

ORGANIZATIONAL RHETORIC IN THE ACADEMY:
JUNIOR FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AND ROLES

Cynthia K. Gordon

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2008

APPROVED:

Karen Anderson, Co-Major Professor
Shaun Treat, Co-Major Professor
John Allison, Committee Member and Chair of
the Department of Communication
Studies
Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B.
Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Gordon, Cynthia K. *Organizational Rhetoric in the Academy: Junior Faculty Perceptions and Roles*. Master of Arts (Communication Studies), December 2008, 90 pp., reference list, 48 titles.

The purpose of this project was to examine the perceptions of junior faculty members as they relate to roles and expectations related to the tenure process. The study utilized a mixed methods approach to gain a multifaceted perspective of this complex process. I employed a quantitative and qualitative survey to explore junior faculty perceptions regarding roles related to promotion and tenure policies. In addition, I conducted fantasy theme analysis (FTA) to explore the organizational rhetoric related to these policies. Findings from the study illustrate the continued presence of the “publish or perish” paradigm, as well as issues related to role conflict within the context of organizational rhetoric.

Copyright 2008
by
Cynthia K. Gordon

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge those without whom I could not have completed this project. To my husband, Jim Gordon – thank you for your constant emotional support, as well as your willingness to eat cereal for dinner. Thank you to Dr. Karen Anderson for your assistance, perseverance, and willingness to listen to me think out-loud. Thank you to Dr. Shaun Treat for your quick mind and helpful persona. Thank you to Dr. Jay Allison for believing in me even when I did not. The journey to this point would not have been possible without my close friends who have held me up and pushed me forward – Stacey, Stacey L., Dr. Jen, Lori, Greta, Melynda, and Maryann – I will be forever grateful. Without my grad school friends, (you know who you are!) I would not have had anywhere near the enlightened experience that I had - thank you for accepting me and teaching me along the way. You have enriched my life in ways you cannot imagine.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
Chapters	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
The History of the University	9
Roles and Tenure.....	13
Organizational Rhetoric.....	19
Mixed Method Rationale	22
3. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODS	25
Participants	26
Procedures.....	27
Results	28
4. FANTASY THEME ANALYSIS	41
Artifact Justification	41
Method	43
Analysis.....	46
5. DISCUSSION	57
Key Findings	57
General Discussion	59
Limitations and Implications for Further Inquiry.....	66
Conclusion	69
APPENDICES	70
REFERENCES.....	87

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In April 2006, the University of North Texas (UNT) unveiled a new mission and vision statement (Batille, 2007). The new mission for the University included the phrase, “The University of North Texas is a recognized student-centered public research university” that quickly became part of the University vernacular and was shortened to “a student-centered, research-focused organization” (Batille). After implementation of the new mission and vision statements, UNT hosted teams of academic professionals to participate in an evaluation of five specific areas of interest within the university. These teams evaluated academic affairs, research, information technology, student development, and advancement operations and provided the Board with specific recommendations. In October of 2007, the University hosted a forum for faculty and staff to evaluate the pros and cons of implementing the recommendations provided by the visiting teams (UNT, 2007). According to comments retrieved from the website dedicated to the forums, faculty and staff expressed concern that the new mission statement means something different to each person and proposed some broad action items to solidify the meaning of the mission statement.

The new mission statement references two generally accepted essentials of higher education: students and research. The reference to students implies pedagogical necessity, while mention of research is self-explanatory. Although individuals employed within higher education serve many different roles as faculty members, teaching and research play a significant role in promotion opportunities and job security in higher education. I believe the shift in the UNT mission statement highlights a broader move in

higher education to a hybrid research-institution that seeks a heavy emphasis on both teaching and research. As noted by Tang and Chamberlain (1997), a number of regional institutions, which formerly focused on teaching, have shifted expectations to research. Tang and Chamberlain maintained that these changes often lead to role conflict for faculty. The changes in expectations of faculty are, in turn, reflected in the promotion and tenure policies of these institutions.

Limited research regarding the promotion and tenure process exists, however, I argue additional research is warranted. Researchers have studied how perceptions of the tenure policy vary between administrators and faculty (Tang & Chamberlain, 1997). Although Diamantes (2004) explored faculty members perceptions of the clarity of promotion and tenure policies, little additional research exists regarding faculty members perceptions regarding the tenure process. For the purpose of this project, I focused solely on the policies as they apply to the tenure process. Additionally, I sought to better understand junior faculty members perceptions of their roles in academia as they relate to the tenure process and how they manage these roles.

In addition, I examined how organizational rhetoric related to promotion and tenure policies affect junior faculty's management of these roles. Organizational rhetoric refers to messages communicated by the organization, both internally and externally. In this study, I focused on organizational rhetoric developed by the University of North Texas (UNT). Although the organizational rhetoric illustrated in the new mission statement, and the discourse related to the implementation of that mission statement, play a significant role in the initial phases of my analysis, the main focus of my project are the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) promotion and tenure policies.

Most universities and colleges in the U.S. maintain policies related to promotion and tenure of junior faculty members (Mallon, 2001). The content of those policies varies based on each university's mission. I have chosen the promotion and tenure policies of UNT for several reasons. First, I attended UNT for both my undergraduate and graduate degrees in communication studies. This experience provided me first hand experience in witnessing junior faculty members as they navigated the tenure process. In addition, my graduate career allowed me to begin the cognitive process of anticipating my life as an academic and garnering a better recognition of how a career in higher education evolves. Second, my interest became elevated with the implementation of the new mission statement mentioned in the introduction of this study. As a graduate student, I am aware of the Publish or Perish syndrome (Douglas, 1992; Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995; Lucas, 1994; Rushing & Frentz, 1999) and I interpreted the new mission statement as a counter to that myth. Because the actual role expectations of junior faculty members are identified in the promotion and tenure policies, I believe analysis of those documents provides a more detailed view of the actual roles required of junior faculty members in a university whose mission statement references both teaching and research. Lastly, UNT recently revised its promotion and tenure policies based on peer review team recommendations to "establish tenure and promotion criteria more reflective of the quality standards applied at research universities" (UNT, 2007). This recommendation trickled down to colleges within the university and the College of Arts and Sciences also began a revision of their promotion and tenure policies. This revised set of promotion and tenure policies provides an excellent case study for examining role requirements of both teaching and research.

The assumption that junior faculty members at a university are expected to teach as part of their job requirements requires little elaboration. However, as students work their way into upper level courses of their majors, they begin receiving exposure to published research, which often leads to the realization that their instructors' perform the roles of both teacher and researcher. Sometimes this awareness comes from a professor who utilizes her or his own research as a teaching tool, sometimes it results from contact with research related to course requirements, and in other situations, recognition arises from classroom discussion or assistance with research projects. Unfortunately, such discussions do not always result in respect or appreciation for research or its possible contributions to the field, or the world at large. For some students, the idea that professors have any other responsibilities outside of teaching comes as a surprise.

Stories regarding academics who appear to care little about the classroom or the students also exist. Countless stories circulate among students regarding academics who appear to teach only so they have the opportunity to do research. Certainly, these types of accusations are not new. Lucas (1994) provided a statement from a college graduate in 1890 describing professors as "self deceiving dreamers who solace themselves with the idea that they are doing for the world a service for their books, while their class work goes unheeded" (p. 180). Barber (1992) claimed the "vast apathetic mass of faculty...do not give a damn one way or another about what goes on" in the classroom (p. 196). These examples suggest that faculty members have some measure of flexibility to choose the behaviors they enact in their role as an academic. However, I argue the roles for junior faculty members are identified within the promotion

and tenure policies at each institution. Therefore, junior faculty members' perceptions of the roles specified in the promotion and tenure policies directly relate to their enactment of role specific behaviors and affects how they consciously manage those behaviors.

As with any profession, organizations enact specific employment requirements that specify what roles employees are required to perform in order to maintain employment and to achieve professional success. Within higher education, the identification and definition of job related roles are especially important to junior faculty members who are negotiating the tenure process. Although several factors measure in the awarding of tenure, for the purpose of this study, I focused on research and teaching which are typically the most heavily weighted elements in many tenure processes (Diamantes, 2004; Kasten, 1984; Silverman, 2001; Wolfgang, Gupchup, & Plake, 1995).

Tenure is the achievement of a position within higher education that provides job security and academic freedom to faculty members. Promotion and tenure policies delineate behaviors required for successful navigation of the tenure process and, as mentioned above, these requirements include specific guidelines regarding the behaviors associated with the roles of teaching and researching. Mawsdley (as cited in Hambright and Diamantes, 1999), described tenure as “an integral part of the employment relationship between institutions of higher education and individual faculty members” (p. 436).

The tenure process usually takes an average of six years (Ovington, Diamantes, Roby, & Ryan, 2003) and successful completion of the process results in job security and a promotion to Associate Professor. Hambright and Diamantes (2004) cited a

colleague as saying, “tenure establishes a marriage between a faculty member and the university where divorce is not an option!” (p. 436). The uniqueness of the tenure process contributes significantly to a need for further examination of how the policy affects junior faculty members. In higher education, the tenure policies usually contain an ‘up or out’ provision. This requirement stipulates that failure to achieve tenure generally results in loss of employment (Lucas, 1996; Mallon, 2001; Silverman, 2001; Tierney & Bensimon; 1996). Thus, research regarding how junior faculty members perceive the policies related to the tenure process is called for.

The tenure process varies from institution to institution. Administrations disseminate the formal requirements through promotion and tenure policies that vary from college to college and from discipline to discipline (Diamond, 1999; Silverman, 2001). However, all promotion and tenure related policies can be viewed as organizational rhetoric. Many organizations exist in today’s society and the university is generally accepted as a functioning bureaucratic organization. Although the word “academia” holds a connotative reference to a noble and idealistic environment, universities and colleges clearly match Bernard’s (1968) definition of an organization as, “a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons” (p. 73). According to Cheney (1991), the majority of the Western population is employed in organizations; faculty members in higher education are no different. Therefore, they find themselves subject to the same types of organizational communication and role requirements as individuals in other fields. Although the goals of each type of organization differ, all organizations communicate via organizational rhetoric. Although scholarly research exists in relation to many different types of organizations and their

unique discourse (see Cheney, 1991, for summary), the effects of organizational rhetoric in higher education have not yet been sufficiently explored.

Obviously, the roles of teacher and researcher are required for success in a university organization and thus deserve attention, time, and consideration. The tenure process, unique to the field of higher education, provides an opportunity to explore the ways in which individuals manage multiple roles. In addition, the techniques utilized by junior faculty members to manage the demands related to the tenure process could prove helpful for both universities and their junior faculty members. Consequently, analysis of promotion and tenure policies might reveal whether organizational rhetorical practices construct a dichotomy that results in junior faculty members privileging one role as noted in the anecdotes cited above.

For this project, I employed a quantitative and qualitative survey to explore junior faculty perceptions regarding roles related to promotion and tenure policies. Furthermore, I conducted a rhetorical Fantasy Theme Analysis (FTA) to analyze the organizational rhetoric related to these policies. Therefore, I utilized a mixed method approach in an attempt to gain a detailed snapshot of this complex issue.

I provide a literature review in Chapter 2 that includes a history of the university, previous research on roles and tenure, and an overview of organizational rhetoric. In Chapter 3, I report the results of the quantitative and qualitative portions of this project. The quantitative analysis revealed that junior faculty members at both research and hybrid institutions privileged the role of researcher in relation to the tenure process. Furthermore, junior faculty members at teaching institutions privileged the role of teacher. While the results related to faculty at research and teaching institutions is not

surprising, the emphasis of research over teaching for faculty at hybrid institutions aids in understanding other aspects of the qualitative and rhetorical analysis as discussed in Chapter 5. The qualitative analysis highlights the importance of the researcher and teacher roles and how junior faculty attempt to balance these roles.

In Chapter 4, I describe the process of FTA and apply this lens to the promotion and tenure policies utilized by the UNT CAS. Analysis required identification of setting, character, and action themes and these are described in detail in this chapter. The results of this analysis lead me to argue that fantasy themes and a rhetorical vision exist within the tenure process and deserve further research.

Finally, in Chapter 5, I provide an integrated discussion of the results from the quantitative, qualitative, and FTA, and consider implications for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this project, I examine the intersections between organizational rhetoric in higher education and junior faculty perceptions and role management as related to the tenure process. To begin, I provide a brief overview of the history of higher education in the U.S. in order to reflect on the historical development of the various roles faculty members perform. Following that, I have provided a review of the theories relating to role concepts and how those roles function in the tenure process. Lastly, I offer a summary of organizational rhetoric and its implications in examining promotion and tenure policies and the roles of junior faculty members.

A History of the University

As the university system in the U.S. developed and expanded, several key events and turning points influenced the establishment of promotion and tenure policies that define the behaviors faculty members are expected to enact in their role in higher education. A review of these events provides important insight into the development of faculty roles.

The American university has its roots in the higher education systems of Europe. (Altbach, 1995). Early forms of formal education in Europe relied on teachings provided by priests at cathedral church schools that eventually transformed into universities during the 11th century (Lucas, 1994). The Nations at Paris, also referred to as The Paris University, provided the foundation for further institutes of learning such as Oxford and Cambridge (Altbach; Lucas). The first college in the U.S., Harvard University, was

established in 1636 by the general court of Massachusetts. Classes, which began in 1638, revolved around a charter that read “pro modo Academiarum in Aglia,” which translates “according to the manner of universities in England” (Lucas, p. 104). The original purpose of the university was for the training and education of clergy in the new colonies. By the beginning of the Revolutionary War, there were nine universities in the newly formed republic and each focused on the goals espoused by Harvard. However, as disagreements over religious doctrine erupted in the colonies, various denominations created additional institutions where learning revolved around specific religious doctrine (Altbach, Lucas).

