetoric, including more recent works like Berlin's (1987) Rhetoric and Reality, North's (1987) The Making of Knowledge in Composition, Elbow's (1990) What Is English? and Miller's (1990) Textual Carnivals. This is not to suggest that the histories and issues discussed in these books are irrelevant to two-year college writing faculty, because they are or should be.[1] It is to suggest, however, that composition theory has been largely site neutral.

As composition theorists begin to move away from the Process Model writ large and toward theories that can variously be referred to as rhetorical, pragmatic, or semiotic, the uneasy sense that composition is an intensely local construction places the idea of a "big

tent" definition of the field in jeopardy. In this climate the differences between both the practitioners and the institutions that constitute "composition" and Composition Studies are more important. With the exception of Ira Shor's work, for example, Critical Teaching and Everyday Life (1987), little of the important work in composition has considered the differences between two- and four-year institutions. What Shor calls the "worker colleges" have been staffed by faculty who, when they have had any training in composition at all, were trained to replicate, without thinking, both the structure and assumptions of the four-year, college freshman orientation. These books have had little to say about adult learners, the social fragmentation of the two-year college, or the culture shock that many writing teachers find when they leave the safe haven of graduate school for teaching positions in the two-year college. Even the work in Basic Writing has failed to shed much light on the textbook and exercise-driven practices of most Basic Writing programs. This is not to lay blame only on the doorstep of four-year college composition faculty and scholars. The two-year college and its faculty are culpable in this invisibility and need to take an active role in reflecting on, and redirecting their practices.

The Culture of the Community College

Various reasons can be given for the absence of two-year college faculty in academia, but the first and foremost reason lies at the heart of the two-year college's original connection to high schools, where the emphasis—at least in theory—has always been on teaching. From the

outset, "junior colleges" were connected both in physicality and philosophy to high schools. In describing the very early years of the junior college, Witt et al. (1994) note that

> Many junior colleges had started as high school extensions, and their representative leaders felt very strongly that the junior college should not separate in its funding and administration from the parent high school. In effect, they regarded junior college education as secondary, not higher education. (79)

Furthermore, as Cohen and Brawer (1989) describe in The American Community College, "beginning with the earliest two-year colleges and continuing well into the 1960s, instructors tended to have prior teaching experience in the secondary schools" (69). It has only been in more recent years that two-year college faculty have come directly from graduate programs or teaching positions at two- or four-year institutions. And in many respects secondary schools and secondary school teachers remain the reference group for both two-year college administrators and faculty.

Regardless of one's beliefs concerning the subsequent growth and development of the two-year college, one fact is indisputable: two-year colleges were established as teaching institutions to the virtual exclusion of faculty research and scholarship, particularly as defined by the four-year college and university. As Eells (1931), an early prominent leader of the two-year college movement, described it:

> It is very doubtful whether pure research of the university type should be strongly encouraged on the part of junior college instructors. Such is likely to consume time, thought, and nerve energy which is better expended on teaching and student contacts. (334)

Caught between an academic culture rooted in a high school model and a traditional model of research and scholarship defined by four-year colleges and universities, two-year college faculty never have been given sufficient time for engaging in research and scholarship, nor have they ever developed their own model of research and scholarship appropriate for their own situation.

As a consequence of the two-year college's overwhelming emphasis on teaching, in essence on practice, two-year college faculty have rarely played an active role in their respective disciplines as knowledge makers. This is not surprising since, according to North (1987), "the whole thrust of the academic reform movement was to remove authority over knowledge from the hands of those whose main source of such authority was their practice" (21).

The separation of teaching and scholarship has also influenced the tenure and promotion process within the two-year college, particularly when compared to tenure and promotion at four-year institutions.

Both two- and four-year institutions consider teaching ability important with respect to granting tenure and promotion: "Quality of teaching was considered very important in granting tenure to full-time instructional faculty by 84 percent of department chairs in four-year schools and 99 percent of department chairs in two-year schools" (United States, Faculty in Higher Education 1990, 12). There were, however, as would be expected, differences in how each type of institution views the role of scholarship in the tenure process. "Three

factors that were held to be very important in tenure decision by sizable minorities of department chairs in four-year schools were rarely mentioned by department chairs in two-year schools: quality of research (45 percent vs. 2 percent), quality of publications (40 percent vs. 5 percent), and number of publications (28 percent vs. less than 1 percent) (United States, Faculty in Higher Education 1990, 13). A study by Kroll (discussed in Chapters Two and Four) of two-year college English faculty supports these findings: when asked "What do you feel are the principal criteria used to determine promotion in rank at your institutions?" 82% of those responding reported that "length of service" was "somewhat" or "very important", 76% reported "teaching ability" as "somewhat" or "very important", but 71% reported that "publications" were "somewhat" or "very unimportant". In addition, 42% of those responding reported that the community college where they taught had no academic rank and 23% reported that their college had no tenure system. These findings suggest that based on some type of assessment of teaching ability and, even more importantly, on length of service, two-year college faculty receive tenure. Once tenured, promotion—usually in the form of salary advances alone—appears contingent upon length of service more than any other factor.

The Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988 study suggests that two-year college departments have little control—certainly far less control than departments at four-year institutions—over hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions: "In contrast to the four-year schools, only 41% of departments in two-year schools exercised

control over the hiring of full-time teaching faculty (9) and "only 8 percent . . . reported control over most decision to promote full-time faculty" (10). Only 30% of two-year college English faculty reported that they had "a great deal" of influence on institutional policies. Two-year college faculty (both full and part time) appear not only disempowered and silent within their respective professions but also within their respective institutions.

Scholarship and Faculty Productivity

In the traditional model of research and scholarship professional identity is established most often through presentations at professional conferences and through publication in academic journals and books. According to the Carnegie National Survey of Faculty, 1984 (1985), community college faculty do little of either. The survey found that 75 percent of community college faculty had attended none or one national professional meeting; 75 percent of community college faculty were not engaged in any scholarly work which might lead to publication; 82 percent had not published or had accepted for publication any professional writing in the last two years; and 65 percent had never published in an academic or professional journal. For "English" faculty, the picture is not much brighter.

Few English faculty present at conferences or contribute to professional journals. My own study of English faculty found that only 32% had presented at least one national, regional, state or local conference in the past three years, only 38% of faculty were engaged in scholarly activities that might lead toward publication, and 40%

had published an article during their career (Kroll). "Moreover, 87% reported that their interests were leaning toward or very heavy in teaching rather than scholarship" (Kroll). Community college English faculty are rarely visible in College English (CE) and College Composition and Communication (CCC). It has only been in recent years that two-year college faculty have begun to regularly publish in Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC).

With this history it is not surprising that in the current climate of repeated calls for the re-examination of faculty time and productivity, two-year college faculty are rarely mentioned. It appears that two-year colleges are omitted because they are widely known as "teaching institutions" and therefore not in need of re-examination, or perhaps, continuing their early history, still not considered part of higher education. (In many states, community colleges are legislated as a part of K-14.) When they are mentioned, it is typically in a positive light. For example, in Higher Education in America: Killing the Spirit, one of the many books and articles arguing that higher education places too much emphasis on faculty research and scholarship and not enough emphasis on faculty teaching, Page Smith (1991) repeats the familiar refrain concerning two-year colleges:

> These institutions, with close ties to their parent communities, free for the most part of the snobbish pursuit of the latest academic fads that so warp their university counterparts, and free of the unremitting pressure to publish or perish, are, I believe, the hope of higher education in America. Unheralded and scorned by "the big boys," they carry out their mission with spirit and élan. (19-20)

On the one hand, as Smith's quote suggests, two-year colleges are praised for being teaching institutions whose faculties' sole purpose is to teach, and because of changing enrollment patterns, "... the quality and scope of instruction at community colleges...will assume growing importance" (Jacobson 1991, A1). On the other hand, there appears to be a growing number of writers who are questioning the academic culture and teaching effectiveness of two-year colleges.

These writers, some who are two-year college faculty, argue that for various reasons, including the two-year college's growing emphasis on career education and a lack of faculty scholarship, that the academic culture of the two-year college continues to suffer. For example, Dougherty (1994) argues that

> As the community college has steadily increased its interest in and spending on vocational education over the last three decades, it has also stopped mentioning transfer as an important option. Students have not been strongly introduced to the idea and given adequate preparation. The liberal arts curriculum has steadily shriveled, with many fields abandoned and sophomore or postintroductory courses becoming rare. . . . (96)

With respect to the teaching of writing, Richardson et al. (1983) report in Literacy in the Open-Access College, a three-year case study of an open-access community college, that

> Consistent with information available about community colleges nationwide . . . we saw little evidence at Oakwood that extensive reading or writing demands were placed on students. Obviously absent were forms and genres of written language earlier considered typical of college work: term papers, essay exams, and required reading lists were rare. (xii)

And in a further comment on the state of writing instruction in the two-year college, McGrath and Spear (1988) write that "[c]omposition teachers are as despairing as their disciplinary colleagues, as lost as everybody else in the face of the continuing deep erosion of the academic culture" (108). If any conclusion can be drawn from these reports and arguments, it is that two-year colleges are in fact not as effective as they could be in promoting critical literacy skills among their students. That is, just as advocates of the two-year college applaud two-year colleges and two-year college faculty for emphasizing teaching, critics of the two-year college question the quality and kind of teaching occurring. While it is clear that two-year college faculty spend more time in the classroom, simply claiming that two-year college emphasize teaching does not necessarily make them effective teaching institutions.

Other critics have argued that they lack scholarship by two-year college faculty has contributed to the decline in the collegiate function of the two-year college and to their absence in academia. As for the former, they argue that "the split between teaching and research is a false dichotomy that serves to undermine the intellectual fabric of community college" (Seidman 1985, 280-81); as for the latter, they argue that two-year college faculty "are pushed toward a marginality that virtually cuts them out of the academic profession" (Clark 1987, 266). And while it is true that the connection between scholarship and effective teaching remains unclear—although it seems hard to argue with the notion that writing teachers should themselves be

writers—Cohen and Brawer (1977) discovered that two-year college humanities "instructors with a high orientation toward research tend also to show a high concern for students" (55), and that

> The instructors who are oriented to research are an involved group. They participate in activities related to the humanities on their own time and attended classes, lectures, and seminars for their own benefit.... There is no support for the contention that an instructor's orientation toward research interferes with his teaching. On the contrary, the two may be mutually supportive. (55)

Finally, even the very notion of two-year colleges as "teaching institutions" is open to question. The United States National Center for Education Statistics (199) in their study of faculty, Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988, reported that with respect to total time spent per week at their respective institutions, "those in two-year colleges averaged 40 hours per week, less than at any of the four-year schools" (vi). And as for actual teaching practices, Astin et al. (1991) concluded that "the faculty in different types of institutions use very similar pedagogical approaches" (15). Both of these findings lend support to the notion that while two-year college faculty may spend more time in the classroom, they are not necessarily teaching any differently than their four-year college and university colleagues, and that they certainly have less attachment to their respective institutions that do four-year faculty: they come on campus, teach their classes, hold office hours, and leave.

Composition Studies and Two-Year College Faculty

It may be, as several sources we have cited suggest, that greater commitment to research would enhance the involvement and teaching of two-year college writing teachers. There have been positive indications that input from two-year college faculty are needed—and wanted—within the professional conversation in composition studies. In 1984, for instance, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) acquired TETYC and has published it since as a refereed journal whose editor and editorial board are two-college faculty. In 1982, the former editor of College English, observed that "among the 8000+ members of the College Section there are many women, and yet many more teachers in two-year colleges, whose voices are needed as complement and counterpoint to those voices which, varied though they certainly are, nevertheless more than half the time come from men teaching in universities" (Gray 1982, 385, my emphasis). In 1994-95, NCTE restructured the College Section to better recognize the importance and membership of two-year college writing teachers. The results, however, have not been as encouraging. Practice in the two-year college has not become much of a concern in the national focus on composition studies —two-year college writing instructors have yet to claim a place in the national conversation equal to the role they play in teaching writing to undergraduates. As Stephen North (1987) has argued

> For an autonomous composition to survive, [the dependency of practitioners on other methodological communities] has to change, and at both ends. Practitioners will have to make the same efforts as other

> communities to become methodologically aware and egalitarian, while other communities must treat practice with much greater respect. (372)

Two-year college faculty should be part of this transforming process. But in joining the conversation, they need to develop a professional set of standards that reflect their local and specific circumstances. They cannot simply imitate the research and scholarship model of the four-year college and university, and they cannot simply maintain a model of longevity and classroom acumen based more on the unreflective acceptance of traditional pedagogical methods, practice, and "lore" than on research. [2] Instead, two-year college faculty need to develop standards that reflect the fact that teaching is an intellectual endeavor in which knowledge making must play an important part. If community college teachers are to gain the intellectual vitality that fosters effective teaching, and if community colleges are to become attractive institution for teachers, than the binary opposition between teaching and scholarship must end.