The American Revolution proved a challenging time for institutions of higher education. As a result of the war, both student enrollments and private donations declined. In addition, American independence was accompanied by an infusion of complex ideas that made philosophies of education a subject of intense debate. In the new democracy, the idea of education for all rather than just the pious and wealthy took hold and citizens began founding additional schools (Altbach, 1995; Lucas, 1994). As the academic model for higher education in the U.S. continued to develop, additional schools of thought such as philosophy and writing were added to the curriculum. In 1756, William Smith, the first Provost of the College of Philadelphia wrote, “Thinking, writing and acting well...is the grand aim of liberal education” (Cheyney, 1940, p. 83). These early colleges provided the foundation for what researchers have (Altbach, Douglas, 1992; Lucas) referred to as a liberal education, which, according to Lucas, served as an “academic archetype” for the liberal-arts colleges that predominated the nineteenth century (p. 112).

Between the beginning of the American Revolution and the beginning of the Civil War, another 241 institutions of higher learning were created in the U.S.. The new universities and colleges served educational purposes different from those concerned with teaching morals and values (Altbach, 1995; Douglas, 1992; Lucas, 1994). Some universities pursued the lofty goal of providing a liberal arts education, while sectarian schools maintained their commitment to teaching morals and values. By the mid 1800s, most institutions had begun to incorporate additional changes in the core curriculum. Some of the courses in classical studies such as Latin and Greek were replaced with classes in mathematics and physical sciences. However, the primary focus of an education remained one of acquiring the “arts of living” rather than teaching students skills that would help them make a living (Lucas, p. 133).

As institutions incorporated more utilitarian-focused courses, additional secular campuses began appearing and organizations viewed federal land grants as impetus for the development of state colleges. The Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, and the Land Grant College Act, signed into law by President Lincoln in 1862, created a wave of changes within many already established universities as well as the creation of new ones. The addition of “agricultural and mechanical” elements created additional areas of learning that substituted practical skills for classical learning (Altbach, 1995, Douglas, 1992; Lucas, 1994).

Clearly, the nineteenth century was a tumultuous, yet innovative time for institutions of higher education. In 1871, the incoming President of Yale University said,

Never, perhaps, did this subject of [higher education reform] occupy the thoughts of so many persons....It certainly never excited more active controversy, or provoked more various...criticism, or was subjected to a greater variety of experiments than with us in these passing years. (Lucas, 1994, p. 140)

Lucas (1994) cited industrialization and new technological innovations as a driving force of change within institutions of higher education. Universities and colleges were responding to changing social, cultural, and economic circumstances and an outcry for courses more suited to learning career skills became prominent (Altman, 1995; Douglas, 1992; Lucas, 1994). In the 1870s, American institutions began emulating German universities by implementing graduate courses and in some cases, establishing schools developed specifically for graduate study. The new courses specialized in scholarly research and prepared students for the “learned professions” (Lucas, 1994, p. 172). In 1876, Johns Hopkins’ mission became “the acquisition, conservation, refinement, and distribution of knowledge” (p. 172). At this time universities began stressing scholarship and research over “instruction” and the debate between teaching and research was born (p. 173).

As the mission and goals of the university changed, so did the role of the professor (Lucas, 1994). Originally, professors taught many subjects; however, with the turn towards research and scholarship, faculty members began specializing in a specific subject and/or discipline. At this same time, universities began creating hierarchical ranking systems for faculty members. (Altbach, 1992; Lucas). According to Lucas, the Publish or Perish syndrome resulted from the turn towards scholarly research and the establishment of promotion policies that included publishing criteria. Tang and Chamberlain (1997) asserted that institution prestige is usually referenced in connection with a faculty’s reputation for publishing and suggested that a reputation for strong scholarly research usually results in endowments. Thus, in an attempt to attract

endowments, and researchers capable of producing such work, universities began incorporating promotion systems that rewarded research.

This focus on research eventually resulted in a debate over whether research or teaching should receive more emphasis in higher education. Proponents for both sides have presented many arguments for the privileging of one role over the other, while others have called for a balanced approach in the university. (Altbach, 1995; Douglas, 1992; Lucas, 1994). Because the success of a university depends on the achievement of their goals, employees are rewarded based on the behaviors associated with those goals (Diamond, 1999). The promotion and tenure policies of a university stipulate the behaviors required for promotion. Therefore, if a university places more value on one role, then that role will play a more pivotal role in the reward system. Thus, how a junior faculty member perceives the rewards associated with their roles affects how they enact those roles.

Roles and Tenure

Extensive research (Cohen & Brawer, 1972; Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995; Goffman, 1961; Tang & Chamberlain, 1997; Wolfgang et al., 1995) has been conducted relating to role concepts. For this project, I focus on how junior faculty members negotiate the various roles they are required to enact as part of the promotion and tenure process and how organizational rhetoric related to promotion and tenure affects those negotiations. Promotion and tenure policies define role expectations for junior faculty members. These expectations inform the communicative behaviors utilized by junior faculty members in role performance. Organizational evaluation of the resulting

performances by junior faculty members determines the professional success or failure of the junior faculty member.

Goffman (1961) defined role as activities identified as “normative for an individual performing a specific role.” He further defined and clarified that role performance, or role enactment, “is the actual conduct of a particular individual while on duty in his position” (p. 85). In other words, the label of researcher or teacher identifies a role; whereas, the actual enactment of behaviors associated with a role is the performance of a role. Furthermore, Goffman situated role as a “typical response of individuals in a particular position” and argued that for role analysis this response, “a typical role,” must be examined differently than “the normative aspects of role and a particular individual’s actual role performance” (p. 93). Goffman posited that the variances between these three elements represent how an individual “perceives and defines his situation” (p. 93).

In higher education, junior faculty members must vacillate between what they perceive to be the typical response required for a particular role, what they perceive to be the normative aspects of the role, and how they will enact the role based on the requirements set forth in promotion and tenure policies. In discussing role performance enacted by teachers, Cohen and Brawer (1972) explained that the performance of a role does not always align with the normative expectations for that role and they argued that for teachers, the “perception of role demands” (p. 57) greatly affects how a teacher performs that role. Crediting perception as a significant factor, the authors suggested that teachers frequently perceive role demands differently than the way administrators expected them to be perceived. Therefore, the perceptions that junior faculty members glean from promotion and tenure policies directly impact how they perform their roles.

Individuals enact many roles in their daily lives and they often engage in performing roles simultaneously (Cohen & Brawer, 1972; Goffman, 1961). For example, an individual might concurrently engage in the role of student, parent, spouse, and child. However, individuals often privilege behaviors in one role that do not carry over to other roles. For example, behaviors enacted in the performance of the role of teacher differ from many of the behaviors required in the role of researcher. In higher education, rewards are tied to the performance of various roles and each of these roles carries a different set of required behaviors (Diamond, 1999). As with most organizations, universities provide rewards for the behaviors they value (Diamond; Kasten, 1984). Within the higher education institution, promotion and tenure policies communicate rewards and incentives for junior faculty members. For a junior faculty member, the ultimate reward is usually the achievement of tenure. Researchers (Tang & Chamberlain, 1997) claimed that rewards such as promotion and tenure influence junior faculty role performance. Additionally, researchers (Hambricht & Diamantes, 2004) claimed that the tenure process requires junior faculty members to juggle the roles of teacher and researcher while attempting to maintain some semblance of balance between the roles. In higher education, the junior faculty member must consider institutional demands when choosing which role to privilege in specific situations (Cohen & Brawer, 1972).

Fairweather and Rhoads (1995) posited that university faculty members must “perform a variety of complex roles for a variety of perhaps even more complex reasons” (p. 180). The tenure process is a situation unique to educational institutions (Diamond, 1999; Douglas, 1992; Mallon, 2001; Silverman, 2001; Tierney &

Bensimon,1996) and the complexities inherent in that process require junior faculty members simultaneously manage several roles, including the role of teacher and researcher. However, other factors might contribute to difficulty in role negotiation. For example, graduate students often adopt the beliefs and practices of their advisors and mentors (Bess, 1978, as cited in Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995); thus, when they begin their careers, they might have preconceived expectations regarding their roles. However, if they interpret the promotion and tenure policies to be in contradiction to their preconceived expectations, they might experience role conflict. Cohen and Brawer (1972) referred to this concept as “self-role conflict” and suggested that these conflicts result in “various personal adjustment techniques or defense mechanisms; for example, rationalization, repression and negativism are sometimes used to reconcile the disturbances stimulated by the broader system” (p. 57). Therefore, junior faculty members who face these types of conflict might find it challenging to balance the role expectations set forth in the policies of their specific institution.

Researchers (Cohen & Brawer, 1972) also argued that “a major determinant of role performance is the teacher’s perception of role demands” (p. 57). Because a direct correlation exists between job security and promotion, and role performance, perceptions regarding those roles provide significant insight into how junior faculty members choose to balance the various roles propagated in the promotion and tenure policies. Wolfgang et al. (1995) suggested that “performance evaluation and reward systems also are believed to play an important role in determining the amount of stress which faculty members experience” (p. 342). In a study conducted by Eble and McKeachie (as cited in Tang & Chamberlain, 1997), the majority of faculty surveyed

confessed to experiencing conflict in managing teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities.

In addition, researchers (Boyer, 1987; Koplik & Welsh, 1993; Mooney, 1992) have reported that tension between role expectations of teacher and researcher exist on most campuses in the U.S. and expectations related to roles continue to shift. Seldin (as cited in Wolfgang et al., 1995), claimed that an attempt to maintain balance in performing roles specified in promotion and tenure policies relates directly to faculty stress and he stated “that faculty members ‘ feel pulled in opposite directions”” (p. 342). Consequently, faculty members must attempt to find a sense of balance and make important career decisions. A report from the AACP Council of Deans/Council of Faculties Joint Committee on Faculty Recruitment and Retention (as cited in Wolfgang et al.) revealed that “the three most important factors that could cause faculty to seek employment outside of academia dealt with reward systems and opportunities for advancement and professional growth” (p. 342). Faculty members might decide that the stress inherent in trying to achieve balance is unworthy of the reward and choose to leave the profession. With this study, I seek better insight into how junior faculty members respond when they experience tension related to balancing their roles and examine to what extent promotion and tenure policies influence those tensions.

Tang and Chamberlain (1997) claimed that Regional State Universities are transitioning from their original, “narrowly defined mission” of teaching to one where research requirements are ever expanding; moreover, increasing publishing requirements “leads to role conflicts” (p. 213). Continually shifting trends and priorities within higher education will result in ongoing role confusion for junior faculty members.

Therefore, the promotion and tenure policies become a most critical communicative tool for defining role expectations for junior faculty members seeking tenure and promotion.

Faculty respondents in a survey conducted by Fedler and Counts (as cited in Ali, Young, & Ali, 1996) reported that although “they preferred teaching” they felt they “had to do research for promotion and tenure” (p. 40). In 1991, the Higher Education Research Institute conducted a survey of over 35,000 faculty members (Lucas, 1996). Eighty percent of the respondents reported their institutional priority was research rather than teaching. Researchers (Wolfgang et al., 1995) suggested that promotion and tenure policies should be based on a more equitable distribution of the behaviors associated with teaching and research roles so that faculty members will not feel a need to choose one role over another as they enact the roles required of them for promotion. Such a dichotomy might result in junior faculty member’s compartmentalization of roles and corresponding behaviors that subsequently prevent them from performing in a manner that integrates both roles. Thus, the conflict over teaching versus research would continue and such a debate does nothing to contribute to the academic experience for faculty or students. Boyer (as cited in Diamond, 1999) wrote that “the time has come to move beyond the tired old ‘teaching versus research’ debate and give the familiar and honorable term ‘scholarship’ a broader, more capricious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work” (p. 2). The new mission statement at UNT appears to be expressing a desire for a balanced approach to higher education and the pursuit and disbursement of knowledge. Certainly, the mission statement addresses a full scope of academic work. This one instance of organizational rhetoric provides insight into the mission and goals of UNT. However, the relation

between this statement and the roles of faculty required in the pursuit of these goals, should be more clearly visible in the promotion and tenure policies.

As junior faculty members turn to promotion and tenure policies for guidance through the complex tenure process, they interpret which roles are rewarded by tenure. Their interpretations provide critical insight into how they choose to balance the roles of teacher and researcher in their professional lives. Thus the following research questions were explored:

RQ1: What are junior faculty members' perceptions of the role expectations of teacher and researcher as defined by the promotion and tenure process?

RQ2: How do junior faculty members balance the role expectations defined in the promotion and tenure process?

The quantitative and qualitative studies described in Chapter 3 provide insight into how junior faculty members perceive the roles and teacher and researcher, and how they attempt to balance those roles. However, examination of additional organizational rhetoric was necessary in order to answer a research question regarding how promotion and tenure policies affect junior faculty members' management of their roles.

Organizational Rhetoric

The study of rhetoric has a long and complex history. Ehninger (1968) identified "three great systems of rhetoric" (p. 131). According to Ehninger, the first of the three systems, the "speech act," also referred to as "the grammatical" system of rhetoric, was a pragmatic approach to the study of rhetoric (pp. 133-134). The second system

identified by Ehninger, as the “psychological,” allowed for consideration of the speaker’s relationship with the audience (pp. 134-135). Lastly, Ehninger identified the third great system of rhetoric as the “sociological” (p. 134). In this system, examination of rhetoric was for the purpose of “understanding and improving human relations” (p. 139). Crable (1990) suggested that in the three systems identified by Ehninger “can be recognized the roots of all later rhetorics” (p. 116), and he argued that the field should be expanded to include a “fourth great system of rhetoric” – organizational rhetoric. (p. 115).

Ehninger’s conception of the rhetorical systems were based on his assumption that each new system built upon the system before it, therefore, each new system was in fact, a cumulation of the systems before it. According to Crable, the new fourth system would function similarly, the fourth great system would be a cumulative system that “transcends grammatical, psychological, and social/sociological rhetorics” (p. 119).

Crable (1990) referred to the need for a new method of rhetorical analysis in order to address a contemporary world where rhetors are “inseparable from the large or small organizations that they represent and that are essential in defining them” (p. 118). In this fourth system, “discourse is produced by organizations, not individuals” (Crable, p. 117). Cheney (1991) also spoke of a need for examination of rhetoric that comes from a “collective voice” rather than an individual one and he agreed that this need arose in response to the “postindustrial, information-oriented” society in which we live (p. 1). Cheney posited that organizations are responsible for the dissemination of the majority of the messages received in today’s society and he established a need for “interpreting a collective or ‘corporate’ message” (p. 2).