Effecting a transformation of composition studies in the two-year college will require a different set of reforms than those focused on extricating composition studies from the tyranny of literary criticism. In the two-year college, the operative tyranny is the "What can I do in my class on Monday morning" mentality. In most two-year colleges it appears that the sole grounds for receiving tenure, or a "continuing appointment," is something called "teaching effectiveness." More often than not, teaching effectiveness translates into whatever system is already in place, including grading schemes

that require mandatory reductions for mechanical errors, fifty minute writing placement exams, five-paragraph essays, and course syllabi that are excessively textbook or workbook driven (Haight 1995). Teaching becomes a means of enforcing both a conservative and "service-driven" agenda in composition. That is, composition instruction in the two-year college has little to do with "knowledge making" or research and everything to do with unexamined notions of "good writing" and shop worn pedagogies that do little to problematize either the needs of the two-year college student or of the teaching and evaluating methodologies of the faculty. In fact, new faculty, many of whom teach part time, who enter this system with a background in composition studies are frustrated and neutralized by it. For full-time faculty in this system, tenure means "going along to get along," and the dialogical and intellectual energy that new faculty could bring to the system is squandered.

If composition studies is going to be transformed at the two-year college level the tenure and review system must change, and it must change in a way that values new training and new skills. The exclusive emphasis on teaching effectiveness blinds the tenure and review process at the two-year college to the research agenda of composition studies. We propose that a system of tenure and review based on local research would be logical first step in making the real work of composition studies-- and not just the lore of teaching composition--the basis for tenure and promotion. By local research we mean research directed toward the institution, its students, and

their needs. Local research might include a survey of the students and faculty served by the basic composition course that identifies their concerns and needs. It might also include a study that provides longitudinal tracking of students from the remedial or developmental sequence through the rest of their curriculum. It would almost certainly involve work on norming the expectations of the composition faculty and providing for a dialogue on the outcomes and expectations of the composition offerings.

The local nature of this system should also be emphasized in the publishing and distribution of the studies and findings. While it is unrealistic, and probably counterproductive, to expect most faculty at two-year college institutions to publish nationally, it would be highly productive if they could publish in local periodicals or occasional technical-report series published by departments of colleges. Such publication would provide community colleges with the necessary data to meet the growing demands (from both inside and outside the college) for good faith efforts to assess student learning, teacher performance, and program and institutional effectiveness.[3]

It is also possible, and we would argue desirable, that these "findings" could be "published" in a consortium of two-year colleges with similar students and missions, or that a state or regional association, perhaps operating as an assessment clearinghouse, could publish the findings of local teacher/researchers and facilitate a dialogue that would promote both a teaching and research agenda at

the two-year colleges. Finally, these publishing arrangements could serve as a springboard for two-year faculty who want to join the national conversations (that occur in journals like CE, CCC, and TETYC) about the future and direction of composition studies but until now have had little incentive to participate and little hope of being heard.

The main emphasis on local standards and research with respect to tenure and promotion would enhance the time honored commitment to teaching at two-year colleges without lapsing back into a system petrified by its commitment to outmoded and invalid theories of teaching, composition, and language. This sort of tenure and review system at two-year colleges may also help spur an accelerated rate of change in graduate programs in composition. As it currently stands, many "English" instructors at two-year colleges do not have extensive training in composition (Kroll), let alone in how to conduct research in composition. Few of these faculty, then, have the skills needed in the tenure system we propose. To fill the increasing demand for writing instructors at two-year colleges (Banach 1992, 12), graduate programs in composition would be encouraged to promote skills necessary for tenure and advancement at these institutions. This arrangement could also spur much needed cooperative agreements between two-year colleges and graduate programs in composition that will give doctoral candidates experiences in two-year assessment and portfolio systems at the same time as they bring new energy and initiatives into the two-year college.

It may even be possible to elevate teaching composition in the two-year college to meaningful intellectual work by creating a market for serious practitioners that would help alleviate what Miller (1991) calls the "sad woman in the basement" (121) status of composition at both two- and four-year institutions.

For anyone who has ever taught in a community college, this proposal must include one final clarification. While it may be easy for practitioners at four-year institutions to imagine the local research, assessment, and publication efforts adumbrated taking place in a collegial setting, that assumption is far from a given in the two-year colleges. Too often, tenure and review have been closed to meaningful input from one's colleagues, becoming instead an administrative prerogative. We envision something very different, something that connects each faculty member to a community of teacher-scholars. Without this emphasis, everything suggested in this chapter would merely lead to the same restrictive practices already in vogue.

The proposed revision of the tenure and review system at the two-year colleges underscores how the current system undermines programs in composition studies at senior institutions as well, and points to ways that changing the current system is in the interest of four-year and graduate faculty in composition. The current system serves the continued devaluation of composition studies and promotes a structural drift between practitioners at different institutions that cannot simply be patched over by the creation of two-year college

sections in major professional organizations. If Miller is right in using the sad woman in the basement analogy, then perhaps the basement is where the discussion of improving the status and tenure possibilities for composition studies should begin. Two-year colleges are being pushed in the direction of massive personnel shifts by the retirement of increasing numbers of faculty (Banach 1992, 12) and are being forced into changes by mandated assessment. These forces make two-year colleges a perfect environment for promoting the agenda of composition studies.

NOTES

[1] For example, Berlin's (1987) theories of rhetoric are as relevant for writing teachers at two-year colleges as they are for writing faculty at four-year colleges and universities: the tension between "expressivist" tendencies and students' own writing and thinking is, if anything, even greater in two-year colleges; Two-year college writing teachers can locate themselves within North's (1987) discussion of "Practitioners"; Elbow (1990) notes the presence of five two-year college teachers at the 1987 English Coalition Conference and includes the voices of two-year college teachers in the book's "interludes"; and Miller's (1991) reconceptualization of composition studies offers much to two-year college writing faculty.

[2] By "research" we prefer the definitions offered by Boyer (1990) in Scholarship Reconsidered. Rather than the traditional institutional definition of scholarship meaning research as solely the production of new knowledge, Boyer argues that scholarship be that of discovery; integration; application; and the scholarship of teaching (15). In addition, we make a distinction between unreflective acceptance of pedagogical methods and practice and "Lore," which North (1987) defines as "the accumulated body of traditional, practices, and beliefs in terms of which Practitioners understand how writing is done, learned and taught" (22).

[3] Though community colleges face mounting pressure from outside groups (including accrediting associations and governmental

bodies) for assessment of student performance, many two-year colleges are not well prepared to meet these demands (Alfred and Linder 1990). Carefully-researched and professionally-published articles and technical reports on instructional effectiveness, retention, etc. could prove valuable evidence of the institution's efforts at assessment—at the same time that they provide faculty with valuable opportunities for research and publication.

6 EMPOWERING FACULTY AS TEACHER-RESEARCHERS

Community college leaders have historically separated teaching from research, proudly proclaiming that their faculty members devote full attention to students rather than to out-of-class research. Over the past ten years, however, a growing number of critics have argued that the separation of teaching and scholarship (research being only one form of scholarship) is a false dichotomy that has weakened teaching effectiveness and professional development at the community college. Writers such as Simonds (1980), Jones (1982), Sledge (1987), Seidman (1985), Vaughan (1986, 1988), and Parilla (1986) define scholarship in ways that are appropriate for the community college and argue that faculty should view themselves as teachers and scholars.

Within the context of this broad view of scholarship, this chapter discusses classroom research and the professional role of community college faculty as teacher-researchers who describe and assess the teaching and learning that goes on in their classrooms. Such classroom researcher–a key element of what Boyer (1990) calls "the scholarship of teaching"–has been viewed as an anchor for faculty scholarship at the community college. The AACJC Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988), for example, argues that "community colleges should define the role of the faculty member as classroom research–focusing evaluation on instruction and making a clear connection between what the teacher teaches and how students learn" (27). The commission's

statement clearly recognizes the potential scholarly contributions of faculty as teachers, contributions that may go unrecognized if scholarship is tied solely to research.

How is classroom research conducted and what are the larger ramifications for the professional roles ascribed to community college faculty? The four sections of this chapter address these questions. The first section posits a typology of classroom research models, with particular emphasis on the roles these models ascribe to faculty and on their applicability to the community college. The second section discusses the ideology underlying the teacher-researcher movement and offers several reasons why community college faculty should become engaged in classroom research. The third section discusses ramifications, including political ones, for community college faculty when they take on the role of teacher-researcher. Finally, the fourth section provides suggestions for community college faculty and administrators interested in teacher-researcher classroom research.

Classroom Research Models

There are various ways to define and describe classroom research (see, for example, Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985; Calkins, 1985; Mohr and MacLean, 1987; Myers, 1985, Shulman, 1986). For the purposes of this essay five research models used in examining teaching and learning within classrooms will be presented (see Tables 18 and 19). The first two models, experimental research and school ethnography, employ (respectively) the quantitative and qualitative methods of social science and rarely involve teachers themselves. The remaining three–teacher-researcher ethnography, teacher-researcher ethnography/assessment, and teacher-researcher assessment–assume a key faculty role, thus shifting

the control of the research agenda from professional educational researchers to practitioners who, in the final analysis, utilize the results of the research.

Table 18 Classroom Research Models: Minimal Teacher Involvement

	Experimental •Process-Product •Academic Learning Time	School Ethnography
Role of Classroom Teacher	Classroom teacher uninvolved in research; Research conducted by educational researcher	•Classroom teacher univolved in research, or •Collaborator with school ethnographer
Purpose	Assessment of classroom instruction in order to improve student learning and teacher effectiveness	Description and interpretation of the culture of the classroom
Audiences	•Educational researchers •Policy makers •Teachers	•School ethnographers •Policy makers •Teachers
Methods of Data Collection	•Standardized tests •Observation scales	•Observations •Field notes •Case Study •Standardized tests

Table 18 (Cont'd)

Methods of Data Analysis	Quantitative statistical and analytical analysis	Qualitiative emphasis but also quantitative
Example	•N.L. Gage, The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching •D.C. Berliner, "Tempus Educare"	•G. Spindler, Doing the Ethnography of Schooling •S. Florio and M. Walsh, "The Teacher as Colleague in Classroom Research

Table 19 Classroom Research Models: Direct Teacher Involvement

	Teacher-Researcher Ethnogrpahy	Teacher-Researcher Ethnography/ Assessment	Teacher-Researcher Assessment
Role of Classroom teacher	Teacher researcher conducts research	Teacher researcher conducts research	Teacher researcher conducts research
Purpose	Description and interpretation of the culture of the classroom to generate pedagogical theory	Observation and formulation of research questions to assess classroom practice and student learning	Improvement pf quality learning through the improvement of teaching effectiveness
Audiences	•Teacher-researcher •Other teacher-researchers •Policy makers	•Teacher-researcher •Other teacher-researchers •Policy makers	•Teacher-researcher •Other teacher-researchers •Policy makers
Methods of Data Collection	•Narratve descriptions •Informal journals •Recordings	•Observations •Student work •Pre- and post-tests	•Classroom assessment techniques (CATs)
Methods of Data Analysis	Qualitative	Qualitative and quantitative	Qualitative and quantitative
Example	•H. Tinberg, "A Model of Theory-Making for Writing Teachers: Local Knowledge"	L. Odell, "The Classroom Teacher as Researcher"	•K. Patricia Cross and T.A. Angelo, Classroom Assessment Techniques

Experimental Research

Within the experimental model of educational research, two methods have been used to assess classroom teaching and learning: process-product research and academic learning time. As described by Shulman (1986), process-product research focuses on the effectiveness of teacher performance (processes) and on student learning (products). In the academic learning time method, the educational researcher studies the observable classroom behavior of students in order to determine teacher effectiveness. In both methods the researcher collects and analyzes data quantitatively. In neither method does the classroom teacher play an active part in research; each depends upon outside observers.

School Ethnography

As defined by Wilcox (1988), "Ethnography is first and foremost a *descriptive* endeavor in which the researcher attempts accurately to describe and interpret the nature of social discourse among a group of people" (458). Erickson (1984) was one of the first to argue that with some changes the ethnographic research model is useful for studying schools, including (but not limited to) classroom activities. According to Goetz and LeCompte (1984), "The purpose of educational ethnography is to provide rich, descriptive data about the contexts, activities, and beliefs of participants in educational settings" (17).

Within the school ethnography model, classroom teacher participation varies from no active involvement at all (Spindler, 1988) to that of collaboration with an educational researcher (Florio and Walsh, 1981; Kantor, 1990). But the purpose is usually to describe the culture of the institution as a whole rather than the teaching and learning that goes

on in individual classroom settings. Examples of school ethnography include the works by London (1978) and Weis (1985), who spent a year or more participating in and describing the institutional character of an urban community college. Their studies provide insights into the cultural contexts within which teaching and learning take place at those institutions.

Teacher-Researcher Ethnography

The teacher-researcher ethnography model of classroom research has a more focused purpose, using the techniques of ethnographic field work to study learning in particular classroom environments. Teacher-researcher ethnography retains ethnographic characteristics because of the teacher-researcher's interest in describing the culture of the classroom and doing field work in the classroom, but it differs from school ethnography in several ways. First, the teacher makes his or her own observations in the role of teacher-researcher, rather than remaining on the sidelines as a nonparticipant. Second, school ethnography tends to be conducted over an extended period of time, whereas a teacher-researcher ethnography project might vary in length from one class period to one term or (at most) one school year. Third, in teacher-researcher ethnography the teacher-researcher focuses solely on his or her own classroom(s). A school ethnographer, on the other hand, may focus on several teachers' classrooms within one or more schools.

Tinberg (1990), who has proposed this classroom research model for community college faculty, argues that there is a "need to observe and to record, in detail, the ceremonies and transactions that take place in the classroom" (19). With these observations, he points out, classroom

teachers can begin to develop and understand the theories that underlie classroom practice. Inquiry and discovery are the primary purposes of this quasi-school ethnography, although assessment–defined throughout this essay as seeking to improve student learning and teacher effectiveness–may ultimately emerge from this model of classroom research.

Teacher-Researcher Ethnography/Assessment

The teacher-researcher ethnography/assessment classroom research model, best described by Odell (1976, 1987), appears to be the dominant model of classroom research currently used by teacher-researchers. It retains ethnographic research methodology in that the classroom research continually emerges from the teacher-researcher's own classroom observations about his or her teaching. As Odell (1987) writes, "The process of exploration and discovery [which generates the research question] arises from a sense of dissonance or conflict, or uncertainty" (129). It differs from the teacher-researcher ethnography model, however, in that the research questions that the teacher-researcher seeks to answer clearly involve the assessment of student learning and teacher effectiveness (Odell, 1976). While the teacher-researcher ethnography model seeks a broad understanding of all that goes on within the culture of a particular classroom, the teacher-researcher ethnographic/assessment model has the more specific goal of answering teacher questions about student learning and teacher effectiveness.

Teacher-Researcher Assessment

The fifth type of classroom research, teacher-researcher assessment, described by Cross and Angelo (1988, 1989), emphasizes the development

and use of simple feedback techniques that can be incorporated into the teaching process to determine if students are learning what is being taught. As an example of such a feedback technique, Cross (1990) notes that "a study of critical thinking in the classroom...might begin with the assignment of a task that requires critical thinking and permits systematic observations about how students approach the task and how well they perform" (15).

Though the use of defined feedback techniques differentiates this model from teacher-researcher ethnography/assessment, which emphasizes a broader process of discovery and inquiry within the classroom leading to the formulation of research questions, there are similarities between the two models. Like teacher-researcher ethnographic/assessment model, assessment of learning is the key focus. As Cross and Angelo (1989) explain, "The purpose of classroom research is to improve the quality of learning in college classrooms by improving the effectiveness of teaching" (24). In addition, both models assume faculty ownership of the research. Cross and Angelo (1988) emphasize that "the research most likely to improve teaching and learning is conducted by teachers on questions they themselves have formulated in response to problems or issues in their own teaching" (2).

Appropriateness for the Community College

The three teacher-researcher models listed above are the most appropriate and beneficial for community college faculty in all disciplines. Research undertaken within these models derives from and is used by faculty themselves. Ideally a combination of all three of these teacher-researcher models provides the best approach to classroom research and to the promotion of faculty scholarship through teaching. This combined

approach proceeds from the general to the specific: the field work of teacher-researcher ethnography helps faculty come to an understanding of the classroom culture in general. This understanding, in turn, leads to more specific research questions that guide the teacher-researcher ethnography/assessment model. Finally, teacher-researcher assessment model provides assessment techniques for determining teacher effectiveness and student performance within the context of specific learning objectives.

By arguing for community college faculty to become teacher-researchers within the context of the latter three models, I do not mean to diminish the importance and value of the more traditional experimental and school ethnography models. All five models have their uses. As Shulman (1986) points out, "Different programs of research are likely to produce different types of knowledge about teaching, knowledge of interest to theoreticians, policy makers, and practitioners" (27). But if the goal of classroom research is to apply faculty scholarship to the understanding and improvement of student learning, then research models that involve faculty themselves (rather than outside researchers) must be employed.

Community College Faculty as Teacher-Researchers

Why should community college faculty members become teacher-researchers actively involved in classroom research, and why should community college leaders encourage and support community college faculty as teacher-researchers? There are several compelling answers to this question: to close the link between educational research and practice, to respond to demands for information on institutional effectiveness, and

to improve teaching itself. Each of these answers posits a strong faculty role within the institution. Hence the underlying ideology of the teacher-researcher movement has implications for college governance as well as educational research.

Ownership of Pedagogical Theory

For years a gap has existed between educational research and classroom practice. Educational researchers complain that classroom teachers dislike educational theory and are more interested in knowing what they can do in class on Monday morning to survive. Classroom teachers respond that educational researchers produce theories that have no direct pedagogical application in the classroom. While both points of view have some validity, the real problem lies less in the relevance of theory than in the question of professional investment in and ownership of that theory. Because teachers are rarely involved in educational research, many faculty members, including community college instructors, do not have a sense of owning the theory that guides classroom pedagogy. As Berthoff (1981) argues, "Educational research is nothing to our purpose, unless we [teachers] formulate the questions;...if the questions...are not originally REformulated [sic] by those who are working in the classroom, educational research is pointless" (31).

Berthoff's assertion is supported in the literature by the arguments for and descriptions of classroom research undertaken by teacher-researchers themselves. (See, for example, Bissex and Bullock, 1987; Daiker and Morenberg, 1990; Goswami and Stillman 1987; and Miller, 1990). By becoming teacher-researchers and analyzing questions that emerge in their own classrooms, faculty members generate, revise, and assess pedagogical theory. The scope of research is no longer left to

outside researchers (as is the case with traditional, experimental research). Ownership of educational theory reverts to those who make use of it.

Assessment

A second answer to the question of why faculty should become teacher-researchers concerns the growing demand (from both inside and outside the college) for good-faith efforts to assess student learning, teacher performance, and program and institutional effectiveness. Though community colleges face mounting pressure from outside groups, including accrediting associations and governmental bodies, for assessments of student performance, many two-year colleges are not well prepared to meet these demands (Alfred and Linder, 1990). Both faculty and administrators are hampered by the traditional barriers between their roles in the community college. If colleges are to collect information about student learning and teacher performance, the faculty role in institutional assessment and decision making will have to be increased.

Classroom research models that cast the faculty member in the role of a teacher-researcher provide one way for community colleges to gain information about student learning and teacher performance based on actual experiences in the classroom. These models also provide community colleges with the opportunity to assess the effectiveness of specific academic programs. Finally, classroom research will encourage and improve involvement of faculty in the college and overcome some of the powerlessness community college faculty currently experience in institutional decision making (Alfred and Linder, 1990). Through their role as teacher-researchers, community college faculty would finally be involved in curriculum development and evaluation.

Effects on Teaching

A third response to the question of why community college faculty should become teacher-researchers lies in the accounts of classroom teachers who have had experience in this role (Bissex and Bullock, 1987; Goswami and Stillman, 1987; Miller, 1990; Mohr and MacLean, 1987). Besides promoting teacher ownership of educational theory, classroom research forces teachers to look closely at their own teaching and to view it in new ways. Such professional reflection and analysis combats stagnation because it requires a continual re-examination of teaching approaches in a quest to find those that are most effective and root out those that are ineffective. In addition, it provides a positive and nonthreatening impetus for change in pedagogical techniques, builds a sense of community with other teacher-researchers (especially when results are shared), and empowers students by creating a classroom environment that encourages collaborative and cooperative learning.

Ideology Underlying Teacher Research

The argument for community college faculty as teacher-researchers clearly alters the traditional role and perception of the classroom teacher both inside and outside the classroom and the college. Educational researchers and school ethnographers are no longer the only groups creating, revising, and assessing educational theory and practice. They are now joined (not excluded) by teacher-researchers who create and revise educational theory, assess the effects of their own pedagogy on student learning, and ultimately own and control the theories that underlie classroom practice. Through their classroom research, teacher-

researchers seek and achieve new and greater authority within their classrooms, their colleges, and higher education as a whole.

By becoming teacher-researchers with the support of college leaders, the traditional roles of teachers and administrators are altered. As teacher-researchers, community college faculty will play a stronger, more important, and necessary role within their respective colleges, particularly in terms of assessment and strategic decisions concerning academic programs and curricula. Teacher-conducted research, then, redefines not only the role of the classroom teacher, but also the governance model for the community college. In the final analysis, most answers to the question of why faculty members should become teacher-researchers touch on the issue of governance.

The Role of Teacher-Researchers

What does it mean for community college faculty members to become teacher-researchers? The ramifications not only involve one's self-identity as a teacher, but also include the teacher-researcher's role in the classroom and in the college as a whole. Finally, the underlying political ramifications must be acknowledged.

Teacher-Research Self-Identity

As discussed above, becoming a teacher-researcher may require faculty members to perceive themselves in new ways. Community college faculty who have previously viewed themselves as teachers, not researchers (particularly when research is defined as basic research of the type that is commonly carried out at the university), may resist or misunderstand the teacher-researcher role. As Mohr and MacLean (1987) acknowledge, beginning teacher-researchers may at first experience a tension between the roles of teaching and researching, particularly

because they cannot distance themselves from the research. The actions and goals of the teacher may at times conflict with the actions and goals of the researcher. Mohr and MacLean argue, and the reports of teacher-researchers confirm, that these conflicts are resolved as the teacher becomes more comfortable in the role of teacher-researcher. Ultimately, as Bissex and Bullock (1987) argue, a "teacher-researcher is not...a split personality but a more complete teacher" (5).

Roles Within the Classroom

Becoming a teacher-researcher also engenders a new model of teacher and student behavior in the classroom. In the teacher-researcher's classroom, education is no longer simply "an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor" (Freire, 1989, 58). Instead, teacher-researchers continually study the culture of the classroom (Tinberg, 1990), inquire into the nature of their teaching and into the scope of student learning (Odell, 1976, 1987), and assess their own effectiveness (Cross and Angelo, 1988, 1989). In these classrooms, students are treated as equals and with respect. Their opinions are valued. They are encouraged to become involved in the life of the classroom, to realize their own potential, and to interact with other students through collaborative learning. When this occurs, the classroom becomes a community of learners (Goswami and Stillman, 1987).

Roles Beyond the Classroom

The ramifications of teacher-conducted research extend beyond the classroom, particularly for community college faculty. Although the primary purpose of classroom research is to enhance teaching and student learning within specific classroom contexts, teacher-researchers should be

encouraged to share the results of their efforts with the larger professional community. Several benefits will derive from this larger distribution.

First, community college administrators will benefit by gaining access to additional and essential information that will aid in curricular decision making. Through the insights gained by describing and assessing classroom pedagogy, faculty can play a larger role in strategic decisions concerning teaching and learning. Increased faculty involvement in decision making, however, will depend on the degree to which college administrators reconceptualize the role of community college faculty in college governance and revise their definitions of research and scholarship. While such changes may at first seem improbable, if not revolutionary, it is heartening to note that many college leaders, including those on the AACJC Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988), endorse the teacher-researcher role for faculty and support the related themes of student empowerment as active learners and of teacher-researcher involvement in curriculum and program assessment.