Crable (1990) asserted that “organizations are inherently rhetorical” and “rhetoric

is inherently organizational” (p. 115). For the purpose of this study, the importance of that assertion lies in the insistence that organizations are inherently rhetorical. To be rhetorical is to be persuasive. Therefore, if organizational rhetoric persuades audience members, then the powers of that persuasion deserve further attention. Any type of discourse that communicates a message from an organization to an audience can be considered organizational rhetoric (Cheney, 1991). Therefore organizational rhetoric includes memos, policies, mission and vision statements, press releases, meeting minutes, etc. For Cheney, a critical component of studying the affects of organizational rhetoric related to the concept of identity. Although the scope of this project does not provide a vehicle for a detailed exploration of identity and the effects of organizational rhetoric on academic identity, the connection between identity and role performance must be briefly reviewed in order to understand Cheney’s concepts.

According to Cohen and Brawer (1972), “the concept of role is inextricably tied to the individual’s concept of self and of identity” (p. 55). They referred to the concept of role as an “interaction between the individual and the group” (p. 56). For the purpose of this study, junior faculty members could be considered the individual, while the administrators who create the promotion and tenure policies could be considered the group. Therefore, the interaction between junior faculty members and the administration, as circulated through promotion and tenure policies, function as a social interaction that influences junior faculty members’ enactments of roles. If, as researchers (Cohen & Brawer; Goffman, 1961) have suggested, individuals perform roles based on their perceptions of others’ expectations of them, then the organizational rhetoric that stipulates what behaviors are rewarded with tenure and promotion

significantly affect role performance. Furthermore, if organizational rhetoric affects an individual's identity (Cheney, 1991) then, based on previous research (Cheney; Cohen & Brawer; Goffman), it must also affect the roles individuals enact in their professional lives.

As junior faculty members attempt to achieve tenure, they must rely on promotion and tenure policies for guidance. A clear delineation of the requirements required for tenure must be communicated in order for junior faculty members to understand what roles are required of them to achieve tenure. Unlike promotion policies within non-educational organizations, lack of promotion to a tenured position results in loss of employment. A junior faculty's interpretation of the promotion and tenure policies is critical in determining role performance. Thus, in this project I explore the organizational rhetoric related to the promotion and tenure process through an examination of UNT CAS promotion and tenure policies:

RQ3: To what extent does organizational rhetoric regarding promotion and tenure influence junior faculty's role management?

Mixed Method Rationale

My goal in this project was to examine junior faculty member's perceptions of their roles as teacher and researcher and to gain a better understanding of how they balance those roles. Additionally, I examined organizational rhetoric as it relates to promotion and tenure policies to measure the effect of those policies on junior faculty role management. I intend to use this pilot study to form the foundation for future work in this area. Therefore, the purpose of this study was purely interpretative and I employed

a mixed methods approach to address three research questions.

The process of applying mixed method research began in the 1950s when researchers experimented with combining different forms of quantitative data collection. The practice continued until the 1970s when researchers began experimenting with combining qualitative and quantitative data to expand upon previous research. This progression continues today as researchers search for and advance theories to make research results more credible (Cresswell, 2002). The use of mixed methods allows researchers to approach data collection with new combined strategies and methods. The complex nature of perceptions and role behaviors required a complex method of investigation in order to examine the many layers involved.

Diamantes (2004) utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods in a study of faculty members at institutions throughout the U.S. He reported a lack of clear criteria in promotion and tenure polices and called for additional research into this topic. In Chapter 3, I discuss the quantitative and qualitative survey I utilized to gather data from junior faculty members regarding their perceptions of how they manage the roles required of them in order to achieve tenure (RQ1 & RQ2).

While tenure is a complex process, Mallon (2001) referred to tenure as “a bedrock principle of mainstream American higher education” (p. 151) and “the common policy of faculty employment” (p. 12). I determine that the similarities inherent in the tenure process allow for a case study of organizational rhetoric related to promotion and tenure polices. In Chapter 4, I conduct a case study utilizing FTA in order to examine the organizational rhetoric regarding the promotion and tenure process at the UNT

(RQ3). Conducting interpretative analysis using a specific lens such as FTA provides a structured method for analyzing text while still allowing for creative interpretation.

CHAPTER 3

QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODS

Quantitative research methods allow researchers to explore attitudes of a specific population, and data derived from such exploration provide insightful descriptions of the represented population (Cresswell, 2002), while qualitative research methods allow for an interpretative approach to data analysis (Cresswell, 2002, 2003). Whereas quantitative data allows researchers to track trends, qualitative data provides researchers “many different perspectives on the study topic and provide a complex picture of the situation” (Cresswell, 2002, p. 559). A quantitative approach allows for analysis of quantifiable data and qualitative provides real life examples of how junior faculty members perceive the promotion and tenure processes within their organizations.

The use of a mixed method allows researchers to incorporate philosophical ideals and to approach data collection with new combined strategies and methods. Cresswell (2003) argued that “results from one method can help develop or inform the other method” (p. 16) thus providing a better understanding of the issues explored by researcher(s). In order to gain an understanding of how junior faculty members manage the various roles they are required to enact throughout the tenure process, I solicited junior faculty members currently involved in the tenure process located at institutions throughout the U.S. I chose to obtain participants from a large population to reduce the likelihood of making errors or overgeneralizing from a limited group of participants (Cresswell, 2002).

Participants

Participants were solicited via two concurrent methods. Junior faculty members at institutions throughout the U.S. were solicited utilizing a snowball sampling method and a request for participants was disseminated via CRTNET (Communication Research and Theory Network). CRTNET is a daily email listserv service provided by the National Communication Association (NCA).

One hundred and thirty three participants responded to the survey, however 2 participants did not complete the survey and were eliminated from the data set. The respondents consisted of 51 males (38.9%) and 80 females (61.1%). The average age of respondents was 37.8 years ($SD = 7.24$). Two participants did not provide age. The majority of the respondents ($n = 93$; 71%) self-identified as being married or having a partner, 31 (23.7%) responded as single, and 7 (5.3%) responded as divorced or separated. One hundred twenty-one of the 131 respondents (92.4%) have acquired their doctoral degree; the remaining 10 participants hold a masters degree (7.6%). Participants from public institutions made up the bulk of the respondents ($n = 97$; 74%), with 34 (26%) participants listing affiliation with a private institution. The majority of the participants are employed within a college of arts and sciences ($n = 62$; 47.7%), with 21 participants (16.2%) reporting affiliation with a college or school of communication. The remaining participants represented colleges including education, business, math, and liberal arts. The report of discipline revealed that 99 (75.6%) of the participants were in the communication field and the remaining individuals came from fields as diverse as foreign languages, forestry/wildlife, math, physics, and chemistry. One hundred sixteen of the participants (88.5%) are classified as assistant professors, 7 (5.3%) are

instructors or lecturers, 3 (2.3%) are associate professors, 2 (1.5%) are visiting assistant professors, 2 are assistant librarians, and 1 (.8%) participant reported as a professor.

Procedures

Participants completed an on-line survey including 14 Likert scale questions and three open-ended questions regarding the tenure and promotion process (see Appendix A). The Likert scale questions were modified from Diamantes (2004). Participants responded on a 5-point scale (5 = *strongly agree*; 1 = *strongly disagree*) to the 14 Likert scale questions. Seven questions specifically address the role of researcher in the tenure process. Questions relate to the importance of the quantity and quality of published research as well as the ability to secure research grants. The responses to the research role sub-scale were averaged together. The sub-scale reached acceptable levels of reliability ($\alpha = .76$).

The remaining seven question address the role of teaching in the tenure process. Questions concerning the importance of number of courses taught, student evaluations, and ability to secure teaching grants were examined. The responses to the teacher role sub-scale were averaged together. The sub-scale reached marginal levels of reliability ($\alpha = .52$).

The respondents also answered three open-ended questions: (1) Briefly explain how important your role as researcher is in the promotion and tenure process; (2) briefly explain how important your role as teacher is in the promotion and tenure process; and,

(3) how do you balance the roles between teacher and researcher as you work towards tenure.

Results

Quantitative

In order to understand the organizational setting, each participant was asked how his or her university self-identified (e.g. teaching or research institution). Participants responses were coded into four categories. Sixty-three participants (48.1%) identified their institutions as teaching universities, which included responses such as liberal arts colleges, regional teaching institutions, Research Level 3, small private college, and teaching university. Forty-two participants (32.17%) indicated their institutions were research universities, while 17 (13%) indicated they were at universities who placed an equal emphasis on teaching and research. The remaining 9 participants (6.9%) either left the question blank ($n = 3$), or indicated that the university was in a state of confusion or change so that they did not know how the institution might self-identify ($n = 6$).

Two one-way ANOVAS were conducted to determine if the participants emphasis of their teacher role and researcher role varied based on the self-identity of the participants' universities. Post hoc analysis using Bonferroni adjustment and Tukey HSD were used.

The importance of the teacher role differed based on self-identity of university, $F(3, 127) = 12.014, p = .000$. Faculty at teaching institutions ($M = 3.25, SD = .61$) indicated that behaviors associated with their role as teacher were significantly more

important in the promotion and tenure process than faculty members at research universities ($M = 2.65$, $SD = .48$) and universities that value both teaching and research equally ($M = 2.65$, $SD = .58$). Participants that were unable to identify a clear self-identity of institution ($M = 3.13$, $SD = .52$) did not differ significantly from any other group.

The importance of the role of researcher was significantly higher at self-identified research institutions and universities that value both teaching and research, $F(3, 127) = 27.82$, $p = .000$. Faculty at research institutions ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .37$) indicated that behaviors associated with their role as researcher were significantly more important in the promotion and tenure process than faculty members at teaching universities ($M = 2.92$, $SD = .76$) and faculty that were unable to identify a clear self-identity of institution ($M = 3.27$, $SD = .50$). Faculty at universities that value both teaching and research equally ($M = 3.88$, $SD = .56$) noted behaviors associated with the role of researcher was significantly higher than faculty at teaching universities, but did not differ from research universities or those who could not identify how their institution self-identifies.

Qualitative

Rather than approach the study from a preconceived theoretical standpoint regarding role management or role conflict, I utilized a grounded theory approach to collect data. The purpose of this approach is to allow themes to emerge from the data rather than seeking to code data into preconceived categories. Rather than looking for one specific problem or theme, grounded theory allows a process to be evaluated

(Cresswell, 2002) for various elements that might prove significant in theory development.

I used thematic analysis to examine the data collected from the open-ended questions. Thematic analysis is the process of examining data to allow for the emergence of themes (Boyatzis, 1998). Reading the data multiple times allowed themes to emerge by pattern recognition (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2000). I read all answers multiple times. After the second reading, themes in responses to each of the questions began to emerge. I then categorized the answers into themes specific to each of the three questions. While this process of data analysis did not rely on predetermined categories, the analysis was most likely informed by the research addressed in the literature review of this project.

The three open-ended questions were developed to allow participants to elaborate on how they balance the roles of teacher and researcher in relation to the tenure process. Although some institutions have begun implementing promotion and tenure policies that provide junior faculty members guidelines regarding the balancing of their academic roles (Diamond, 1999), this does not seem to be a common occurrence. I was interested in seeing whether junior faculty members were cognizant of a need to self-monitor the roles of teacher and researcher, and if so, what strategies they utilized to create a sense of balance.

Publish or perish. Responses to the first question, “Briefly explain how important your role as researcher is in the promotion and tenure process,” revealed repetitive comments that were sorted into categories that appeared most often. The first recognizable category was coded as “publish or perish.” As noted in Chapter 1, the

phrase “publish or perish” is commonly used in the academy to capture the crucial emphasis on publishing in the tenure process (Douglas, 1992, Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995; Lucas, 1994). Many respondents, particularly those from self-identified research universities, articulated the publish or perish approach in their responses. As Participant 1 (assistant professor, research university) stated, “One cannot receive tenure or promotion without [research].” Additional comments from participants at research universities were similar in nature. For example, “Extremely important. The most important factor in the tenure decision” (Participant 16, assistant professor, research university).

While it is not surprising that individuals from research universities view research as crucial to achieving tenure, research is also important at other types of institutions. Many of the respondents who listed their institution as a teaching university related the importance of the researcher role to promotion and tenure. One respondent wrote “the dean said that one must publish in peer-reviewed journal to receive tenure” (Participant 49, assistant professor, teaching university) and another, “research is the deciding factor” (Participant 52, assistant professor, teaching university). Individuals at self-identified teaching institutions repeatedly reported that the role of researcher is valued. These findings confirm Tang and Chamberlain’s (1997) finding that teaching universities are beginning to place more focus on research. For the junior faculty member attempting to successfully navigate the path to tenure, clear delineation of role expectations is critical, and a changing academic environment makes this even more important.

Role confusion. As junior faculty members perform the roles of teacher and

researcher, they must make decisions of which role to perform based on what their institution requires of them for promotion and tenure. Wolfgang et al. (1995) claimed that promotion and tenure processes directly relate to the stress level of faculty members. Surely, junior faculty members who feel confused about their roles will also experience stress. A sense of confusion regarding the role of researcher in the tenure process was visible across respondents from the various institution types *except* research universities. This finding suggests that junior faculty members at research universities have a strong sense of purpose as it relates to role expectations in the promotion and tenure process. Several research university respondents provided specific publishing guidelines in their answer of this question. For example, one respondent (Participant 47, assistant professor) wrote “must have at least 6 pubs in 6 years,” while another wrote “If I don’t publish, I won’t get tenure (1-2 national refereed articles a year)” (Participant 86, assistant professor). Another respondent added “very – dependent on research – national journals and/or book preferred” (Participant 102, assistant professor). Although these responses suggest some faculty members have a clear idea of exactly what the publishing requirements for tenure are, this type of detailed response proved to be an exception in the respondents narratives and junior faculty members from institutions other than research facilities told a much different story. A respondent from a teaching university wrote:

As a small private university, this organization has aspirations of more research-focus. While we are supposed to focus on teaching, a colleague recently failed to receive tenure for lack of publications. This indicates to me that we are expected to produce research regardless of the school’s expectations of teaching.
(Participant 29, assistant professor)

Another respondent from a teaching university expressed confusion regarding the role of researcher in the tenure process:

It is hard to say, as it seems to be something of a moving target. There are tenured faculty who have published considerably less than I have, but every evaluation I receive tells me that I've not published enough. There are no clearly stated rules - number of publications, etc - which makes the answer to how much research one needs to get tenure always "more." (Participant 41, assistant professor)

Confusion also appears in the comments from faculty members who identified their institution as a hybrid institution. One respondent wrote, "I think it's very important, but it's not all that clear. Supposedly it's 40%" (Participant 99, assistant professor).