Second, sharing results with other educators through college seminars, state and national conferences, and professional publications will help establish a large body of classroom research studies that may be analyzed. An accessible body of classroom research studies will allow teacher-researchers to test the validity and reliability of their own research efforts. As Mohr and MacLean (1987) state:

> Through the specific nature of teacher-researchers' reports and the personal nature of their interpretations, other teachers and readers see the generalizable "truths" that can be reliably interpreted as applicable in their classrooms. No classroom setting with all its variables can be replicated or controlled, but with enough information and solid, explanatory analysis, readers may discover findings that do apply in their own work with their own students (64).

Third, sharing classroom research results with other educators will provide community college faculty with an opportunity to become part of the larger community of scholars. Studies have consistently shown that community college faculty have for too long been isolated from their respective disciplines and colleagues in two-year and four-year colleges (Seidman, 1985). As teachers in a sector of higher education now enrolling close to 51 percent of all first-time college students and over 40 percent of all undergraduates (AACJC Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988), community college teacher-researchers should have and can have a stronger voice in higher education.

Political Ramifications of Teacher Research

Calls for faculty to take on the teacher-researcher role are not without political ramifications; as Berlin (1990) points out, the ideology underlying the teacher-as-researcher movement stresses "democratization of authority" in education (10). Teacher-researchers gain authority over the educational theory that supports classroom practice. They gain a voice inside the college through their active involvement in strategic decisions concerning curricula, and they gain authority outside their colleges through active involvement in their respective disciplines. Finally, students in the classrooms of teacher-researchers gain authority by becoming active participants and learners rather than passive consumers of facts. According to Berlin and to writers such as Aronowitz and Giroux (1985), all of these outcomes, which strengthen teacher and student authority, are counter to the ideology of many educational reformers who, in response to the crisis in American education, suggest reforms that ignore or weaken the authority of classroom teachers by

imposing prepackaged curricula that assume that all students learn the same way in all classrooms.

Nowhere else in American higher education is the democratic ideal more sought after than in the community college. But are community colleges truly democratic institutions? Yes and no, depending upon whom you read. Certainly efforts to encourage community college faculty to become teacher-researchers will go a long way to strengthen the democratic ideal of the community college.

Developing Classroom Research Projects

There are teacher-researchers and teacher-research groups and projects throughout the country. Currently the most notable project involving community college faculty is the Classroom Research Project headed by K. Patricia Cross at the University of California, Berkeley (Cross and Angelo, 1989). While the support such projects provide is helpful, there are enough materials now available (and still more materials becoming available) to assist community college faculty in their own classroom research efforts.

How should community colleges go about starting a departmental or campus- wide classroom research project? The following list provides several suggestions.

- Faculty involvement in the project should be voluntary, and faculty should (if possible) receive some form of compensation.
- A first-time classroom research project might be more manageable and beneficial if three or four faculty members are selected from two or three departments. Ultimately, it should be a college goal to incorporate classroom research into the college's faculty development activities.

- The six to twelve project members should spend some time at the beginning of the project reading and discussing the available material about classroom research. (Several of the items listed in the reference section will be helpful.)
- The classroom research model should include all three models of teacher research described in Table Two.
- Once a research question is formulated, the teacher-researchers should read material related to their individual investigations.
- Teacher-researchers should share their research findings with other project members, with college administrators who make strategic decisions concerning curricula, and with other colleagues both inside and outside of the college.

Teacher-researcher classroom research offers a new, exciting, and realistic model of teaching to community colleges. It is teacher-centered, classroom-based, and assessment-oriented. It provides community college faculty with an opportunity to develop and apply pedagogical theory and with a means for assessing their own teaching effectiveness. It encourages faculty participation in strategic decisions concerning curricula, and it promotes professional renewal by giving faculty a sense of purpose, by valuing what goes on in the classroom, and by building a sense of community with the larger community of scholars. All of these outcomes are essential to the future development and success of community colleges.

7 Building Communities: Joining The Community Of Professional Writing Teachers

In Building Communities: A Vision for A New Century (1988), the AACJC Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, proposes:

> that the theme "Building Communities" become the new rallying point for the community college in America. . . . The term "community" [is] not only . . . a region to be served, but also . . . a climate to be created. (7)

The Commission describes how the mission of the two-year college must be to build communities within the college and the region, and partnerships with high schools, with four-year colleges and universities, and with employers. Most importantly, they describe how the classroom will provide faculty renewal by becoming a community of learners and by the community college teacher becoming a "dedicated scholar," by which they mean "a *classroom researcher*–one who is involved in the evaluation of his or her own teaching and learning..." (1988, 27). If, however, the classroom is to provide the renewal of faculty that the Commission views as crucial to the future of the community college, then community building must occur beyond the classroom: community college faculty, including English faculty, must establish a professional identity within the academic community of higher education.

To do this, community college faculty must actively participate in the "process of collaborative knowledge making" (Reither and Vipond 1989, 860). It is a lack of "knowledge making" and a resulting lack of professional identity and community that have engendered the anti-intellectual environment and faculty burnout which the Commission discovered during their examination and which has historically pervaded community college campuses.

Fortunately, now is the best (and most crucial) time for community college English faculty to establish themselves as an important and vital part of the academic community in higher education, specifically the community of professional writing teachers–those who "intend to put [their] primary energy into the teaching of writing and into research that informs the teaching of writing..." (Hairston 1985, 281). As writing teachers, we have the opportunity to become knowledge makers and to establish our identity and membership within the community of professional writing teachers.

Unlike literary studies, composition studies rely on the classroom. After surveying eighteen scholars in the field of composition, Chapman (1987) concluded:

> Composition studies have been and must be closely tied to the teaching of writing. Most of the researchers [surveyed] indicated that their initial contact with the theory of composition came as a result of teaching composition classes, and the enthusiasm for further research is based on the continuing challenge of writing instruction. The symbiotic relation between teaching and research seems much more important in this field than in traditional literary studies in English. (45)

Since community college English faculty are primarily classroom teachers of writing, this should come as welcome assurance. The classroom can provide renewal if in fact we become classroom researchers *and* active participants in what North (1987) calls the "making of knowledge in composition" (361).

Teacher-Research

As described in Chapter 6, teacher-research provides excellent opportunity for community college English faculty to become knowledge makers. By the very nature of our positions as classroom teachers, we are in an exceptional position to conduct "research that informs the teaching of writing" (Hairston 1985, 281), to become teacher-researchers. In Working Together: A Guide for Teacher-Researchers, Marian M. Mohr and Marion S. MacLean (1987) describe the teacher-researcher:

> As they begin to think of themselves as researchers, teachers are moved to redefine their roles as teachers. As their research becomes integrated into their teaching, their definition of teacher-researcher becomes teacher–a teacher who observes, questions, assists, analyzes, writes, and repeats these actions in a recursive process that includes sharing their results with their students and with other teachers. (4)

By formulating a "well-defined research question" (Odell 1987,130) to investigate within our classrooms, we can become learners and knowledge makers within our own classrooms: teacher-researchers seeking answers to questions and sharing our findings with other professional writing teachers.

Establishing a Professional Identity

In order to establish a professional identity and to gain membership in the community of professional writing teachers, each teacher-researcher must share his or her results. It is the individual's "contribution to knowledge-already-existing" (Reither and Vipond 1989, 860) that establishes professional identity and affords membership in the community. In academia this sharing, this social process, occurs most often through presentations at professional conferences and through publication in academic journals. According to the Carnegie National Survey of Faculty, 1984 (1985), community college faculty do little of either. The survey found that 75 percent of community college faculty had attended none or one national professional meeting; 75 percent of community college faculty were not engaged in any scholarly work which might lead to publication; 82 percent had not published or had accepted for publication any professional writing in the last two years; and 65 percent had never published in an academic or professional journal. For English faculty, the picture–at least in terms of publication–is not much brighter.

We do not contribute much to professional journals, including our "own" Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC). In 1988, community college faculty wrote only 38 percent of the pieces published in TETYC. Even more disheartening, only about 33 percent of submissions to TETYC were from community college faculty. Community college English faculty are even less visible in two other

highly prominent journals, College English (CE) and College Composition and Communication (CCC). An examination of three volumes (38, 39, and 40) of CCC identified only one article (2 percent) and six (12 percent) "Staffroom Interchange" essays by community college authors. As for CE, from the period of 1 September-31 August 1986, only 17 (3 percent) of articles submitted to CE were from community college faculty (Raymond 556). This was actually a decrease from 33 (9 percent) articles submitted during the period from 1 September 1980-31 August 1981 (Gray 1982, 387).

Most importantly, within the community of professional writing teachers, the knowledge-making contributions of community college English faculty are wanted and (as I will describe later) needed. For example, the 1990 CCCC Annual Convention in Chicago with the theme, appropriately enough, "Strengthening Community through Diversity," recognized the contributions of two-year college English faculty, specifically writing teachers. And Donald Gray (1982), former editor of CE, observed that "among the 8000+ members of the College Section there are many women, and yet *many more teachers in two-year colleges, whose voices are needed* as complement and counterpoint to those voices which, varied though they certainly are, nevertheless more than half the time come from men teaching in universities" (385, my emphasis). The invitation to publish is offered; it is our responsibility to accept.

Why We Haven't Accepted the Invitation

There are four reasons why community college English faculty (and community college faculty in general) have not previously become knowledge makers and, therefore, have not established a professional identity. The first and most important reason lies at the heart of the community college's founding philosophy. Whether you believe that the founders of the community college–Henry Tappan, William Mitchell, and William Rainey Harper among others–sought to provide an education for everyone, or sought to protect the elitism of the university (or something in between), it is indisputable that they established community colleges as teaching institutions and virtually excluded scholarship.[2] And, unfortunately, early prominent leaders of the community college movement supported this philosophy. For example, Walter C. Eells, in The Junior College, a classic study of the early community college movement, wrote:

> It is very doubtful whether pure research of the university type should be strongly encouraged on the part of junior college instructors. Such is likely to consume time, thought, and nerve energy which is better expended on teaching and student contacts. (334)

From the very outset, then, community college leaders have separated teaching and scholarship.

Second, since teaching and scholarship are separated, community college faculty never have been given sufficient time for engaging in scholarship. Community college faculty teach more classes than faculty at four-year colleges and universities, which does

not allow them as much time for scholarly activities. Cohen and Brawer (1977) found that 61 percent of community college instructors who responded would, if given enough time, spend more time on "research or professional writing" (52). Earl Seidman's (1985) interviews of community college faculty, In the Words of the Faculty, revealed similar responses. Among the English faculty interviewed, he found instructors interested in their students and in contributing to their profession but lacking enough time to effectively handle either. Of course, some community colleges do support faculty scholarship. And even without support, many community college faculty struggle to be both teacher and scholar.

Third, community colleges have traditionally not rewarded scholarship and publication by faculty. In fact, as Seidman's interviews illustrate, faculty who do write and publish often face hostility from administrators and other faculty. Most importantly, as George Vaughan (1986) argues, "the lack of rewards may be the real reason [community colleges] do not place more emphasis upon scholarship, especially research" (16). Rewarding faculty scholarship is essential. I believe that when community college faculty are rewarded for their scholarship, time will become less of a concern.

Fourth, as a consequence of the community college's emphasis on teaching, community college faculty have rarely been asked to play an active role in their respective disciplines. According to North (1987), "the whole thrust of the academic reform movement was to

remove authority over knowledge from the hands of those whose main source of such authority was their practice" (21).

Why We Must Accept the Invitation

Teaching requires continual learning, intellectual development, and participation in one's discipline. As studies of faculty have shown, separating teaching and scholarship "serves to undermine the intellectual fabric of the community college" (Seidman 1985, 280-81) and, contrary to popular belief, weakens teaching.

Cohen and Brawer (1977) discovered that community college humanities "instructors with a high orientation toward research tend also to show a high concern for students" (55), and that

> the instructors who are oriented to research are an involved group. They participate in activities related to the humanities on their own time and attend classes, lectures, and seminars for their own benefit.... There is no support for the contention that an instructor's orientation toward research interferes with his teaching. On the contrary, the two may be mutually supportive. (55)

Simply put, teaching is an intellectual endeavor in which knowledge making must play an important part. If community college teachers are to gain the intellectual vitality that fosters effective teaching and if community colleges are to become attractive institutions for teachers, then the separation between teaching and scholarship must end.

Finally, composition studies need us. As professional writing teachers, we can celebrate that "from the 'ugly stepchild' of the English department to the Cinderella of the Ivy Hall, composition studies have made great progress in recent years" (Chapman 1987,

43), and that "in the twenty years of its modern history...Composition has gone from being the least prestigious leg in the 'tripod' of the English curriculum to a fairly substantial academic 'society'" (North 1987, 363). Yet, even in the face of this good news, the survival of composition as a distinct academic discipline is still at stake. Strengthening our bond with four-year college and university professional writing teachers will benefit the discipline:

> For an autonomous Composition to survive, [the dependency of practitioners on other methodological communities] has to change, and at both ends. Practitioners will have to make the same efforts as other communities to become methodologically aware and egalitarian, while other communities must treat practice with much greater respect. (North 1987, 372)

Conclusion

Classroom research offers one feasible way for English faculty to become knowledge makers, to overcome the false dichotomy that exists between teaching and scholarship in community colleges, to establish a professional identity, and to affirm our bond with the community of professional writing teachers.

By accepting "the responsibility to contribute to our individual and collective understanding of how people use language to communicate" (Odell 1986, 401), we will have a positive effect on ourselves, our students, our colleges, and the community of professional writing teachers.

NOTES

[1] See Chapter 5: "Empowering Faculty as Teacher-Researchers" for a detailed discussion of classroom research. [William F. Irmscher's "Finding a Comfortable Identity," CCC 38 (1987): 81-87; Miles Myers's The Teacher-Researcher: How to Study Writing in the Classroom, Urbana: NCTE, 1985; Lee Odell's "The Classroom Teacher as Researcher," English Journal 65.1 (1976): 106-11, and "Teachers of Composition and Needed Research in Discourse Theory," CCC 30 (1979): 39-45

[2] I prefer the broader term scholarship rather than the term research. As George B. Vaughan (1988) describes in "The Path to Respect," research is only one aspect of scholarship.

Afterword: Toward 2000 and Beyond

Projecting the future of the two-year college English department is, of course, directly tied to projecting the future of the two-year college in America. As Cohen (1995) points out, such work "involves projecting the future for the nation in general: its demographics, economy, and public attitudes" (n. pag.). Before discussing the future of the community college English department, then, it is important to briefly describe future projections concerning the community college, its students, and its faculty.

The Future of the Two-Year College

The great days of two-year college expansion--the period when a new two-year college seemed to open nearly every day--are now some twenty-five years behind us. Rarely does one read in the newspaper of a new community college opening. Rather, existing community colleges are more likely to open extensions or to expand satellite campuses--within the last three years my own college opened a new and expanded downtown campus--or four-year colleges and universities may open additional two-year branch campuses. In 1996, there is seemingly a community college within commuting distance of most people in the United States--a main goal of the Truman Commission.

Although books continue to be published arguing for either more emphasis on the community college's collegiate function or, conversely, for more emphasis on its career education function, Cohen (1995) believes that

> the function of the community college will not change either. The institution offering career, collegiate, developmental and continuing education has become well accepted by the public and by state-level coordinating and funding agencies. (n. pag.)

It is highly unlikely that community colleges will evolve into four-year colleges or even two-year branch campuses of four-year institutions as some critics, for example, Dougherty (1994) have recommended. At the same time, it appears just as unlikely that community colleges will move closer to becoming institutions more akin to proprietary schools. Rather, as Cohen suggests, the community college will remain an "open admissions" institution whose mission encompasses offering comprehensive programs in career, collegiate, developmental, and continuing education.

As for community college students, government data suggests an increasing number of students seeking access to higher education, with many of these students selecting community colleges. Community colleges will continue to enroll students of all ages and all abilities. With the increasing costs of tuition at four-year institutions, it is possible that community colleges will enroll an increasing number of students who consciously choose the community college over the four-year institution for the first two years of their undergraduate education based solely on its lower tuition costs. As one highway billboard ad put it: "Jackson

Community College: More College, Less Money." At the same time community colleges will continue to enroll an increasing number of students deemed academically unprepared, particularly in reading and writing skills, for college coursework. More and more community colleges will be asked, or in some cases mandated, to provide developmental coursework in reading, writing, and mathematics. Some campuses of the University of California system, for example, the San Diego and Davis campuses, have stopped (or want to stop) offering developmental writing courses and are requiring students to complete such courses at a local community college. In addition, if the current trend in governmental efforts to cut funding for Adult Education programs--such as is happening in Michigan--continue, community colleges will most likely be asked to provide academic instruction for students no longer in Adult Education programs.

As a result of increases in college enrollments, the number of community college faculty is likely to increase, albeit slowly. However, Cohen (1995) argues that "this does not mean a change in the ratio of full-timers to part-timers. This ratio is likely to remain stable at 40 to 60 [full-time to part-time faculty] as administrators' desires to save money by employing part-timers and faculty organizations' ability to protect full-time positions offset one another" (n. pag.). In addition, the faculty member's primary role as a classroom instructor and the number of hours that a full-time instructor spends in the classroom has not changed for decades and is not likely to change. Although current views about technology in the classroom often envision a fully learner-controlled

environment that is totally responsive to individual needs, historically such claims do not hold. The advent of phonograph, phone, radio, and TV all have brought with them claims of freeing instructors from their roles as information conduits, but this has never come to fruition. Regardless of the spread of multimedia and interactive technology-based education, classroom centered instruction will remain essential (Haight 1995).

What does all this mean for the future of the community college English department?

The Future of Community College English Department

As I have argued in earlier chapters, the current culture of the community college English department developed in the early 1930s and '40s and--like the community college in general-- appears likely to remain unchanged. The pre-service training of community college faculty will likely remain as it currently stands--the master's degree being the prerequisite degree for employment. Few if any job listings for community college English positions require a Ph.D. or specific training in teaching English in the community college. It is likely, however, that new community college English faculty will have training in the teaching of writing as a result of the growth in graduate programs in Composition. It seems highly unlikely that the Ph.D. will ever come to serve as the requisite degree. As my study of English faculty shows, the percentage of community college faculty with the Ph.D. has remained fairly constant over the years, roughly 15 percent of the full-time faculty. One possible change that could alter this statistic is the number of retirements currently facing the English profession and the large number of English

Ph.D.s seeking employment. (In the last few years teaching at a community college has been a "hot" topic at the annual Modern Language Association Convention as recent Ph.D. graduates see the community college as a possible place for employment when faced with the dismal job market at four-year colleges and universities.) It is possible that many of the current faculty who will retire in the next five to ten years could be replaced by new faculty with a Ph.D. Much of this depends, however, on the number of full-time faculty who retire who are replaced with new full-time faculty rather than part-time faculty. Despite Cohen's belief that the ratio of full-time faculty to part-time is likely to remain the same, the ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty in English departments has historically been lower. It is more likely that community colleges will not replace all retiring full-time English faculty with new full-time faculty, but instead rely even more on part-time faculty. At this point, it appears that community college faculty unions or associations can do much to prevent this from happening.

It appears likely that teaching loads, courses, and curriculum will, for the most part, remain unchanged. At best, community college English faculty will follow in the footsteps of their writing colleagues in four-year colleges and universities with respect to writing pedagogy. That is, teaching writing as a process has taken hold in community colleges; although, many community colleges--despite many years of research that suggest otherwise--still teach grammar-based writing courses. Furthermore, any changes in writing pedagogy that eventually appear in community college writing classrooms will filter down from writing

scholars at four-year colleges and universities rather than from community college writing faculty. As my study reports, few community college writing faculty are involved in the writing profession through professional publication. Sadly this has historically been the case and it appears unlikely to change.

While teaching writing has become the main work of community college English faculty, the teaching of literature remain part--albeit a small part--of the community college English department. Although course offering in literature continue to decline in the community college, I am confident that they will not completely disappear. There will always be a small cadre of students interested in literature or English majors enrolling in such courses. The general survey courses of American and English literature will always have a place in the community college English department as they are the required transfer courses to the four-year college or university.

From the early 1970's, community college faculty development has emphasized improving teaching and student learning. With the community college's almost sole emphasis on teaching, this makes sense. The only problem has been that such a model of faculty development has led to what McGrath and Spear (1991) have called "generic teachers" (see Chapter 3). Instead, as I have proposed in this dissertation, faculty development should continue to emphasize improving teaching and student learning, but the model of faculty development should be based on classroom-based teacher research. As I have argued in several chapters in this dissertation, and as my own experiences support, classroom-based

teacher research offers community college writing teachers the chance to become reflective practitioners of their own teaching--to study their own practice. It offers the classroom teacher the opportunity to investigate his or her own teaching practices and his or her students' learning. Classroom-based teacher research offers a new theory of research that makes more sense for community college faculty than the applied research that is most often associated with the university. It provides one remedy to the routinization that accompanies teaching many of the same courses over and over again, year after year. That is, classroom-based teacher research makes the familiar strange and the strange familiar. Each course offers new possibilities for research.

I am not so naive, however, to believe that all community college English faculty will become active classroom researchers. I do believe, however, that community college English departments, students, and colleges will benefit if even a few faculty members at each community college become involved in classroom-based teacher research.

Conclusion

After teaching ten years at Kalamazoo Valley Community College, and with a Ph.D. degree soon to be in hand, I am now often asked by my students and colleagues if I plan to apply for teaching positions at four-year institutions. There seems to be an unspoken notion that once I have the Ph.D., I will "want to move on." I tell those who ask that I always plan to keep my options open (and I do regularly scan the Chronicle of Higher Education on-line job listings, mostly to verify how dismal the job market in English really is), and that--despite my rather pessimistic views

concerning the chance for positive change in the community college English culture--I am quite happy teaching at KVCC and plan to stay. I will continue to conduct classroom-based teacher research and I will continue to write and publish within the English profession. I will also continue to work to convince my colleagues that teacher-research and writing and (sometimes) publication is the way to go. Ultimately I'll stay at KVCC for the most important reason I can imagine--my students.

It may seem ironic to someone who reads this dissertation that it doesn't appear to be much about community college students. In fact, one respondent to my faculty questionnaire was quite upset at me for having so few questions in the questionnaire concerning students. And on one level it's true that this dissertation doesn't say much about community college students--I was interested in studying community college faculty. On another level, however, that's all this dissertation is about, students--all my students, but especially Doug, Billy, Darrin, Maria, Heather, Jemar, Tom, Darnell, and Kim.

APPENDICES

A STUDY OF ENGLISH EDUCATION IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Faculty Questionnaire

KEITH KROLL

COMMUNICATION ARTS DEPARTMENT
KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a study of English education in two-year colleges and would like your help. In order to make the study as comprehensive as possible, your input is needed by completing this faculty questionnaire. Please be candid in your responses. I can assure you that your responses will be held in strict confidence.

A major purpose of the study is to describe the current (full- and part-time) faculty who teach writing and literature courses and the English education programs at two-year colleges, so as to gain a better understanding of who we are and what we do. The final goal of the study is to provide a detailed history of our profession. Traditionally, two-year college English faculty and education have received little attention in the standard histories of the English profession.

The study is supported by Kalamazoo Valley Community College and endorsed and funded by the Council of North Central Two Year Colleges.

As a two-year college instructor myself, I realize the hectic schedule you face and the number of questionnaires that appear in faculty mailboxes. I greatly appreciate your taking time to complete the questionnaire, which takes about twenty minutes, and for contributing to a history of our profession. I have enclosed a postage-paid envelope in which to return the questionnaire.

Cordially,

Keith Kroll
Communication Arts Department

INSTRUCTIONS FOR

COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read each question carefully. Most questions require only one response. Others request that you circle all that apply. Some ask you to write a number, and a few questions ask for a short narrative response.

I. Formal Education

1. What is the highest academic degree you presently hold?

   1 Ph.D.
   2 Ed.D.
   3 D.A.
   4 Ed.S
   5 M.A./M.S.
   6 M.F.A.
   7 B.A. /B.S.
   8 Other (please specify) _____

2. Please specify the subject(s) in which you hold each degree. You may select more than one subject within each degree.

   a. Doctorate
      1 English
      2 Composition/Rhetoric
      3 Education
      4 Other (please specify) _____

   b. Master's
      1 English
      2 Composition/Rhetoric
      3 Education
      4 Other (please specify) _____

   c. Bachelors
      1 English
      2 Composition/Rhetoric
      3 Education
      4 Other (please specify) _____

3. How many semester hours of graduate credit have you earned in English? (Do not include credit earned for thesis or dissertation. Multiply quarter hours by 2/3 to get semester hours)

   1 None
   2 1-10
   3 11-20
   4 21-30
   5 31-40
   6 41-50
   7 51-60
   8 over 60

Please Turn Over

4. Subject Area — List No. of Graduate Courses completed

Composition	_____
Education	_____
Journalism	_____
Linguistics	_____
Literature	_____
Other	_____

5. During your graduate course work did you take a course on the history of the two-year college?

   1 Yes
   2 No

6. During your graduate course work did you take a course on teaching English in the two-year college

   1 Yes
   2 No

7. Please specify the <u>one</u> or <u>two</u> areas in which you feel graduate courses should be taken by individuals preparing to teach English in a two-year college.