However, 14 of the 17 hybrid institution respondents reported that the role of researcher plays a significant role in the promotion and tenure policy. Although some confusion exists, the majority of the respondents appeared to have a firm grasp on the value placed on the role of researcher in regards to the promotion and tenure process. However, the source of that knowledge appears to come from various entities.

The grapevine. Several respondents suggested that answers to role expectations do not lie within the promotion and tenure policies. I have identified this category as "the grapevine." These responses suggested that knowledge of what is required in the role of researcher is a dynamic and unknown element that circulates verbally rather than from official organizational rhetoric. For example, one respondent wrote, "It's extremely important. I have always heard that tenure decisions are dependent on what I publish, not what my teaching is like" (Participant 24, assistant professor, research university). Another respondent wrote, "Need to get some [research], but discussion suggests this is just to satisfy the administration" (Participant 34, assistant professor, teaching university). Participant 110 (assistant professor,

research university) reported “this is very important to my tenure. Even though the university insists that teaching and research are split equally in tenure decision, there is no secret that research is more important.” And consider the individual from the teaching university who claimed:

Even though this is a teaching university, the scholarship requirements have gone up “unofficially.” While 2 publications is what the handbooks says, privately, dept. chairs say “5 or 6 would be better.” (Participant 48, assistant professor)

These responses suggest junior faculty members also look outside the promotion and tenure policies for guidance on role management. Even though responses to the first question indicate that the role of researcher is important in the promotion and tenure process, consideration of how this information is disseminated to junior faculty members deserves further attention.

Teacher role primary. The second question, “Briefly explain how important your role as teacher is in the promotion and tenure process,” allowed participants to elaborate on how they perceive the value of the teacher role. Based on the number of respondents who identified themselves as affiliated with a teaching university, it was not surprising that the majority of respondents reported the role of teacher to be of higher value than the role of researcher in the tenure process. For example, Participant 30 (instructor, teaching university) reported:

This is of primary importance. At my institution the three substantial areas of evaluation are; Teaching, Service, & Scholarly activity. Research would fall under the heading of scholarly activity, but it is not a requirement. Other choices of this area could consist of; curriculum development, symposia/conference attendance, Professional memberships/affiliations, etc.

Another respondent wrote, “Since we are a teaching institution, the focus is on providing excellent instruction. So teaching is very important to the promotion and tenure process”

(Participant 75, instructor of communication).

Teacher role secondary. However, another category emerged that required further examination. Nineteen respondents reported that the teacher role was secondary to the role of researcher in the promotion and tenure process. What makes this startling is the secondary variable in these responses. Six of those respondents reported affiliation with a teaching university and four of them identified membership with an hybrid institution. For example, one respondent from a teaching university wrote, “irrelevant; counts less than 25% towards tenure decision” (Participant 72, lecturer). Another respondent, (Participant 95, assistant professor, hybrid university) reported “my university emphasizes/values teaching, so I have to carefully balance that with my research.” However, this same participant answered the question regarding the role of researcher with this narrative, “no research, no tenure. Simple as that.” These results confirm that although the role of teacher appears to be important within a teaching institution, the role of researcher still carries considerable weight in the promotion and tenure process.

These responses suggest that institution identity does not guarantee a clear picture of the roles required for promotion and tenure. If junior faculty members must rely on their interpretation of the promotion and tenure policies for an explanation of role expectations, then those policies must be explicit and clear.

No value, high risk. The third category that emerged from the question regarding the role of teacher was labeled, “no value, high risk.” Responses reflecting this sentiment argued that although exemplary performance in the role of teacher will not result in tenure, poor teaching can result in the denial of tenure. One respondent wrote,

“teaching evaluations can only hurt my tenure case, they typically do not help even if they are good evaluations” (Participant 98, assistant professor, research university). Another reported, “student evaluations are looked at but only seem to influence the decision of they are negative” (Participant 47, assistant professor, research university). The majority of the respondents in this category were affiliated with a research university. These findings, along with the ones discussed above, confirm that junior faculty members do perceive their role in academia to include the enactment of behaviors associated with multiple roles. These findings relate directly to RQ1 and provide sufficient data to call for additional research into this area. Because the respondents indicated they perceived a difference between their roles, I anticipated that the third question might reveal critical information regarding strategies for role management and this assumption proved accurate.

The third question, “How do you balance the roles between teacher and researcher as you work towards tenure,” provided participants an opportunity to elaborate on how they work to achieve balance. However, this question had an unexpected benefit. As participants reflected on their roles in academia, they also shared their perceptions of what the word balance means to them. Occasionally, the responses seemed to reflect the authors desire to express pent up frustrations. Other times, participants’ reflections indicated a strong sense of purpose and a well-thought out plan of attack. One noteworthy finding – no participant responded in a manner that could be interpreted to mean that the concept of balance is never considered. Even those junior faculty members who perceived one role to be more valued than another in

the tenure process feel compelled to be both teacher and researcher. Thus, I selected the most prominent themes and created categories for discussion.

To research or to teach. The most prominent strategy offered by respondents reflected the tendency to privilege one role over another when there is not time for both. I have labeled this category “to research or to teach.” One participant reported, “I don’t sleep very much, I try as hard as I can to keep the teaching scores up (since they’re primary) and I do sub-standard research. It’s not my dream situation, but it’s realistic” (Participant 13, assistant professor, teaching university). Another respondent wrote, “I devote 80% of my time to research, 20% to teaching. I frankly don’t worry too much about my teaching. I do ok, my evals are good, so I don’t spend a lot of time thinking about pedagogy” (Participant 115, assistant professor, research university).

Teaching is research. Several participants indicated they attempt to achieve balance between the role of teacher and researcher by combining the behaviors associated with the two roles as often as possible and I refer to this category as “teaching is research.” A respondent affiliated with a hybrid institution wrote, “I try to intertwine both teaching and research by conducting research in the classroom and presenting results to the students. I also look to students for ideas for future research ideas so I can provide them with answers in the future” (Participant 130, assistant professor, hybrid university). And yet another respondent replied:

I struggle with the balance. I love teaching and often put my students before my own research program. I enjoy research and believe that it is vitally important but I believe that a good teacher adds to our understanding of research and that a good researcher adds to teaching. For me, teaching is research and research is teaching. (Participant 136, assistant professor, hybrid university)

Calendar & Clock. Many respondents have created strategies related to time management. I refer to this category as “calendar & clock.” As one participant put it, “Much of my activity in the field occurs during the summer months. During the school year I focus on my role as teacher” (Participant 8, assistant professor, teaching university). Based on the responses, junior faculty members creatively organize their time in order to focus on the roles they must perform. One respondent wrote:

I have worked to keep 2 days a week as “teaching” days and 3 days a week as “research” days. I try to maintain this balance. I got this idea from a tenured full professor in my department when I arrived at the university and was questioning how to divide my time. It’s worked well so far. (Participant 24, assistant professor, research university)

This response is telling in that new junior faculty members appear to be aware that they will be required to perform various roles in their attempt to achieve tenure. Some of the participants reported they find shortcuts to address the teacher roles so that they have more time for research. Each of these respondents reported that their role as researcher receives more value in the promotion and tenure policy than teaching does. One creative participant suggested, “look for ways to incorporate past lessons taught in current lesson plans to minimize prep time; assign group projects to minimize time spent grading; eliminate certain assignments to cut down on grading time” (Participant 64, assistant professor, research university). And at least one respondent found a way to minimize teaching tasks while combining the roles of researcher and teacher.

Although this type of strategy could also fit in the “teaching is researching” category, I will highlight it here:

I try not to alter my classes too much each semester to reduce prep time. I have TAs and graders grade all written work from students. I also create teaching opportunities that allow me to complete more research, like giving students independent study credits for working on a research team. That way I'm

accountable to students each week in terms of moving a project along and making sure there are tasks that get completed. The independent studies are in addition to the classes I'm already teaching, but having a research schedule for the semester keeps me on track. (Participant 16, assistant professor, research university)

Strategies to create (im)balance. Although some respondents seem capable of managing their roles, others reported a high level of stress and struggle inherent in the daily management of the roles of teacher and researcher. Some respondents reported they utilized various strategies to achieve a sense of balance. However, for most of these respondents, the attempted strategy resulted a continued state of imbalance. For some, the struggle is overwhelming and they feel they are fighting a losing battle. As one weary participant wrote:

God only knows. I'm not sure if I do balance them. I do whatever feel right/necessary in any given situation/moment. I probably devote more time to teaching, since that's an immediate pressure, and stress about not devoting more time to research. (Participant 27, assistant professor, research university)

Others recognize the conflict and struggle to stay afloat. One respondent reported:

I pray that I don't have to teach in the summer or winter terms--I ask for these terms off, and I find it very hard to balance the two demands. I don't feel like I am really in a "teaching" university--I feel pressured and overwhelmed with both sets of demands. (Participant 48, assistant professor, teaching university)

Some participants report difficulty in balancing the roles, but express that their personal educational philosophies must also factor into their role management:

It is difficult. Research is the only thing that "counts," but you are always immediately accountable to students when it comes to teaching. And I believe in teaching. It is undoubtedly the way that one in our chosen profession can have the most impact on people and on struggling for social justice. Nonetheless, because research is all that counts for tenure and promotion, I generally devote particular days exclusively to research, I limit contact time with students, I limit graded assignments and other course prep. (Participant 31, assistant professor, research university)

And still others search for balance and end up sacrificing personal quality of life. As some junior faculty members find a way to manage their professional roles, their personal life balance is sacrificed. One participant wrote:

The regular term is given to teaching and service, and possibly gathering small amounts of data. Any research that happens has to be done on holiday time - Christmas, summer, etc - with only a slight possibility of funding from the University. The only way I've found to balance it so far has been to let my personal life slip to allow for research time. (Participant 41, assistant professor, teaching university)

CHAPTER 4

FANTASY THEME ANALYSIS

Artifact Justification

The use of fantasy theme analysis (FTA) for the examination of organizational practices and rhetoric is not new (Jackson, 1999; 2000; Kendall, 1993). Bormann (1972) argued “that there is a connection between rhetorical visions and community consciousness” (p. 289). Gunn (2003) interpreted Bormann’s claim to “imply that rhetoric occurs within a field of a collective consciousness that is not reducible to any individual” (p. 49). As I discuss in the literature review found in Chapter 2, organizational rhetoric represents a collective voice and cannot be reduced to one individual. Thus, FTA provides an excellent vehicle for examination of organizational rhetoric related to promotion and tenure policies.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) claimed that although promotion and tenure policies may vary from institution to institution, the experiences of junior faculty members enmeshed in the process are often similar. The process at each institution is guided by promotion and tenure policies; thus, I chose to treat this portion of the project as a case study rather than analyze organizational rhetoric from multiple institutions. Cresswell (2002) agreed that analysis of organizational processes can be done effectively via case studies and the organizational rhetoric I chose for analysis directly corresponds to this concern. When new faculty members join the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at the University of North Texas (UNT), they receive a copy of the guidelines with their contract (K. Anderson, personal correspondence, July 20, 2008). These guidelines are the primary source of official information available for faculty

members navigating the tenure process, thus, the policies qualify as an appropriate artifact for examination of a process. In addition, Hambright and Diamantes (2004) suggested “case studies provide insightful generalizations essential to educational inquiry” (p. 436). The authors utilized a case study approach to examine the experiences of a junior faculty member during her or his first year of the tenure-track process. The experiences culled from the current analysis revealed events that might be repeated in other tenure processes.

According to Bormann (1982), an effective FTA requires examination of multiple texts from which themes emerge and result in a coherent narrative understanding of specific characters or agents who act within a scene. As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, I choose the UNT CAS promotion and tenure policies for this project for several reasons. The implementation of a new mission statement implies a period of transition intended to create an institution that balances researching and teaching. In addition, the comments from the Peer Review Team regarding tenure policies appear to contradict the hybrid institution advertised in the new mission statement. Lastly, my personal experience as a student at UNT allowed me to observe several tenure-track faculty members currently enmeshed in the process.

Currently, UNT has 211 individuals (D. Randolph, personal correspondence, July 17, 2008) participating in the tenure track process. Promotion and tenure policies developed for such a large population makes the UNT promotion and tenure policies an adequate representational sample of a promotion process. However, the broad generalizations of the university level promotion and tenure policies required analysis of the policies at the college level. I chose CAS policies for my artifact because the CAS is

the largest and most diverse college at UNT including departments from the sciences, social sciences, humanities and performing arts (College, n.d.). The policy is accessible through the CAS website and is titled “University of North Texas College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Documentation of Promotion and/or Tenure Cases” (revised February 28, 2008). The policies begin with some general information for the audience, but the bulk of the material relates to the submission of the faculty dossier. The guidelines are provided in outline format and most entries are written in passive voice. Additional information regarding style and content will be provided in the FTA that follows.

Method

Bormann is credited with developing symbolic convergence theory (SCT), the foundation of FTA (Foss, 2004). The concepts behind SCT require acceptance of the assumptions that “communication creates reality,” and, that “individuals’ meanings for symbols can converge to create a shared reality or community consciousness” (Foss, p. 110). Bormann (1985) claimed:

If several or many people develop portions of their private symbolic worlds that overlap as a result of symbolic convergence, they share a common consciousness and have the basis for communicating with one another to create community, to discuss their common experiences, and to achieve mutual understanding. (p. 102)

Proof of a symbolic convergence can be found by uncovering recurrent “themes” within a discourse (Foss, 2004, p. 110). Bormann (1976) identified these themes as fantasy themes and posited that fantasies “fulfill a psychological or rhetorical need” (p. 434).