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

8. What academic degree are you currently pursuing?

   1 Ph.D.
   2 Ed.D.
   3 D.A.
   4 M.A./M.S.
   5 None
   6 Other (please specify) _____

9. If you are presently pursuing an advanced degree, in what subject will it be granted?

   1 English
   2 Composition/Rhetoric
   3 Education
   4 Other (please specify) _____

10. If you are presently pursuing an advanced degree, in which academic year do you expect to graduate?

19___

II. ACADEMIC RANK, TENURE, and TEACHING EXPERIENCE

11. If your institution has a system of academic rank, what is your status?

1 No system of academic rank at my institution
2 Professor
3 Associate Professor
4 Assistant professor
5 Instructor
6 Other (Please specify) _____

12. What do you feel are the principal criteria used to determine promotion in rank at your institution?

Ratings: 1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Somewhat unimportant
4. Very unimportant

(Circle as many as apply, but make only one rating for each item.)

☐ Not applicable since rank is not given at my institution

Publications	1	2	3	4
Length of service	1	2	3	4
Teaching ability	1	2	3	4
Additional graduate work	1	2	3	4
Committee work	1	2	3	4
Community Service	1	2	3	4

Other (please specify) _____

13. How many years of teaching are required before you may be granted tenure?

1 Tenure is not granted at my institution
2 One year
3 Two years
4 Three years
5 Four years
6 Five years
7 Six years
8 Seven years
9 Eight years or more

Please Turn Over

14. Do you have tenure?

    1 Yes

    2 No

15. Indicate the category of work activity in which you were engaged immediately before your present position.

    1 Graduate student no teaching assistantship
    2 Graduate student with teaching assistantship
    3 Elementary school teaching
    4 High school teaching
    5 Full-time two-year college teaching
    6 Part-time two-year college teaching
    7 Part-time or full-time four-year college/university teaching
    8 Other (please specify) _____

16. From what source did you first learn about the teaching position you now hold? (Please make only one selection.)

    1 University or college placement center
    2 Professor(s) in graduate school
    3 Advertisement in *Chronicle of Higher Education*
    4 Student(s) in graduate school
    5 Letter of inquiry to selectedinstitution(s)
    6 Professional organization placement service
    7 Advertisement in local newspaper
    8 Other (please specify) _____

17. For how many academic years have you been employed in your present position?

    1 This is my first year
    2 one to three years
    3 four to six years
    4 seven to nine years
    5 ten to eleven years
    6 twelve to fourteen years
    7 fifteen to nineteen years
    8 twenty or more years (please specify) _____

18. How many years do you anticipate remaining in your present position?

    _____ year(s)

Only Faculty teaching part-time should answer question # 19.

19. Would you be willing to move to a state different than the one in which you currently teach in order to gain a tenure-track position?

    1 Yes
    2 No (If no, please indicate why) _____

20. During your graduate education did you ever complete a teaching internship at a two-year college?

    1 Yes
    2 No

21. Have you ever taught in any of the following institutions?

Type of Institution	Yes	No
Elementary School	1	2
High School	1	2
Two-year College	1	2
Four-year college/university	1	2
Other (Please specify) _____		

22. Are you currently teaching part time at a two-year college? If yes, please answer question 23.

    1 Yes
    2 No

23. How many years have you taught part time at a two-year college?

    _____ Years

Please Turn Over

III. PRESENT TEACHING POSITION

24. How many instructional hours, on the average, do you teach each semester? (Convert quarter hours to semester hours by multiplying by 2/3) Circle a number below.

_____ Hours teaching

25. How many instructional **hours** do you usually teach each semester in each of the following areas?

_____ Developmental/Remedial Writing
_____ African-American literature
_____ Writing (College-level)
_____ Creative Writing
_____ English as a Second Language
_____ Genre courses
_____ Introduction to literature
_____ Journalism
_____ Linguistics
_____ Literature (American)
_____ Literature (English)
_____ Non-western literature
_____ Speech
_____ Women's literature
_____ Specific courses in response to community request (e.g. "Great Books")
_____ Other English courses (please specify)

_____

26. How many English course **preparations** do you usually have per semester or quarter?

_____ Number of preparations

27. How many students are enrolled in all of the English classes you are currently teaching?

1	fewer than 50	4	101-125
2	51 - 75	5	126-150
3	76-100	6	over 150

28. How many students are currently enrolled in all of your writing courses?

1 fewer than 51
2 51-75
3 76-100
4 101-125
5 126-150
6 Over 150
7 Not applicable

29. What is the average size of your **developmental** or **remedial** writing classes?

1 Do not teach developmental or remedial writing
2 fewer than 16
3 16-20
4 21-25
5 26-30
6 31-35
7 over 35

30. What is the average size of your first **college-level** writing classes?

1 Do not teach college-level writing
2 fewer than 16
3 16-20
4 21-25
5 26-30
6 31-35
7 over 35

31. Do your teaching responsibilities lie primarily in composition or literature?

1 Very heavy in writing
2 In both, leaning toward writing
3 Equally in both
4 In both, leaning toward literature
5 Very heavy in literature

Please Turn Over

32. If you teach on a part-time basis, in what other occupation are you engaged?

1 Not employed elsewhere
2 Teach in elem. school (K-6)
3 Teach in proprietary school
4 Teach in high school (7-12)
5 Teach at another two-year institution
6 Teach in four-year college/univ.
7 Other (please specify) _____

33. How much time do you spend, on average, in the following activities? (Two-year college position only.)

Activity	Hours per week
Preparing for class	_____
Class presentations	_____
Grading	_____
Office hours	_____
Faculty meetings	_____
Administrative duties	_____
Reading professional publications	_____
Conducting research	_____
Professional writing	_____
Clerical duties	_____
Community service	_____

IV. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

34. Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or scholarship?

1 Very heavy in scholarship
2 In both, leaning toward scholarship
3 Equally in both
4 In both, but leaning toward teaching
5 Very heavy in teaching

35. Please circle the following journals to which you currently subscribe

1 *ABC Bulletin*
2 *ADE Bulletin*
3 *College Composition and Communication*
4 *College English*
5 *Community College Humanities Review*
6 *Community College Review*
7 *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*
8 *Community College Week*
9 *English Journal*
10 *Journal of Advanced Composition*
11 *Journal of Basic Writing*
12 *Journal of Business Communication*
13 *Journal of Popular Culture*
14 *Language Arts*
15 *PMLA*
16 *Poets and Writers*
17 *Quarterly Journal of Speech*
18 *Research in the Teaching of English*
19 *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*
20 Other (please specify) _____

36. Please circle the following journals that you read.

1 *ABC Bulletin*
2 *ADE Bulletin*
3 *College Composition and Communication*
4 *College English*
5 *Community College Humanities Review*
6 *Community College Review*
7 *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*
8 *Community College Week*
9 *English Journal*
10 *Journal of Advanced Composition*
11 *Journal of Basic Writing*

Please Turn Over

12 *Journal of Business Communication*
13 *Journal of Popular Culture*
14 *Language Arts*
15 *PMLA*
16 *Poets and Writers*
17 *Quarterly Journal of Speech*
18 *Research in the Teaching of English*
19 *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*
20 Other (please specify) _____

---

37. Please circle each of the following professional organizations to which you belong.

1 American Association of University Professors
2 American Association of University Women
3 American Federation of Teachers
4 Association of Business Communication
5 College English Association
6 Community College Humanities Association
7 Conference on College Composition and Communication
8 International Reading Association of America
9 Modern Language Association of America
10 Modern Language Association--Regional
11 National Council of Teachers of English
12 National Council of Teachers of English--Regional two-year conference
13 National Council of Teachers of English--state group
14 National Education Association
15 National Scholars Association
16 Popular Culture Association
17 Society of Technical Communicators
18 Speech Association of state or region
19 State two-year college association
20 Teachers for a Democratic Culture
21 Other (please specify.)

---

38. During the past three years, how many of the following professional meetings did you attend?

Meetings	Number Attended
a. International	_____
b. National	_____
c. Regional	_____
d. State	_____
e. Local	_____

39. During the past three years, at how many of the following professional meetings did you make a presentation? (i.e. read a paper, conducted a workshop, etc.)

Meetings	Number Attended
a. International	_____
b. National	_____
c. Regional	_____
d. State	_____
e. Local	_____

40. How important is it to you to attend such meetings?

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Fairly unimportant
4. Very unimportant
5. No opinion

a. International meetings	1	2	3	4	5
b. National meetings	1	2	3	4	5
c. Regional meetings	1	2	3	4	5
d. State meetings	1	2	3	4	5
e. Local meetings	1	2	3	4	5

41. How important is it to you to present at such meetings?

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Fairly unimportant
4. Very unimportant
5. No opinion

a. International meetings	1	2	3	4	5
b. National meetings	1	2	3	4	5
c. Regional meetings	1	2	3	4	5
d. State meetings	1	2	3	4	5
e. Local meetings	1	2	3	4	5

Please Turn Over

42. What is the attitude of your administration toward your attending such meetings?

1 Approves
2 Is indifferent
3 Disapproves
4 I do not know

a. International meetings	1 2 3 4
b. National meetings	1 2 3 4
c. Regional meetings	1 2 3 4
d. State meetings	1 2 3 4
e. Local meetings	1 2 3 4

PUBLICATION

43. Are you currently engaged in any scholarly work that you expect to lead to publication?

1 Yes
2 No

44. Approximately how many articles have you ever published in

a. academic or professional journals _____ articles

b. popular journals or newspapers _____ articles

c. edited collections or volumes _____ articles

45. Approximately how many books or monographs have you ever published or edited, alone or in collaboration?

_____ book(s) or monograph(s)

46. Approximately how many of your professional articles (excluding fiction or poetry) have been published in the PAST THREE YEARS

_____ professional articles

47. Approximately how many works of fiction and/or poetry have you ever published?

_____ works of fiction and/or poetry

48. Approximately how many textbooks have you ever published?

_____ books or monographs

49. Approximately how many hours do you spend per week on activities that may lead toward publication?

_____ hours

50. How important is it to you to publish your writing?

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Fairly unimportant
4. Very unimportant
5. No opinion

a.	Professional articles	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Books	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Fiction and/or poetry	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Textbooks	1	2	3	4	5

51. What is the attitude of your administration toward publication of your writing?

1 Approves
2 Disapproves
3 Is Indifferent
4 I do not know

52. Does your administration reward publication?

1 Yes
2 No

If yes, please explain briefly how it rewards publication

_____

_____

_____

Please Turn Over

V. CURRICULUM

53. Many goals have been proposed for a two-year college education. Please indicate the importance of each of the following goals.

1 = Very important
2 = Fairly important
3 = Fairly unimportant
4 = Very unimportant
5 = No opinion

a. Provide an appreciation of literature and the arts	1	2	3	4	5
b. Provide students with competence in writing and reading	1	2	3	4	5
c. Shape students' values	1	2	3	4	5
d. Enhance creative thinking	1	2	3	4	5
e. Prepare students for a career	1	2	3	4	5
f. Provide knowledge of one subject in depth	1	2	3	4	5

54. How would you evaluate the curriculum requirements <u>at your institution?</u>

1 = Too little
2 = About right
3 = Too many
4 = No opinion

a. General education requirements	1	2	3	4	5
b. Requirements for a preprofessional program	1	2	3	4	5
c. Required writing courses	1	2	3	4	5
d. Required literature courses	1	2	3	4	5

55. Please specify the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

1 = Strongly agree
2 = Agree with reservations
3 = Neutral
4 = Disagree with reservations
5 = Strongly disagree

a. I prefer to teach courses <u>that focus on limited specialities</u> to those that cover wide varities of material	1	2	3	4	5
b. In my courses I prefer teaching students who have a clear idea of the career they will be following.	1	2	3	4	5

c.	Two-year college education in America would be improved if there was less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The typical two-year college curriculum has suffered from the specialization of faculty members	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Students at my institution are not getting as good an education today as they did five years ago	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Outcome assessment of two-year college students using multiple-choice instruments will increase the quality of a two-year college education	1	2	3	4	5
g.	State mandated assessment requirements threaten the quality of two-year college education	1	2	3	4	5
h.	State mandated assessment requirements intrude on institutional autonomy.	1	2	3	4	5

56. Please specify the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

1 = Strongly agree
2 = Agree with reservations
3 = Neutral
4 = Disagree with reservations
5 = Strongly disagree

a.	I enjoy interacting informally with students outside the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Most students expect too much attention	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Students should seek out faculty only during posted office hours	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Most students at my institution only do enough to just "get by"	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Grade inflation is a problem at my institution	1	2	3	4	5
f.	A "tough" grading system contributes positively to student motivation	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Two-year college education would be improved if grades were abolished	1	2	3	4	5
h.	I find myself not grading as "hard" as I should	1	2	3	4	5
i.	The students with whom I have close contact are seriously underprepared in basic skills--such as those required for written and oral communication	1	2	3	4	5
j.	There has been an overall decline in the quality of my students during the past decade	1	2	3	4	5

Please Turn Over

VI. TEACHING PRACTICES
(First college-level writing course)

The following questions concern various teaching practices used in the teaching of the first college-level writing course required in your department.

57. Do you teach a freshman college-level writing course?

1 Yes
2 No

If No, please skip to question number 72.

58. Which statement below best characterizes the focus of your first college-level writing course?

1 The course emphasizes the writing of essays.
2 The course emphasizes the writing of paragraphs.
3 The course emphasizes the learning of correct grammar and mechanics
4 Equal emphasis on all three
5 Other (Please specify) _____

59. Do you encourage students to write multiple drafts of essays?

1 Yes
2 No

60. Do you grade individual drafts of a student essay or do you delay grading until a final draft?

1 Grade individual drafts of an essay
2 Delay grading until "final" draft of an essay

61. How often do you use a portfolio method for grading student essays? That is, grading of essays is delayed until the end of course.

1 Always
2 Occasionally
3 Seldom
4 Never

62. How often do you use peer review/writing workshops in your class?

1 Always
2 Occasionally
3 Seldom
4 Never

63. How often do you hold required writing conferences with individual students concerning a draft in progress?

1 Always
2 Occasionally
3 Seldom
4 Never
5 Hold writing conferences but not required

64. What type of essays do students typcially write in your first college-level writing courses? (Circle all that apply.)

1 Personal narrative
2 Exposition
3 Argumentation
4 Literary analysis
5 Other (please specify) _____

_____

65. Who selects topics for student essays?

1 I assign all essay topics
2 Students select all essay topics
3 Both, I assign some topics and students select some topics

66. How many pages (250 words/page) of writing, on average, do you assign per week in your first college-level writing course?

_____ page(s)/week

67. How much time do you spend during the semester in your first college-level writing course teaching grammar and mechanics

1 None
2 1-5%
3 6-10%
4 11-15%
5 16-20%
6 More than 20% of the time

68. What two or three composition theorists have most influenced your methods for teaching writing?

(1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____

Please Turn Over

69. How does your department place students in the first college-level writing course? (Circle all that apply.)

1 National Standardized Test
2 State Standardized Test
3 Department created Test
4 Writing Sample
5 Grade in Developmental/Reading/Writing course(s)
6 No placement test used

70. Which of the following statements best describes the textbook used in your first college-level writing course?

1 It places more emphasis on grammar and mechanics exercises than writing paragraphs or essays
2 It places more emphasis on writing essays than grammar and mechanics
3 It places more emphasis on writing paragraphs than essays
4 Equally on both
5 Other (please specify) _____

71. What is/are the title(s) of the textbook(s) that you currently use in your first college-level writing course?

_____

VII. TEACHING PRACTICES
(Developmental/Remedial Writing Course)

The following questions concern various teaching practices used in the teaching of a developmental/remedial writing course required or recommended prior to a student enrolling in a first college-level writing course.

72. Do you teach a developmental/remedial writing course?

1 Yes
2 No

If No, please skip to question number 86.

73. Do you encourage students to write multiple drafts of essays?

1 Yes
2 No

74. Which statement below best characterizes the focus of your developmental/remedial writing courses?

1 The course emphasizes the writing of essays.
2 The course emphasizes the writing of paragraphs.
3 The course emphasizes the learning of correct grammar and mechanics
4 Equal emphasis on all three
5 Other (Please specify) _____

75. Do you grade individual drafts of a student essay or do you delay grading until a final draft?

1 Grade individual drafts of an essay
2 Delay grading until "final" draft of an essay

76. How often do you use a portfolio method for grading student essays? That is, grading of essays is delayed until end of course.

1 Always
2 Occasionally
3 Seldom
4 Never

77. How often do you use peer review/writing workshops in your class?

1 Always
2 Occasionally
3 Seldom
4 Never

78. How often do you hold required writing conferences with individual students concerning a draft in progress?

1 Always
2 Occassionally
3 Seldom
4 Never
5 Hold writing conferences but not required

79. What type of essays do students typcially write in your developmental/remedial writing course? (Circle all that apply.)

1 Personal narrative
2 Exposition
3 Argumentation
4 Literary analysis
5 Students do not write essays in this course
6 Other (please specify) _____

Please Turn Over

80. Who selects topics for student essays?

1 I assign all essay topics
2 Students select all essay topics
3 Both, I assign some topics and students select some topics

81. How many pages (250 words/page) of writing, on average, do you assign per week in your developmental/remedial writing course?

_____ page(s)/week

82. How much time do you spend during the semester in your developmental/remedial writing course teaching grammar and mechanics

1 None
2 1-5%
3 6-10%
4 11-15%
5 16-20%
6 More than 20% of the time

83. How does your department place students in the developmental/ remedial writing course? (Circle all that apply.)

1 National Standardized Test
2 State Standardized Test
3 Department created Test
4 Writing Sample
5 Grade in Developmental/Reading/Writing course(s)
6 No placement test used

84. Which of the following statements best describes the textbook used in your developmental/remedial writing course?

1 It places more emphasis on grammar and mechanics exercises than writing paragraphs or essays
2 It places more emphasis on writing paragraphs than on writing essays
3 It places more emphasis on writing essays than grammar and mechanics
4 Equal emphasis on all three
5 Other (please specify) _____

85. What is/are the title(s) of the textbook(s) that you currently use in your developmental/remedial writing course?

_____

VIII. INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

86. Please indicate the degree to which each of the following is important to you .

1 = Very important to me
2 = Fairly important to me
3 = Fairly unimportant to me
4 = Not at all important

a.	My academic discipline	1	2	3	4
b.	My department	1	2	3	4
c.	My college	1	2	3	4
d.	My relationship with students	1	2	3	4
e.	My relationship with colleagues at my college	1	2	3	4
f.	My relationship with colleagues at other colleges	1	2	3	4

87. How much opporunity to you have to influence the policies of: (a) your department (b) your institution?

1 = A great deal
2 = Quite a bit
3 = Some
4 = None

a.	Department	1	2	3	4
b.	Institution	1	2	3	4

88. How would you rate each of the following?

1 = Excellent
2 = Good
3 = Fair
4 = Poor
5 = Not applicable

a.	Your own salary	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Your own teaching load	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The academic reputation of your institution	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The intellectual environment at your institution	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Faculty salary levels at your institution	1	2	3	4	5
f.	The administration at your institution	1	2	3	4	5
g.	The quality of life at your institution	1	2	3	4	5
h.	The sense of community at your institution	1	2	3	4	5

Please Turn Over

APPENDIX B: APPROVAL FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH
AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1046

March 30, 1993

TO: Keith Kroll
1811 Apple St.
Portage, MI 49002

RE: **IRB #:** 93-085
TITLE: A STUDY OF ENGLISH IN THE COUNCIL OF NORTH CENTRAL TWO-YEAR COLLEGES
CATEGORY: 1-C
REVISION REQUESTED: N/A
APPROVAL DATE: March 29, 1993

The University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects' (UCRIHS) review of this project is complete. I am pleased to advise that the rights and welfare of the human subjects appear to be adequately protected and methods to obtain informed consent are appropriate. Therefore, the UCRIHS approved this project including any revision listed above.

UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year, beginning with the approval date shown above. Investigators planning to continue a project beyond one year must seek updated certification. Request for renewed approval must be accompanied by all four of the following mandatory assurances.

1. The human subjects protocol is the same as in previous studies.
2. There have been no ill effects suffered by the subjects due to their participation in the study.
3. There have been no complaints by the subjects or their representatives related to their participation in the study.
4. There has not been a change in the research environment nor new information which would indicate greater risk to human subjects than that assumed when the protocol was initially reviewed and approved.

There is a maximum of four such expedited renewals possible. Investigators wishing to continue a project beyond that time need to submit it again for complete review.

UCRIHS must review any changes in procedures involving human subjects, prior to initiation of the change. Investigators must notify UCRIHS promptly of any problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects during the course of the work.

If we can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to contact us at (517) 355-2180 or FAX (517) 336-1171.

Sincerely,

David E. Wright, Ph.D.
UCRIHS Chair

DEW:pjm

cc: Diane Brunner

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

AACJC Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Adleman, C. (1992). The Way We Are: The Community College as American Thermometer. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Alfred, R.L., and Linder, V.P. (1990). Rhetoric to Reality: Effectiveness in Community Colleges. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Community College Consortium.

Allen, H. L. (1994). "Workload and Productivity In An Accountability Era." The NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: NEA Publishing, 25-38.

Angelo, F., and Pickett, N.A. (1988). "Teachers of Technical Communication in Two-Year Colleges: Who, Why, When, and with What Results." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 15: 126-34.

Apple, M. W. (1990). Ideology and Curriculum. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Archer, J. W., & Ferrell, W.A. (Eds.). (1965). Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College: Proceedings of the Tempe Conference 1965. Champaign, IL.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal, and Radical Debate Over Schooling. (1985). South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Dey, E. L. (1991). The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1989-90 HERI Faculty Survey. Los Angeles: University of California, Higher Education Research Institute.

Banach, W. J. (Ed.). (1992). "Critical Issues Facing America's Community Colleges." Warren, MI: Strategic Alternative Series.

Benjet, R. G., and Loweth, M. (1989). "A Perspective on the Academic Underclass, the Part-Timers." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 16: 40-41.

Barton, T. L., & Beachner, A.M. (1970). Teaching English in the Two-year College. Menlo Park, CA.: Cummings Publishing Company.

Berlin, J.A. "The Teacher as Researcher: Democracy, Dialogue, and Power." In D.A. Daiker and M. Morenberg (Eds.). (1990.). The Writing Teacher as Researcher: Essays in the Theory and Practice of Class-Based Research. Portsmouth, N.H.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Berlin, J. A. (1987). Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985. Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Berliner, D.C. "Tempus Educare." (1979). In P.L. Peterson and H.J. Walberg (Eds.). Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Berthoff, A.E. (1988). The Making of Meaning: Metaphors, Models, and Maxims for Writing Teachers. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Bissex, G.L., and Bullock, R.H. (Eds.). (1987). Seeing for Ourselves: Case-Study Research by Teachers of Writing. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Bossone, R. M. (1964). The Training and Wwork of California Public Junior College English Teachers. Riverside, CA.: Office of Riverside County Superintendent of Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 011 189)

Boyer, E. L. (1989). The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989. Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brawer, F. B. (1990). "ERIC Review: Faculty Development: The Literature." Community College Review, 18, 50-56.

Brawer, F. B. (1975). The Humanities in Two-Year Colleges: The Faculty in Review. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior

Colleges, Center for the Study of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 111 469)

Calkins, L.M. "Forming Research Communities Among Naturalistic Researchers." (1985). In B. W. McClelland and T.R. Donovan (Eds.). Perspectives on Research and Scholarship in Composition. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1985). National Survey of Faculty, 1984. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Chapman, D. W. (1987). "Conflict and Consensus: How Composition Scholars View Their Discipline." Profession 87. New York: MLA, 43-45.

Clark, B. L. (1987). The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation.

Coan, O.W. (1932). "English in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, 3, 94-96.