Foss further explained:

Fantasy is 'the creative and imaginative interpretation of events,' and a fantasy theme is the means through which the interpretation is accomplished in communication. Fantasy themes tell a story about a group's experience that constitutes a constructed reality for the participants. (pp. 110-111)

The process of communicating a fantasy between group members functions similar to a drama and contains the same elements present within a drama: character, action, and setting (Bormann, 1972; Foss, 2004). The individual(s) performing the action(s) represent the character theme, although some researchers (Foss, 2004; Jackson, 2000) refer to them as agents or actors. The plot of the drama can be found in the action themes, and setting themes reflect the place(s) where the action takes place. These elements comprise a fantasy theme, or dramatization, which group members share through communicative behaviors (Bormann; Foss; Jackson).

The process of sharing fantasies within a group is referred to as a "chaining process" (Jaisinski, 2001, p. 248). As themes are "circulated, revised, and/or elaborated by other members of the group," group fantasizing occurs (Jaisinski, p. 248). For example, as junior faculty members perform actions related to specific fantasy themes, they are chaining the process out to other junior faculty members thus creating a shared reality. This process of chaining links the individuals performing those actions to a rhetorical vision.

Bormann (1972) defined a rhetorical vision as a "composite drama which catch up large groups of people in a symbolic reality" and succeed in "changing their behavior" (pp. 398-399). Participation within a rhetorical vision results in individuals taking action and the fantasy themes direct the action of the character. According to Bormann and Foss (2004), motivations for individuals who belong to a rhetorical community lie in the rhetorical vision. Bormann wrote "motives do not exist to be

expressed in the communication but rather arise in the expression itself and come to be embedded in the drama of the fantasy themes that generated and serve to sustain them” (p. 406). For Bormann, the most important issue was that “motives are in the messages” (p. 406) consequently the message should be the ultimate focus of analysis. Analysis of organizational rhetoric related to promotion and tenure using FTA provided an excellent vehicle to examine what messages might be communicated to junior faculty members who utilize these documents to make sense of the tenure process.

When fantasy themes containing the same elements are played out within a rhetorical vision over and over, they are categorized as a fantasy type (Foss, 2004; Jasinski, 2001). Bormann (1982) wrote:

When a community of people have come to share the fantasy type until it is thoroughly ingrained in their consciousness they will respond to general statements which allude to the type or to code words that signal the type without the supporting references to specific themes. (p. 295)

Fantasy types are more abstract or broad than fantasy themes and they do not refer to an entire rhetorical vision. The addition of the analysis of fantasy types allows the critic to identify shared fantasy themes exemplary of a rhetorical vision. When group members experience something new that fits into a previously recognized fantasy type, they accept the new event as part of their shared reality (Bormann, 1982; Foss, 2004). Individuals who share a collective reality have access to scripts that promote community, prescribe roles, and endorse behaviors. Bormann posited that the inclusion of fantasy types in FTA allows the critic to examine how fantasies are shared within larger communities. Because the tenure process encompasses a large group of individuals, inclusion of fantasy type in this analysis proved to be crucial.

FTA of character, action, and setting themes located in promotion and tenure policies provided significant material for analysis that consequently led into the identification of a unique rhetorical vision which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Analysis

When I began this study, I expected FTA of promotion and tenure policies would provide an organized method to examine what type of messages might be communicated to junior faculty members who utilize these documents for guidance through the tenure process. I began analysis by examining the UNT CAS promotion and tenure policies for fantasy themes, utilizing the elements provided by Bormann (1972): character, action, and setting. I looked specifically for characters and actions that are rewarded by tenure. I expected to find actions for specific characters, but most specifically, I expected to find actions related to the candidate and the academic roles of junior faculty members. However, it quickly became apparent that the policies were not written as a list of requirements or specifications. As I mentioned above, even the title of the document proved to be a foreshadowing of things to come. In the title, the word “documentation” proved noteworthy. As I coded characters and their actions, I quickly realized the policies were intended to function as instructions for the *physical* preparation of a dossier and not, as I expected, as guidelines for performing the academic roles related to achieving tenure.

However, as I continued to examine the policies, I realized that although explicit actions related to roles were not visible, I recognized a significant number of implicit actions that were connected to the candidate and to the roles associated with a junior

faculty member in an academic institution. Before unpacking the implicit actions revealed through FTA, I will provide a review of the explicit actions and the characters associated with those actions. This explanation will help lay a foundation for understanding how the implicit action items are embedded in the policies.

Character Theme: Faculty and Administration

Because FTA focuses so intently on actions (Bormann, 1972; Foss, 2004), the characters performing the most actions play the more significant role in analysis. The following characters were identified: Candidate (for tenure), CAS, Department, Department Chair, Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, External Reviewer, and Mentor. Both internal and external faculty members are present although the role of the external faculty members lies solely in the external review portion of the process. The two characters who figure most prominently in the process are the candidate and the Department Chair. Analysis revealed that the candidate is responsible for 12 explicit actions in the process and the Department Chair is tasked with 13 items. The explicit actions for candidates include items such as preparing a Curriculum Vita (CV) and providing the Department Chair with list of possible external reviewers. The Department Chairs' action items revolve around mainly administrative tasks related to the process although clearly, the requirement to provide an independent evaluation of the candidate suggests she or he must also be aware of the implicit action items required of a candidate. Thus, I argue there are two overarching character themes present in the promotion and tenure policies: Faculty and Administration.

It is important at this point to note that although faculty members enact administrative roles such as Department Chair, and function in the tenure process in many roles, any reference to faculty from this point forward can be assumed to include tenured and untenured faculty members regardless of their role in the tenure process. Although the identification of the candidate will be necessary in some instances, this definition includes the tenure candidate as faculty. Furthermore, references to Administration or Administrators should be interpreted as a reference to the overarching administrative system inherent in a higher education institution such as Deans, Provosts, Vice Presidents, and Presidents.

Setting Theme: Academia

Foss (2004) stipulated that setting “not only describes where the action takes place but may also describe the characteristics of that scene” (p. 112). Clearly, the tenure process takes place in a common setting, institutions of higher learning. However, the characteristics of this setting provide some of the more critical components of this analysis. As I discussed in Chapter 2, today’s university reflects a dynamic and fluid organization that continues to evolve in tandem with society. A significant turning point for the modern university was the development of the tenure process. Created in part to protect intellectual freedom (Altbach, 1995; Douglas, 1992; Lucas, 1994), the tenure process became a complex and ever changing process found in most institutions of higher learning. Eventually, the phrase intellectual freedom (also referred to as academic freedom) became an accepted element of the vernacular associated with tenure. Therefore, both intellectual freedom and tenure characterize the

setting for this analysis. Both of these characteristics have a great influence on the two main characters associated with the promotion and tenure policies – faculty and administration.

Both faculty and administration depend on intellectual freedom. Intellectual freedom ensures faculty members can engage in scholarship without censorship (Lucas, 1994; Mallon, 2001; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Intellectual freedom allows faculty members to research the topics they find pertinent and to share those findings with students. Intellectual freedom allows faculty members to “think in new ways, test theories held as sacrosanct, and flourish uninhibited by the fears of retaliation” (Tierney & Bensimon, p. 18). These activities are necessary if new knowledge is to be created and shared.

However, without tenure, intellectual freedom becomes open to attacks from several avenues. First, tenure provides a contractual, legal protection that guarantees faculty members the right to research subjects of their choosing (Mallon). In addition, tenure provides faculty members with job security, allowing them time to complete longitudinal research without fear of dismissal for not completing projects in a timely manner (Mallon, 2001). Lastly, the award of tenure often requires a significant publishing record in a fairly short amount of time. Once a junior faculty member meets the publishing criteria for tenure, the fear of up or out is gone and she or he can adjust her or his schedule to allow for a less frantic approach to research.

The characteristics of intellectual freedom and tenure are of significant importance to administrators as well. Intellectual freedom allows faculty members to engage in research that results in the production of new knowledge. Without the

production of new knowledge, universities cannot keep up with societal demands to produce educated individuals capable of developing new technologies and teaching the next generation (Lucas, 1994; Mallon, 2001). In addition, classrooms devoid of intellectual freedom restrict the creativity of faculty members. College enrollments are necessary for the success of the university organization and students are drawn to courses that interest and excite them (Silverman, 2001).

Successful faculty members ensure successful universities. Thus, tenure is also important to administrators. Because of the up or out stipulation, faculty members are motivated to complete the actions required of them for the award of tenure. For administrators, the up or out approach to tenure ensures that only faculty members that meet university standards earn the right to tenure and intellectual freedom. This provides university administration security in the knowledge that the tenured faculty members imparting knowledge to the students, and adding knowledge to the field through research, are qualified to do so (Furniss, 1981).

The setting of this analysis, academia, contains characteristics unique to the university organization and to the tenure process. A review of the actions that occur within this setting complete the analysis for fantasy themes embedded in the promotion and tenure policies and allow me to apply a thorough FTA to this artifact.

Action Theme: Implied

As mentioned before, initial examination of the policies revealed that the actions implied in the fantasy themes offer greater insight into the tenure process than do the actions required for the preparation of the dossier. These implied action items refer to

events that must take place prior to the preparation of the dossier if the candidate is going to be able to include them in their dossier. Since the award of tenure is based on the events listed in the dossier, then junior faculty members will be motivated by the award of tenure to complete those actions.

Actions for characters involved in the tenure process are created rhetorically in the promotion and tenure policies. As junior faculty members interpret the promotion and tenure policies, they respond by performing the actions they perceive to be important for their professional success. FTA is based on the assumption that actions result from the motivations inherent in the setting. The motivations for both faculty members and administration can be found in the two main characteristics of the setting, intellectual freedom and tenure. For tenure candidates, successful completion of the tenure process ensures they have met the qualifications necessary to receive the award of tenure, which also guarantees faculty members intellectual freedom. Thus, motivated by the security inherent in the award of tenure, junior faculty members interpret what actions are necessary to achieve tenure. FTA analysis revealed that the implicit actions in the promotion and tenure policy provide a much more detailed explanation of those actions that originally thought.

A review of each of the explicit action items reveals implicit action items that must be completed in the past so that the candidate can include them in their dossier. For example, although one explicit action item requires a candidate to submit a complete and current *curriculum vita* (CV), the list of accomplishments that are to be included on the CV (see Appendix B) suggests that inclusion of those items is important for a successful tenure application.

Faculty members (character) are explicitly involved in the submission of a dossier (action) in order to achieve tenure (setting characteristic). The dossier must include a CV, a list of productions, performances, exhibitions, seminar presentations etc., a personal essay, teaching evaluations, a copy of individual annual performance evaluations, and five external evaluation letters (including a CV of the reviewers). This fantasy theme advises group members of future actions (submitting the dossier) and requires interpretation of past events (the implied actions embedded in the explicit actions). For example, the policies provide a detailed list of the types of publications that should be included on the junior faculty member's CV. The list includes books and journal articles and provides specific instructions on the information required for each type of publication included on the CV (see Appendix B). Therefore, when junior faculty members (character) compile their dossier (explicit action) for tenure (setting), they should have already completed the actions connected with publishing (implicit action). Thus a fantasy has been created that functions as a means of communicating expectations between the administration and junior faculty members involved in the tenure process.

Fantasy Themes

Foss described a fantasy theme as “a word, phrase, or statement that interprets events in the past, envisions events in the future, or depicts current events that are removed in time and/or space from the actual activities of a group” (pp. 110-111). A fantasy theme summarizes the motivations and actions of the characters within the setting into a specific word or phrase allowing for the development of short hand

understanding between group members who share the fantasy. The drama summarized by the fantasy theme engages group members in a shared reality. Thus, as Foss (2004) noted fantasy themes narrate a collective experience resulting in a constructed reality for the group members.

The promotion and tenure policies inform group members that the reality of achieving tenure is tied to the actions they should have already completed. The placement of these items in the policy also warrants discussion. Other than a CAS and UNT checklist and a basic information form, the first item listed for dossier preparation is the CV. The remaining items (personal essay, teaching evaluation forms, etc.) follow. The emphasis on research and publishing, in particular in the explicit and implicit actions required of junior faculty members in the tenure process, evoke a fantasy theme of Publish or Perish. The Publish or Perish fantasy theme can be isolated upon further examination of the specific action items in the CAS tenure and promotion guidelines. The action items related to research and publishing, both explicit and implicit, appear to require more detail than the other items listed on the dossier. The placement of the publication specifications at the top of the list of items for inclusion in the dossier, as well as the apparent weight given to such criteria suggest that the Publish or Perish fantasy theme may well be the dominant fantasy theme in this scenario.

The second item required for completion of the candidates' dossier is the personal essay. The composition of a personal essay (explicit action) for inclusion in the dossier includes implied actions that must have already occurred as well as a prediction of events to come. Junior faculty members must include information related to research

that has already been conducted as well as evidence that their research priorities are sustainable. Therefore, this action also belongs to the Publish or Perish fantasy theme.

The Publish or Perish fantasy theme relies heavily on the perceived motivations of the junior faculty as those motivations relate to the setting. As noted earlier, faculty who do not receive tenure are asked to leave the university. Despite this common understanding, the consequence of failing to achieve tenure is not explicitly stated in the tenure and promotion guidelines. Thus, the job security motivations of junior faculty members clarify the implicit Perish portion of the fantasy theme.

Furthermore, the implied motivations of junior faculty members, the lack of detail in the tenure and promotion guidelines, and the reliance of implied actions in the tenure and promotion guidelines support the claim that Publish or Perish is a fantasy type. Fantasy types contain the same elements in the fantasy themes, but they are played out over and over (Foss, 2004) and may speak to a larger audience (Bormann, 1982). The notion of Publish or Perish exists beyond the specific rhetorical vision uncovered in this specific organizational rhetoric. The Publish or Perish concept appears in literature (Douglas, 1992; Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995; Lucas, 1994; Rushing & Frenz, 1999) and most academics have at least heard of the adage. Publishing requirements are generally a part of the promotion and tenure policy and junior faculty members who fail to meet the requirements necessary for tenure find themselves unemployed and looking for a new career (up or out).

While other actions related to the role of teaching are included in the candidates' dossier, the lack of detail provided in the tenure and promotion documents and setting do not provide adequate information to document the chaining out of an additional

fantasy theme associated with teaching. Future research could explore additional themes if specific candidates' dossiers or personal interviews were examined to clarify the chaining out of any fantasy themes related to teaching.

The Rhetorical Vision: The Tenure Process

In FTA, a group of individuals who share the same fantasy themes are assumed to belong to a rhetorical community who share common symbolic ground and respond to messages in a similar fashion (Bormann, 1972; Foss, 2004; Jackson, 2000) Bormann stipulated that these rhetorical visions could take place in many diverse instances including "face-to-face interacting groups and speaker-audience transactions" (p. 398). As mentioned above, careful analysis of fantasy themes allows for these visions to emerge and the enactment of the actions within the themes provide the dramatization that is categorized as a rhetorical vision.

A thorough examination of the setting, character, and action themes communicated by the UNT promotion and tenure policies, confirm the presence of fantasy themes as discussed above and I argue the tenure process meets the criteria to be perceived as a rhetorical vision. Junior faculty members caught up in the drama of the promotion and tenure process share a symbolic reality that defines the award of tenure. Bormann (1982) argued that communication within a viable rhetorical vision is "the means by which the community makes and implements plans and interprets its success and failure" (p. 292).

The policies prescribe roles that will result in the award of tenure. The reward inherent in tenure acts as motivation for the junior faculty member to enact the actions

sanctioned within the policies. The community uses the promotion and tenure policies to successfully navigate the tenure process and interprets the inability to achieve tenure as a failure.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The goal of this project was to examine how junior faculty members perceive the roles of teacher and researcher as they relate to the tenure process. In addition, I sought to gain an understanding of how promotion and tenure policies affect junior faculty's performance of those roles. I utilized a mixed method to collect data regarding faculty perceptions via a survey consisting of 14 Likert scale questions and three open-ended questions. In addition, I employed the rhetorical method of FTA to examine the promotion and tenure policies utilized by the UNT CAS to identify what types of messages might be communicated in this instance of organizational rhetoric. Each of the methods revealed insightful information regarding junior faculty roles and the key findings are summarized below.

Key Findings

Quantitative

The results of the quantitative analysis revealed two trends. First, faculty that identified as affiliated with both research institutions and hybrid institutions (valuing both research and teaching equally) reported they privilege the role of researcher over the role of teacher as it relates to the tenure process. Although this finding is not surprising in regards to junior faculty members at research institutions, the revelation that faculty members at hybrid universities privilege the role of researcher is noteworthy simply because the phrase hybrid suggests a more balanced approach. The second trend relates to participants that reported affiliation with teaching institutions. Again, not

surprisingly, these faculty members reported that they privilege the role of teacher over researcher as it relates to the tenure process. Although the bulk of these findings do not represent groundbreaking scholarship, the data becomes significant when the results from the other two methods are taken into account. Further discussion regarding these findings as they relate to the qualitative and rhetorical methods will be discussed later in this chapter.

Qualitative

As the responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed, themes related to each of the questions began to emerge. The first question, “Briefly explain how important your role as researcher is in the promotion and tenure process,” revealed three clear themes: Publish or Perish, Role Confusion, and the Grapevine. The second question, “Briefly explain how important your role as teacher is in the promotion and tenure process” resulted in three themes: Teacher Role Primary and Teacher Role Secondary, and No Value, High Risk. The last question, “How do you balance the roles between teacher and researcher as you work towards tenure” resulted in four themes, To Research or To Teach, Teaching in Research, Calendar & Clock, and Strategies (Im)Balance. The participants narratives provided clear insight into faculty perceptions of the two roles under observation in this study. Consideration of these responses, in tandem with the results of the other two methods, provide a clear path for additional research into the roles associated with promotion and tenure policies. A discussion regarding these implications follows later in this chapter.

Fantasy Theme Analysis (FTA)

Rhetorical analysis of the promotion and tenure policies provided important insight into how messages regarding promotion and tenure policies are communicated to junior faculty members. My analysis resulted in two prominent findings. First, I identified a fantasy type which I label “Publish or Perish.” In addition, I located the presence of a rhetorical vision I refer to as “Tenure.” These findings become more significant when combined with the results from the other methods utilized in this study. Discussion of those comparisons is provided below.

General Discussion

Publish or Perish

Results from all three methods provided a direct correlation to the concept of Publish or Perish. As I discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, “publish or perish” is a well-known paradigm and is often referred to in academic literature (Douglas, 1992; Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995; Lucas, 1994; Rushing & Frenztz, 1999).

The quantitative survey revealed that participants affiliated with both research and hybrid institutions recognize the role of researcher as critical for success in the tenure process. Although this finding is not a surprise, it confirms the results of the qualitative and rhetorical studies. Narratives gathered in the qualitative portion of the study suggest that publishing requirements at both research and hybrid institutions are the key criteria for tenure and both the implicit and explicit actions found within the promotion and tenure policies during FTA corroborate this perspective. Additionally, responses to the qualitative portion of the study suggest that the publish or perish

paradigm is communicated via informal organizational rhetoric (e.g. information passed between faculty members) as junior faculty members turn to the Grapevine in order to understand the implicit actions required of them to achieve tenure. Furthermore, junior faculty members might then utilize this informal organizational rhetoric in order to determine how they will perform the roles of teacher and researcher.

Although the quantitative study suggested that individuals at teaching universities recognize an emphasis on the role of researcher in the tenure process, the qualitative portion of the study. In some cases, respondents at teaching universities wrote that research and teaching are weighted equally while others reported that although teaching performance is the primary criteria for tenure, they are still expected to publish in order to achieve tenure. If publishing is required in the tenure process, then the publish or perish concept still applies at some teaching universities.

Fantasy types allow for common understanding of fantasy themes across a broader audience. The respondents in the survey represent multiple types of institutions, yet a common thread is visible. This common thread allows group members to chain out the fantasies regardless of the type of institution with which they are affiliated. For example, respondents from hybrid institutions subscribe to the fantasy that publishing plays a greater part in the tenure process even though a hybrid institution suggests a more equitable dispersion of role behaviors would be apparent.

The responses in the qualitative portion of the study provided for a greater understanding of the results found during FTA. The rhetorical analysis revealed that scholarly work related to publishing plays an important role in the promotion and tenure process. A consideration of the participants responses in conjunction with the actions

embedded in the policies suggest different degrees of action (specifically expectations of publishing quality and quantity) in the Publish or Perish fantasy type exist.

As I mentioned above, FTA resulted in identification of a fantasy type I have labeled Publish or Perish. A fantasy type is a scenario with common setting, character, and action themes shared by group members (Foss, 2004). In this analysis, junior faculty members comprise the group or community and within this community, the Publish or Perish scenario occurs again and again. In each scenario the setting is academia, the characters are represented by junior faculty member and administrator, and the actions relate to the role of researcher. Foss wrote:

Once a fantasy type has developed, rhetors do not need to provide an audience with details about the specific fantasy theme it covers. They simply state the general story line of the fantasy type or refer to one of the fantasy themes in the scenario, and the audience is able to call up the specific details of the entire scenario. (p. 112)

Thus, when junior faculty members refer to publishing requirements for tenure purposes, they automatically communicate to their audience all the details inherent in Publish or Perish. This finding becomes especially significant as it relates to organizational rhetoric.

In Crables' (1990) system of organizational rhetoric, members of the audience will eventually begin "to function as rhetors" and at this point, the critics' focus must be turned to those individuals to "assess their rhetorical activity and their own constituencies" (p. 122). Within higher education, junior faculty members function as the audience for the promotion and tenure policies. However, the rhetoric in those policies influences the communicative behaviors of the junior faculty members. In turn, the communicative behaviors of the faculty member could also be examined as

organizational rhetoric as the faculty member rhetorically functions as a “spokesperson” for other audiences within the organization. One of the key elements of organizational rhetoric revolves around the ability of “organizations to ‘speak to’ and enlist the ‘voices’ of individual persons” (Cheney, 1991, p. 15).

Crable (1990) asserted that audience members eventually begin to act as “spokespersons.” Junior faculty members communicate the Publish or Perish fantasy type through communicative behaviors and thus, chain out the fantasy type to create a rhetorical vision. However, fantasy type may mean different things in terms of explicit behavior. For example, when asked about the role of research in tenure, some faculty members from research universities mentioned specific numbers of publications (e. g. “6 in 6 years”; “one a year”), while others indicated the quality of publication as illustrated by Participant 102 (assistant professor, research university) who wrote that tenure is “very dependent on research – national journals and/or books preferred.” In contrast, some respondents at teaching institutions replied with a variety of specific actions including Participant 127 (assistant professor) who wrote, “Must complete one contribution, pub or proceeding, at least once a year” and Participant 78 (assistant professor) wrote, “conference presentations and continuing education activities or more the norm.” Thus, the action of publishing in the Publish or Perish fantasy type varies based on specific organizational rhetoric. The specific academic institutions expectations will influence the explicit actions related to number of publications and publication outlets for each junior faculty member.

While each individual faculty member will filter the fantasy type through their specific institution’s organizational rhetoric regarding the promotion and tenure process,

the drama of the tenure process is shared across various institutions of higher learning as demonstrated in my qualitative results. Thus, the faculty engage in a shared rhetorical vision called “Tenure.”

Rhetorical Vision

According to Jasinski (2001), FTA provides researchers with insight into how discursive and symbolic processes work to construct social reality and to examine how acts of persuasion occur within those social realities. According to FTA, when a group of people share a social reality, they constitute a rhetorical community. Groups create rhetorical communities by participating in a shared rhetorical vision. A rhetorical vision is the overarching coherent narrative that results in a symbolic drama (Foss, 2004).

Based on analysis of the promotion and tenure policies, the tenure process qualifies as a rhetorical vision. For ease in discussion, from this point forward I will refer to this rhetorical vision as Tenure.

The fantasy theme that occurs most often in the promotion and tenure policies is the one related to publishing/research. Although this theme is identified through implied actions, the theme is obvious. A rhetorical vision usually contains several fantasy themes, however, as noted my analysis is limited by the information available in my artifact. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the promotion and tenure policies consist of a mix of both explicit and implicit action items. The location of action items is critical to analyzing a text via FTA because fantasy themes require dramatizations of actions. As these actions are dramatized (enacted) they chain out into both small and large groups. Unfortunately, I cannot locate additional fantasy themes within my current artifact.

However, the responses to the qualitative portion of the study hints that other fantasy themes exist in the Tenure rhetorical vision. One of these themes relates to the tension between the teacher and researcher role. Without fail, every participant reported they must balance the roles required for tenure. Even participants who recognize a need to privilege one role over the other in certain situations, acknowledge that the other role still has to be addressed.

Role Conflicts

Tang and Chamberlain (1997) claimed that the requirement to “publish while carrying heavy teaching loads leads to role conflicts” (p. 213). Individuals who report affiliation with both research and hybrid universities reported the lowest amount of confusion regarding the publishing requirements at their institutions. However, the comments received from participants suggest the path is not always clear. Although one respondent (Participant 47, assistant professor, research university) reported explicit knowledge of the specific publishing requirements related to promotion and tenure (“Must have at least 6 pubs in 6 years”), another wrote:

It is 45% of my responsibility allocation, but I’m not sure that tells the whole story. I think its more that I need to have quality or quantity of pubs. I’m not sure how they can translate that into a percentage. (Participant 128, assistant professor, research university)

The role conflict between research and teaching is apparent in many responses from faculty at teaching institutions. For example, Participant 29 (assistant professor, teaching university) wrote:

As a small, private university, this organization has aspirations of more research-focus. While we are supposed to focus on teaching, a colleague recently failed to receive tenure for lack of publications. This indicates to me that we are

expected to produce research regardless of the school's expectations of teaching.

As this quote demonstrates, and other respondents answers echo, the frustration and confusion of having high teaching loads at teaching institutions that also require increasing amounts of research causes the confusion and stress as demonstrated in the Strategies of (Im)Balance theme. Many of the respondents who participated in the study demonstrated a tension between researching and teaching. Some manage by privileging one role over another as discussed in the To Research or To Teach theme, while others work during vacations such as the winter and summer terms in order to achieve the expectations of the tenure process as noted in the Strategies of (Im)Balance theme.

Role conflict is exacerbated by the use of the grapevine in disseminating information about the implicit actions needed to navigate the tenure process successfully. As noted in the FTA the CAS promotion and tenure guidelines imply a variety of actions to be completed prior to preparing a dossier for review. As noted by some respondents in the qualitative interviews, faculty learn about expectations through a variety of individuals in the organization. The Grapevine theme provides strong evidence for the inclusion of responses from individual organization members to demonstrate the chaining out of the rhetorical vision of tenure.

As noted by Cheney (1991), the voices of individual persons can be a key feature of organizational rhetoric. Expectations for action are communicated via the grapevine. The process of interpreting the promotion and tenure policies and general shared rhetorical vision of tenure in the specific academic institution relies on existing organization members providing guidance in interpreting the rhetorical vision of tenure

in a localized context. However, FTA does not account for shifting localized context. As Foss notes, fantasy themes depict character(s), action(s) and setting removed from actual group interaction. However, the Grapevine theme demonstrates that the interaction between group members is crucial to successful achievement of the rhetorical vision of Tenure.

Thus, the rhetorical vision of Tenure and fantasy type of Publish or Perish provide a general framework to understand the organizational rhetoric of the tenure process in the academy, but FTA of this specific artifact does not clarify or resolve the ambiguity of the tenure process or the role conflict experienced by faculty. However, FTA of promotion and tenure policies from a variety of institutions, as well as a review of a more inclusive range of both formal and informal organizational rhetoric, in-depth personal interviews, and dossier reviews might provide a more comprehensive picture of the tenure process and the effect of these processes on junior faculty perceptions.