Cohen, A.M. (1995). "Projecting the Future of Community Colleges." ERIC Digests (January 1996): n. pag. Online. World Wide Web. 10 Jan. 1996.

Cohen, A. M. (1973). "Toward a Professional Faculty." In New Directions For Community Colleges. No. 1 (Spring). Toward a Professional Faculty. Ed. Arthur M. Cohen. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 101-17.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F.B. (1989). The American Community College. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F.B. (1977). The Two Year College Instructor Today. New York: Praeger.

Cohen, A. M., & Ignash, J. M. (1992). "Trends in the Liberal Arts Curriculum." Community College Review, 20, 50-56.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). Building Ccommunities: A Vision for a New Century. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Conley, William H. (1938). "The Junior College Instructor." Junior College Journal, 9, 507-12.

Cook, A.R. (1933). "English in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, 3, 313-18.

Cowan, G. 1971). "Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs. College Composition and Communication, 22, 303-13

Cross, K. P. (1990). "Celebrating Excellence in the Classroom." Paper presented at the International Conference on Teaching Excellence, Austin, Texas, May 20-23. (ED 320 625)

Cross, K. P., and Angelo, T.A. (1988). Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty. Ann Arbor, Mich.: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Cross, K.P., and Angelo, T.A. (1989). "Faculty Members as Classroom Researchers." Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 59 (5), 23-25.

Curzon-Brown, D. (1988). "The Gripes of Wrath." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 15, 195-98.

Daiker, D.A., and Morenberg, M. (Eds.). (1990). The Writing Teacher as Researcher: Essays in the Theory and Practice of Class-Based Research. Portsmouth, N.H.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Davis, J. R. (1992). "Voices of Authority." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 19 , 113-22.

Deegan, W.L. et al. (1985). Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Efective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diel, G. (1942). "A Portrait of The 'Typical' Instructor of English in The Junior College." College English, 4, 46-49.

Directory. (1992). Two-Year colleges. PMLA, 107, 967-978.

Dougherty, K. J. (1994). The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College. Albany: SUNY Press.

Eells, W. C. (1931). The Junior College. Boston: Houghton.

Elbow, P. (1999). What is English? New York: Modern Language Association.

El-Khawas, E., Carter, D. J., & Ottinger, C. A. (1988). Community College Fact Book. New York: Macmillan.

Erickson, F. "What Makes School Ethnography 'Ethnographic.'" (1984). Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 15, 51-66.

Fleckenstein, K. S. (1991). "Inner Sight: Imagery and Emotion in Writing Engagement." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 18, 210-15.

Florio, S., and Walsh, M. "The Teacher as Colleague in Classroom Research." (1981). In H. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie, and K.H. Au (Eds.). Culture and the Bilingual Classroom, New York: Newbury House.

Freire, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. (1989). Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Frye, J.H. (1992). The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940. New YorK: Greenwood Press.

Gage, N.L. (1978). The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gaj, P. (1969). "The Preparation of Junior College English Instructors." New York: The ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English in Higher Education. (ED 033 153)

Gappa, J. M. (1984). Part-Time Faculty: Higher Education at a Crossroads. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Goetz, J., and LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research. San Diego: Academic Press.

Gosch, M. (1939). "English Literature in Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 8, 194-99.

Goswami, D., and Stillman, P.R. (Eds.). (1987). Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Gray, D. (1982). "Another Year with College English." College English, 44, 385-89.

Green, R. H., & Hellstrom, W. (1975). "Graduate Preparation in the Humanities for Community College Teachers." In Graduate Education and Community Colleges: Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development. Technical Report No. 5. Ed. S.V. Martorana et al. Washington, D.C.: National Board on Graduate Education, 96-104. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 111 479)

Haight, R. (1995). "Glencoe 17." Paper presented at College Conference on Composition and Communication Convention. Washington, D.C., 23 March.

Hairston, M. (1985). "Breaking Our Bonds and Reaffirming Our Connections." College Composition and Communication, 36, 272-82.

Himes, C. (1931). "Composition in Chicago Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 2, 86-89.

Jacobson, R. L. (1991). "Academic Leaders Predict Major Chnages for Higher Education in Recession's Wake." Chronicle of Higher Education 20 November, A1, A35-A36.

Jones, D.M. "'Applied Expertise': A Redefinition of Research in Community Colleges." (1982). Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 52, (1), 40-42.

Joyal, A.E. (1932). "Problems of Class Size and Teaching Load." Junior College Journal, 2, 444-54.

Kantor, K. "Learning from Teachers." (1990). In D.A. Daiker and M. Morenberg (Eds.). The Writing Teacher as Researcher: Essays in the Theory and Practice of Class-Based Research. Portsmouth, N.H.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Keim, M. C. (1989). "Two-Year College Faculty: A Research Update. Community College Review, 17, 35-43.

Kent, T. H. (1971). A Study of the English Instructors in the Junior and Community Colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 200A-201A. (University Microfilms No. 71-17, 882)

Kitzhaber, A. R. (1964). The Two-Year College and the Teaching of English. A Report of the Incoming President of the National Council of Teachers of English to the Executive Committee, November 1963. Champaign, IL.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Knodt, E. A. (1988). "Taming Hydra: The Problem of Balancing Teaching and Scholarship at Two-Year Colleges." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 15, 170-174.

Koeppel, M. S. (1989). "Credibility of TETYC." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 16, 188.

Koos, L. V. (1924). The Junior College. (2 vols.) Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press.

Kort, M. S. (1991). "Classroom Research and Composition Classes. " Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 18, 98-102.

Kroll, K. (1990). "Building Communities: Joining the Community of Professional Writing Teachers." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 17, 103-108.

Laser, M. (1954). "English Composition in Public Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 25, 130-41.

Laser, M. (1955). "Teaching Load and Class Size in English Composition." Junior College Journal, 25, 253-60.

London, H.B. (1978). The Culture of a Community College. New York: Praeger.

London, H. B. (1980). "In Between: The Community College Teacher." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 448, (March), 62-73.

McConnel, F. R. (1993). "Freeway Flyers: The Migrant Workers of the Academy." Writing Ourselves into the Story: Unheard Voices from Composition Studies. Ed. Sherl I. Fontaine and Susan Hunter. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 40-58.

McGrath, D., & Spear, M.B. (1991). The Academic Crisis of the Community College. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

McGrath, D., & Spear, M.B. (1988). "A Professoriate Is In Trouble." Change (January/February), 26, 53.

McGrath, D., Spear, M.B., & Seymour, E. (1992). "The New Problem of Staff Development." In New Directions For Community Colleges, No. 79 (Fall). Maintaining Faculty Excellence. Ed. Keith Kroll. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McPherson, E. (1990). "Where Were We, Where Are We as Community College English Teachers?" Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 17, 92-99.

Mahoney, J., & Jimenez, E. (Eds.). (1992). Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges Statistical Yearbook (1992 ed.). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Miller, J.L. (1990). Creating Spaces and Finding Voices: Teachers Collaborating for Empowerment. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Miller, Susan. (1991). Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition. Carbondale: SIU Press.

Mohr, M.M., and MacLean, M.S. (1987). Working Together: A Guide for Teacher-Researchers. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Myers, M. (1985). The Teacher-Researcher: How to Study Writing in the Classroom. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and National Council of Teachers of English.

National Center For Education Statistics. (1990). Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988. Contractor Report. Data Series DR-NSOPF-87/88-1.27. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center For Education Statistics. (1995). "Fall Enrollment Surveys, 1993." Education Statistics on Disk. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

"News." (1993.) Forum: Newsletter of the Part-Time Faculty Forum, Conference on Composition and Communication 4.2, 4.

North, S. M. (1987). The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field. Upper Montclair: Boynton.

Odell, L. (1975). "The Classroom Teacher as Researcher." English Journal, 65 (1), 106-111.

Odell, L. (1986). "Diversity and Change: Toward a Maturing Discipline." College Composition and Communication, 37, 395-401.

Odell, L. (1987). "Planning Classroom Research." In D. Goswami and P.R. Stillman (Eds.). Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Palmer, J. C., & Vaughan, G. B. (1992). Fostering a Climate for Faculty Scholarship at Community Colleges. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Parilla, R.E. (1986). "Gladly Would They Learn and Gladly Teach." Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occasional Paper, 4 (1), 6 pp.

Radner, S. (1958). "A Three-Track Community College English Program." Junior College Journal, 29, 97-100.

Raines, H. (1990). "Is There a Writing Program in This College?" College Composition and Communication, 41, 151-165.

Ransom, E. (1938). "The Evolution of a Course in Freshman English." Junior College Journal, 8, 245-49.

Raymond, J. C. (1987). "College English: Whence and Whither." College English, 49, 553-57.

Reither, J. A., & Vipond, D. (1989). "Writing as Collaboration." College English, 51, 855-67.

Reynolds, M. (1991). Writing for Professional Publication. Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 19, 290-196.

Richardson, O.D. (1931). "English for Semi-professional Students." Junior College Journal, 1, 30-35.

Richardson, R. C., Fisk, E.C., & Okun, M.A.. (1983). Literacy in the Open-Access College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seidman, E. (1985). In the Words of the Faculty: Perspectives on Improving Teaching and Educational Quality in the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seppanen, L. (1991). "Washington Community College Faculty Development Survey Results: A Summary of the Results of Survey of all Full-time Faculty. Operations Report No. 90-3. Olympia, WA: Washington State Board for Community College Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 325 171)

Shor, I. (1987). Critical Teaching and Everyday Life. 1980. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.

Shugrue, M. F. (1970). The National Study of English in the Junior College. Washington, DC: American Association on Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 037 480)

Shulman, L.S. (1986). "Paradigms and Research Programs in the Study of Teaching: A Contemporary Perspective." In M. E. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Simonds, P.M. (1980). "Scholarship and the Community College." The Community College Humanist, 2 (3), 2.

Sledge, L.C. (1987). "The Community College Scholar." Community College Humanities Review, 8, 61-66.

Smith, P. (1991). Higher Education in America: Killing the Spirit. 1990. New York: Penguin.

Sparrow, W., & Fearing, B. E. (1980). "New Kid on the Block: Graduate Programs for Two-Year College English Teachers." CEA Forum, 11, 7-12.

Speer, T. (1992). "Part-Time Instructor: Strategies to Survive/ Thrive in the 90s." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 19, 266-73.

Spindler, G. (Ed.). (1988). Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Stewart, D. (1987). Foreword. In Berlin, J. A. Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985. Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press, viiii-xi.

Stone, H. M. (1939). "English Courses for the Terminal Student." Junior College Journal, 8, 85-88.

Sydow, D. (1993, April). Professional Development Issues for Community College English Faculty. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 357 364)

Tinberg, H. (1990). "A Model of Theory-Making for Writing Teachers: Local Knowledge." Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 17 (1), 18-23.

Thompson, K. (1992). "Pittance for Piecework: Workload and Compensation Issues for Part-time Faculty." Forum: Newsletter of the Part-Time Faculty Forum, Conference on College Composition and Communication, 4.1, 1-4.

United States. Dept. of Commerce. (1993). Statistical Abstract of the United States 1993. 113th ed. Washington: GPO

United States. National Center for Education Statistics. (1990) Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988. Contractor Report. Data Series DR-NSOPF-87/88-1.27. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Vanderkelen, B. (1994). "Stability and Change in the Liberal Arts Curriculum." New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 86. Ed. Arthur M. Cohen. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 31-41.

Vaughan, G.B. (1986). "In Pursuit of Scholarship." Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 56 (4), 12-16.

Vaughan, G. (1988). "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." Educational Record, 69 (2), 26-31.

Vaughan, G. B., & Palmer, J. C. (1991). Enhancing Teaching and Administration Through Scholarship. New Directions for Community Colleges, 76. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weingarten, S., & Kroeger, F. P. (Eds.). (1965). English in the Two-Year College: A Report of a Joint Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Champaign, IL.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Weis, L. (1985.). Between Two Worlds: Black Students in an Urban Community College. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wilcox, K. (1988). "Ethnography as a Methodology and Its Applications to the Study of Schooling: A Review." In G. Spindler (Ed.). Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Winetrout, K. (1947). "What's in a Name? Communications or English?" Junior College Journal 18, 34-36.

Witt, A. A., et al. (1994). America's Community Colleges: The First Century. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.

Worthen, H. (1992). "Some Progress, Lots of Struggle: A Profile of Part-time Teaching in the California Community Colleges in the Last 25 Years." Forum: Newsletter of the Part-Time Faculty Forum, Conference on College Composition and Communication, 4.1, 5-7.