Limitations and Implications for Further Inquiry

While the conclusions I draw in this project add to our understanding of the tenure process, the project has several limitations. Initially, the reliability of the teacher role sub-scale is marginal. A full redesign of the teacher and research role scales would strengthen the consistency and generalizability of the quantitative results. A redesign of the scale would allow it to function optimally.

While the quantitative and qualitative results of faculty at hybrid institutions are evocative and seem to imply a research first perspective, only 17 respondents from hybrid institutions replied to the survey. Thus, future research endeavors should attempt

to capture the perspectives of faculty at self-identified hybrid institutions. To gain more in-depth information from junior faculty members at hybrid institutions, personal interviews should be conducted in conjunction with analysis of the organizational rhetoric related to promotion and tenure at those institutions.

Furthermore, the FTA was hindered by a lack of explicit actions within the UNT CAS promotion and tenure policies. While at first glance these policies looked like a good rhetorical artifact, they proved to be limited in providing the evidence necessary for a chaining out process. Thus, in order to utilize FTA in the future for this purpose, additional materials must be analyzed. For example, I could analyze promotion and tenure policies from multiple institutions, as well as Department promotion and tenure guidelines, in-depth personal interviews and candidate dossiers.

One of the more interesting themes to emerge from the qualitative responses suggested that faculty members often turn to other faculty members for information regarding the promotion and tenure process. This finding suggests that promotion and tenure policies do not provide enough specific information, or that explicit information is not necessary in the promotion and tenure policies, because the rhetorical vision “Tenure” provides a shared understanding that is constructed through a socialization process that occurs as individuals complete graduate school and enter academia as faculty. As noted in the literature review, graduate students often adopt the practices of their advisors and mentors (Bess, 1978, as cited in Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995). Thus, future research should also explore Ph.D. candidates understanding of the tenure process in order to understand how the rhetorical vision is constructed through the socialization process within academia. Additional research related to the Grapevine

theme might explore storytelling within organizations, internal and external organizational rhetoric, or organizational narrative fidelity.

Some respondents expressed confusion related to shifting organizational missions and goals. This finding suggests that future researchers might need to focus on the changing nature of bureaucratic organizations and the resulting modifications to policies and requirements related to the tenure process. The general nature of bureaucracy in organizations may create a lag between perceived and actual expectations in the tenure process. The resulting confusion could lead to increased stress and anxiety that would mirror those in the qualitative responses as noted in the section on role conflict. In order to understand the tenure process in these types of changing organizations, the exploration of organizational rhetoric from various universities may be useful in providing solutions to organizations facing challenges regarding changes in the tenure process.

Additionally, one respondent addressed the issue of gender, and in particular pregnancy, as a significantly stressful event that might interrupt the tenure process. While the open-ended questions did not request specific information regarding possible obstacles to the tenure process, multiple respondents mentioned the impact of tenure on personal life in their responses. The participants responses highlighted the importance of gender and life circumstances in navigation of the tenure process. The work versus home balance is evoked in multiple other responses related to giving up vacation time and family time in order to manage both the researcher and teacher roles simultaneously. Further exploration of the constraints and strategies used to balance

home life with work during the tenure process would be beneficial for junior faculty members. Interviews or open-ended surveys could provide this type of information.

Conclusion

As demonstrated in this project, the tenure process is a crucial component in academia. Through a quantitative and qualitative survey, as well as a FTA, I have demonstrated how junior faculty manage the roles of teacher and researcher as they relate to the tenure process. Furthermore, in my findings I argue that tenure functions as a rhetorical vision. Organizational rhetoric used to describe the tenure process provides insight into the complex nature of this process.

The intellectual freedom and job security assured by the tenure process provides benefits to both the administration and the faculty. This project provides insight into part of the process. However, as noted above, future research is crucial to understanding how the tenure process fully function as a rhetorical vision and how specific institutions organizational rhetoric may clarify, or hinder, the tenure process for junior faculty.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY

This study is an attempt to assess the affect of organizational rhetoric in regards to attitudes toward tenure and promotion in higher education on junior faculty members. Please provide honest and complete answers to all questions. Identity of participants will remain anonymous.

Please tell us a little about yourself (Circle appropriate answer or fill in the blank):

1. Gender: _____
2. Marital Status: _____ Single Married/Partner Separated/Divorced
3. Highest level of education (Masters Degree, Ph.D.): _____
4. Age (in years): _____
5. Institution Type (Public OR Private): _____
6. College (i.e. Arts & Sciences): _____
7. Discipline (i.e. Communication Studies, English, etc.): _____
8. Title (i.e. Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Adjunct, etc.): _____
9. Does your university self-identify as a teaching or a research university? If so, how does it identify: _____

Please complete the survey listed below. Please keep in mind your university and department promotion and tenure policies as you complete the survey.

1 – Strongly Disagree,; 2- Disagree; 3 - Are Undecided; 4 – Agree; or 5 – Strongly Agree. Circle the number of your response in each row. Work quickly and just record your first impressions.

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1. Tenure decisions depend upon the quantity of published research and/or creative work	1	2	3	4	5
2. Tenure decisions depend upon the quality of published research and/or creative work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Tenure decisions depend upon the number of courses taught	1	2	3	4	5
4. Tenure decisions depend on student evaluations	1	2	3	4	5
5. Tenure decisions depend on my ability to work collaboratively & effectively with professional colleagues on research?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Tenure decisions depend on my ability to work collaboratively & effectively with professional colleagues on instructional development?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Tenure decisions depend on one's ability to secure <i>research</i> grants or fellowships	1	2	3	4	5

8. Tenure decision depend on one's ability to secure <i>teaching</i> grants or fellowships	1	2	3	4	5
9. The promotion and tenure polices influence the amount of time I dedicate to my role as a teacher	1	2	3	4	5
10. The promotion and tenure policies influence the amount of time I dedicate to my role as a researcher	1	2	3	4	5
11. My university rewards activities related to the role of <i>teacher</i>	1	2	3	4	5
12. My university rewards activities related to the role of <i>researcher</i>	1	2	3	4	5
13. My university offers course releases for research related activities	1	2	3	4	5
14. My university allows for less research related activities based on increased teaching load	1	2	3	4	5

Please open the following open-ended questions regarding your perception of your university's promotion and tenure process:

Questions:

Briefly explain how important your role as researcher is in the promotion and tenure process?

Briefly explain how important your role as teacher is in the promotion and tenure process?

How do you balance the roles between teacher and researcher as you work towards tenure?

APPENDIX B
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GUIDELINES FOR DOCUMENTATION OF
PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE CASES
(REVISED FEBRUARY 28, 2008)

The goal of the College of Arts and Sciences is to oversee a transparent, collegial process that is fair to the faculty member, the department and the College. To this end, these guidelines are provided to assist all of the participants in the tenure and promotion process.

General Information

Notice to Faculty Members/Faculty Rights

To ensure the procedural rights of the candidate, the department Chair will provide a copy of these guidelines to the candidate and to all appropriate departmental committees as soon as a determination has been made that the faculty member is to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. In no case will this occur later than the beginning of the fall semester in which the candidate is applying.

Faculty Responsibilities for Dossier Preparation

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure assume the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that all required materials are available and complete and that the dossier has been prepared following college guidelines.

P&T Sessions

The College conducts two P&T information sessions each year in September. Tenure-track faculty, chairs, mentors and faculty on department and college PAC/PT committees are strongly encouraged to attend.

Review of Material

The College of Arts and Sciences uses a standardized form of documentation for the review of promotion and/or tenure cases. It is the responsibility of the candidate, the department Chair and the department Promotion and Tenure Committee to ensure that materials submitted are in accord with the Faculty Handbook and the College Guidelines. Files that are inconsistent with these guidelines will be returned to the department. While some variation can be expected in order to provide for differences in department procedures and professional activities, documentation deviating from the instructions described under "submission of dossier" will not be accepted.

Promotion and tenure are serious matters affecting the future well-being of the individual, the department, and the university. For a recommendation to receive serious consideration at the College level, full documentation, supported by evidence of

achievement, is required. All such recommendations will be based on department, college and university performance standards.

One original and one copy of the candidate's dossier, along with electronic submission of the candidate's vita, personal essay, department criteria, summary page/rankings of teaching evaluations, PAC recommendation, chair recommendation and external letters will be submitted to the Dean no later than the deadline stated in the CAS Administrative Calendar. In order to ensure that the dossier is complete, departments and divisions will begin the process of examining all potential candidates for promotion and/or tenure early in the fall semester. Of critical importance is the initiation of the outside review process, which involves the identification of qualified referees and the solicitation of their external review letters. Candidates will provide the department chair with the names of potential external reviewers, an updated and complete vita, and selected reprints and supporting materials by the beginning of the fall semester. This timeframe must be followed to ensure that the external letters are available and that the dossier is complete when the department chair and department PAC begin reviewing the candidacy in late October. External reviewer letters and recommendations from the department Chair and Promotion and Tenure Committee will be added after the dossier is submitted to the Chair and before the dossier and supporting materials are forwarded to the Dean's Office. On request of the candidate, the Chair will supply the names of the outside reviewers to the candidate, once all letters have been received and forwarded to the College Personnel Affairs Committee.

Submission of Dossier

Two Sets (one labeled original and one labeled copy) and One Electronic Set (see page 14)

Items are to be placed in 3-ring binders (one inch minimum) - one binder with original material and labeled "original" and one binder with copies and labeled "copy." The binders should include the material in the following IX major sections, with each section separated by index tabs (labeled accordingly) and in the order listed below.

I. CAS and UNT CHECKLISTS (see Attachment A and B)

In order to ensure that all the materials required by the University and College are included in the dossier, the UNT and CAS checklists are required for assembling candidates' materials (see Attachment A and B). The completed checklists including the candidate's name and department are the first entry in the dossier.

II. BASIC INFORMATION FORM, DEPARTMENT CRITERIA AND ORIGINAL OFFER LETTER

This form must be completely filled out (see Attachment C). A copy of the department's promotion and tenure criteria must be included in this section. In the case of candidates who are seeking tenure, this section must also include a copy of the candidate's original offer letter.

III. CURRICULUM VITA AND PERSONAL ESSAY

Curriculum Vita - A complete and current CV must include factual information about the candidate's publications and scholarly/creative activities including exhibits, performances, presentations, or seminars; professional activities including those involving holding of offices in learned societies; membership on professional panels; service to the department, college, or university; and other evidence of professional growth which might be unique to the candidate's discipline. The following will be considered as extremely important.

Publications - The materials will include a brief overview of the categories of publications that are considered typical of a candidate's specific field and their relative importance as contributions in that discipline. If some disciplines have specialized types of publications and/or peer review processes that might be unfamiliar to members of the College PAC, a brief explanation or description of the items must be included in this part of the dossier. The publication section of the CV will separate and identify the candidate's work as follows.

- Books.
- Journal articles.
- In all cases, indicate which publications are peer-reviewed.
- For publications with multiple authors, underline the name of the principal author.
- Note which publications, paper presentations, etc. are the result of grants the candidate has received.
- For publications listed "in press," include a copy of the letter from the editor accepting the publication (include letters of acceptance or page proofs, where applicable, in appendix/supplemental materials folder).
- Where book reviews are listed, separate them from articles and include a statement of their relative importance in the candidate's discipline.
- Where grants or submitted proposals are listed, distinguish between grants for equipment, training, travel, and research; also distinguish between grant proposal awarded and declined.
- A complete bibliographic citation, including page numbers (total number of pages in article) must be provided for each entry in the publications section.

- In an appendix to the vita, note any creative/scholarly work performed during time at a previous institution that has been credited towards the probationary period at UNT
- Productions, Performances, Exhibitions, Seminars Presented, etc. – For activities that were refereed, juried, or critically evaluated, include copies of the evaluations.

Samples of the candidate's work over the time period in question, such as publications, professional work, external evaluations, reviews, will not be included in the file itself. These will be submitted in a portfolio or accordion file folder as addenda to the file.

Personal Essay - The College conducts personal essay workshops each year to assist faculty in preparing this important part of the dossier. Contact the Dean's Office for date information.

The candidate must include an essay describing their teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service accomplishments. The essay should provide context and coherence for all the other tenure materials submitted. In short, the essay is the candidate's opportunity to state their case for tenure. The essay will be approximately four (4) pages long and should address the following.

- The essay must emphasize both the quality and the significance of the candidate's work.
- Evidence for a sustained program of high quality scholarly/creative work must be provided – e.g., paper/book/performance reviews, rankings of journals or exhibitions, extensive publications, and citation indices.
- It is essential to provide perspective that confirms a coherent sustainable professional program that contributes to the advancement of the candidate's field of scholarship or creative work.
- Evidence should be given of development of an area of expertise and how this expertise relates to long-term professional goals.
- It is important that the broader significance of the candidate's expertise be addressed.
- Discussion of teaching activities should include teaching philosophy, curriculum innovation and student mentoring.

IV. TEACHING EVALUATIONS/SUMMARY OF NUMERICAL RANKING

Comprehensive evidence of teaching effectiveness is required, covering the period of time since the appointment or last promotion. Candidates receiving credit for previous years of service must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness from that university.

The candidate and the department must ensure that teaching achievement is demonstrated and properly documented. Documentation must reflect a systematic appraisal of teaching effectiveness and performance including a quantitative assessment of student opinion, peer reviews, input from the department Chair and/or members of the department PAC and where appropriate, assessment by other knowledgeable persons. Accompanying the quantitative assessment will be an explanation of the survey instrument and scoring scheme (departments will attempt to use a standard 1-5 scale, where for example 1 would be the highest rating and 5 the lowest). A summary analysis clearly indicating how the candidate's scores rank relative to the rest of the faculty in the department must be included.

Evaluations must also consider the faculty member's activity in advising students, in supervising graduate students, and in other instructionally related activities.

The candidates should use a portion of the candidate essay to provide information they consider relevant for evaluating their effectiveness as university instructors.

Supporting materials placed in the addenda will include the following items:

- A. Sample syllabi and other relevant pedagogical materials; and
- B. Teaching evaluation forms and the scale of values used on the forms.

V. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS and PROBATIONARY FACULTY FORMS

Include, in reverse chronological order, copies of each of the pertinent annual written evaluations the faculty member has received from the department Personnel Affairs Committee, and/or the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the department Chair since the last personnel decision.

For faculty members seeking tenure, the evaluations must include the Recommendation for Probationary Faculty Form (see Attachment D), along with copies of the Annual Performance Evaluations conducted each year which documents the faculty member's rankings within the department.

If departments do not use the Performance Evaluation Form, then an alternative method of reporting the results of the candidate's annual evaluation of teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service must be included. The evaluation should provide a summary analysis indicating how the candidate's annual evaluation scores rank relative to the rest of the faculty in the department (see Attachment F for an alternative method of a peer evaluation summary form).

For promotion cases, all copies of the Annual Performance Evaluation (see Attachment E for sample) since the last personnel decision are required. Again, if departments do not use the Performance Evaluation Form, then an alternative method of reporting the results of the candidate's annual evaluation of teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service must be included. The evaluation should provide a summary analysis

indicating how the candidate's annual evaluation scores rank relative to the rest of the faculty in the department (see Attachment F for an alternative method of a peer evaluation summary form).

Faculty members may include written communications relative to promotion and/or tenure (such as letters from the Dean).

VI. FIVE EXTERNAL EVALUATION LETTERS AND VITAE OF REVIEWERS

At least five letters of external evaluation must be submitted by persons in the candidate's area of expertise. External reviewer letters will be added after the dossier is submitted to the Chair and before the dossier and supporting materials are forwarded following guidelines. to the Dean's Office. In submitting these letters, departments must adhere to the

- A. Indicate how the external referees were selected, including who submitted each of the names. Indicate who contacted each external referee.
- B. Include a copy of the letter requesting the evaluation from the external reviewer.
- C. The department Chair or whoever was responsible for contacting the external reviewers from the Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide a list of the external reviewers along with a vita for each.
- D. In addition to the vitae for the external reviewers, it is vital that the department provide a brief statement on each reviewer testifying to their credentials, reputation, and appropriateness to serve in this capacity. These statements will be included in the main dossier accompanying the external letters.
- E. The external reviewers providing letters must be selected from tenured faculty or administrators at institutions with programs, at a minimum, comparable to those at the University of North Texas. It is recommended that external reviewers be selected from institutions with the most prominent national/international reputations in the candidate's field.

Reviewers must hold the rank of full professor unless an exception is approved by the Associate Dean for Administrative Affairs. Exceptions will be clearly explained and documented. (An example of an exception would be an associate professor who is a leading researcher in a special sub-field of the discipline. It may also be appropriate to solicit additional letters from researchers in industry. Professionals who are not members of the academic community may also be able to comment on public service activities of the faculty member.)

Reviewers must not be close friends of the faculty member being reviewed and only in extraordinary circumstances should they be graduate school colleagues, former professors, or former colleagues. If the latter are used,

the extraordinary circumstances must be explained, and such letters must be a minority of those submitted with a candidate's dossier.

The external evaluators will be chosen in the following manner.

1. The candidate will submit to the department Chair at least four names and addresses of individuals who he/she believes are professionally capable of evaluating his/her professional achievements. If the names include graduate school colleagues, former professors, or former colleagues, the candidate must justify their inclusion, and the Chair, in consultation with the candidate and appropriate department Promotion and Tenure Committee, must decide if extraordinary circumstances exist to warrant their use. In some cases, the candidate may also supply a list of names of individuals who he/she believes would not be able to serve as objective external reviewers. For example, if the candidate has had a professional conflict of interest with a colleague over a grant proposal or article review, then that person might not be appropriate to serve as an external reviewer. If the candidate does submit such a list, he/she will provide a brief statement on the nature of the conflict and why the individual should be disqualified as an external reviewer.
 2. Members of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee will similarly assemble and submit to the Chair a list of at least four persons so qualified and with the same restrictions as noted in paragraph 1 above. In cases where there are distinct and appropriate disciplinary sub-fields, it is recommended that the committee solicit such names from department faculty of that sub-field.
 3. The department Chair may also submit the names of possible reviewers. The department Chair in concert with the department Promotion and Tenure Committee will select a minimum of five referees from these lists, without revealing those names to the candidate. Consideration will be given to selecting at least one external reviewer from each of the lists provided.
 4. Every letter received must be sent forward with the candidate's file.
- F. If a candidate is reapplying for promotion and/or tenure, then at least five new external letters must be obtained. If reviewers from a previous application are used, then letters from all the reviewers from that application must be solicited. If a reviewer from a previous application does not respond, the previous letter will be included in the candidate's dossier.
- G. Outside reviewers will receive the candidate's complete vita and relevant supporting material, e.g., offprints, personal essay and a copy of the UNT department's criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

- H. The external review letters must address the candidate's record as a scholar, the extent his/her scholarly/creative record constitutes a significant contribution to the discipline, and his or her potential for continued productivity. The reviewers will also address the question of whether the reviewer thinks the candidate should be promoted based on the UNT department's criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- I. Letters of external review will state the reviewer's knowledge of, or relationship to, the candidate. This information will be requested to be part of the letter when arrangements are made for the external reviews. As noted above, letters will not be solicited from close personal friends of the candidate and only under exceptional circumstances from graduate school colleagues, former professors, or former professional colleagues of the candidate. External reviewers will also provide a copy of their vita with their evaluation letter. The vitae for the external reviewers will be placed in the folder with the other supporting materials and not included in the dossier itself.
- J. Upon receipt of the letters of evaluation, the department Chair will submit all of them to the department Promotion and Tenure Committee for use in its deliberations. The committee will include these letters with the evaluation which is sent to the Chair, and the Chair will forward them with the candidate's dossier to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Chair will also forward with these letters a vita for each of the external reviewers.
- K. General practice is that the external letters will not be released to the candidate until the College review process is completed, unless there is a negative decision at the College or Department level.

VII. RECOMMENDATION OF DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE

Recommendations from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will be added after the candidate submits the dossier to the Chair and before the dossier and supporting materials are forwarded to the Dean's Office.

The recommendation of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee will include a narrative statement. The numerical vote of the PAC and list of members must be noted in the narrative along with any minority reports from the committee.

General Instructions

The department Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for preparing an overall departmental assessment of the candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The committee document will focus on an appraisal of the candidate's contributions and upon furnishing insights for reviewers whose disciplines are not the

same as that of the candidate. The committee will evaluate scholarly and creative materials, including work in progress, carefully reading relevant scholarly publications and reviewing artistic productions and works in the applied arts. The committee will also include a history of the candidate's evaluations within the department: while systems for annual peer evaluations vary, as an example, it would be appropriate to include charts, graphs, or tables indicating how this individual has been rated as a teacher, as a professional, and as a contributor to departmental and University life (service), as well as any overall rating comparing this individual with colleagues. Finally, if the committee and the candidate are in disagreement about portions of the candidate's evaluation, the committee will so indicate in this section of the document and provide support not only of its own interpretation but also of efforts to reconcile the differences.

The committee may wish to begin the evaluation with a brief summary or introduction. It may then elect whether to initiate the specific narrative comments with an appraisal of either teaching or professional activities. Under the headings for each evaluative category, a series of sample questions is listed to provide a guide for the committee. The sample questions are not an exclusive list of evaluation criteria. The committee may address additional aspects of the candidate's performance. Professional service is interpreted differently from department to department since it often contains elements of both professional development and pure service. Accordingly, questions on professional service are included under both "Professional Activities" and "Departmental and University Service." The committee will include discussion of professional service under the most appropriate category for that discipline. If professional service is included under "Professional Activities," the committee will briefly justify its inclusion there. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will use the standards and criteria outlined in the department promotion and tenure documents as the guideline in evaluating the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service.

Committee Membership and Voting Eligibility

Membership on departmental tenure and promotion committees will be open to tenured faculty holding the rank of either associate professor or professor. Committee member eligibility to participate in the discussion of, and voting on, a candidate will be determined by the rank to which the candidate aspires. All members of the committee would participate in decisions on candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor. Only members holding the rank of professor would participate in decisions on candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure at the rank of professor.

Instructional Activities

The following paragraph lists questions the Promotion and Tenure Committee could

address related to instructional activities.

Has the individual been a conscientious teacher, willing to devote time and attention to the preparation of courses? Has the individual been an attentive and helpful advisor to students? Has he/she been willing to attempt innovations and experiments in the classroom? Are there any special indicators of this person's merit as a teacher, such as student publications or awards in which the faculty member played a major role, significant awards for teaching excellence, or student demand for this person as a major professor? What evidence did you have in assessing this person's accomplishments as a teacher? (e.g., student evaluations, peer evaluations, classroom visits by chairperson or appropriate departmental committee members, course syllabi, team teacher with candidate, etc.)

Professional Activities

The following paragraph lists questions the Promotion and Tenure Committee could address related to professional activities.

Are publications/performances/exhibitions of a high quality, and how was this assessment made? Are they sufficient in number as identified in the departmental guidelines for promotion and tenure? What contributions does this individual seem to be making to his/her field? Do they believe that this candidate will continue to make contributions in the future? If appropriate, do you think the professional service contributions of this candidate represent a regional and/or national recognition of his/her professional abilities and scholarship? How did you assess the quality of these contributions? What evidence did you have in assessing this person's accomplishments as a professional person? (e.g., peer evaluations, awards)

Departmental and University Service/Professional Services

The following paragraph lists questions the Promotion and Tenure Committee could address related to service activities.

If more appropriate in this category, how do you judge the quality of this individual's contributions to the profession? Is this individual regarded as a good departmental citizen, that is, willing and able to carry out such tasks as committee assignments? How do you assess the quality of this candidate's departmental and University service? What evidence did you have to assess this person's contributions in the service category? (e.g., peer evaluations, evidence from those with whom he/she has served, service citations)

Overall Evaluation

Summary questions the Promotion and Tenure Committee could address are listed below.

What is your overall assessment of this candidate? What are his/her strengths? Weaknesses? How well do you think this individual compares with other persons of the same rank and equivalent experience at other institutions? What evidence do you have to support this assessment? (For example, you might include the history of annual departmental peer evaluations and the statements on the Recommendation for Probationary Faculty Forms.) Does the committee believe that the candidate will continue to perform at a high level? Does the committee believe that the candidate has demonstrated an overall record of quality and quantity in performance across the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service to warrant tenure and/or promotion?

VIII. RECOMMENDATION OF CHAIR

The departmental Chair will provide his/her own independent evaluation of the candidate's dossier. The department Chair's recommendation will be added after the candidate submits the dossier to the Chair and before the dossier and supporting materials are forwarded to the Dean's Office.

THIS LETTER IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TO THE FILE AND SHOULD BRING INTO FOCUS THE MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF THE CASE BEING PRESENTED AND THE FACTORS SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATION.

1. The Chair will address and evaluate achievements in the three traditional areas of teaching, professional activity, and service.
 - a. The Chair will indicate what deficiencies, if any, were noted in previous annual evaluations, what counseling took place, and how these deficiencies have or have not been corrected;
 - b. In tenure cases, the Chair will provide evidence that, in the normal course of appointments (a six-year probationary appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor), counseling of the candidate took place yearly (annual Recommendation for Probationary Faculty forms) and with special emphasis in the third year (midterm) regarding deficiencies, and what would be expected of the candidate in order to achieve tenure. In the case of appointments with credit for prior service, reference must also be made to annual counseling sessions (annual Recommendation for Probationary Faculty Forms, Attachment C).
2. The Chair will explain the relative weighting which he/she assigns to these three areas.

3. If there is an unusual gap in performance in one or more of these areas, such as a sustained period of low teaching evaluations or a long period in which professional achievement has not been demonstrated, the Chair will:
 - a. explain the gap; and
 - b. explain whether he or she believes that the candidate can be reasonably expected to perform as a professional, should promotion be granted.
 4. The Chair will address in his/her letter the vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 5. If there is a difference of opinion between the Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluation of the candidate's dossier, the Chair will address in his/her letter what attempts were taken to resolve the differences. This discussion will occur prior to any submission of material to the Office of the Dean.
 6. Should unresolved differences remain between the Chair and the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, those differences will be reported with appropriate explanation in the Chair's letter.
 7. The department Chair will notify any faculty member of a negative recommendation by either the Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or Chair sufficiently in advance of the date of transmittal to the Dean to allow a departmental appeal, if desired by the candidate. The chair will also notify the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee if he/she makes a negative recommendation on a candidate.
- C. Adverse recommendations from the department for promotion and/or tenure of a faculty member must show additionally:
1. that the faculty member has received copies of the recommendations of the Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee; and
 2. that the faculty member has been informed of the department's appeal procedures. If there is an appeal at the department level, a summary of the findings will be included along with a copy of the current department's appeal procedures.

SPECIAL NOTE: In cases involving tenure recommendations, reference must be made to the following assurance statement by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department Chair.

The tenure recommendations must include the assurance, so far as can be determined, that the individual practices professional integrity; that he or she adheres to high standards of professional ethics; that he or she understands the nature of membership in a community of scholars and has the ability and desire to work as a member of a

group while retaining all rights of individual expression; and that he or she feels a sense of responsibility for the well-being of the University of North Texas and a commitment to work for the accomplishment of its goals.

IX. APPENDIX

A pocket folder of appendix material may be submitted with the dossier if needed. An index tab and a document noting what is included in the appendix should be provided as the last section of the binder.

Electronic Submissions

Dossier documents must be submitted in PDF format by email to the Assistant to the Dean by the CAS calendar deadline. The following documents are required in electronic format and need to be sent as separate documents:

- Department criteria
- Faculty vita
- Personal essay
- Teaching summary
- External letters (each letter must be sent as a separate document)
- Department committee's recommendation
- Chair's recommendation

REFERENCES

- Ali, S. N., Young, H. C., & Ali, N. M. (1996). Determining the quality of publications and research for tenure or promotion decisions: A preliminary checklist to assist. *Library Review, 45*, 39-53.
- Altbach, P. (1995). Problems and possibilities: The U.S. academic profession. *Studies in Higher Education, 20*, 27-45.
- Barber, B. R. (1992). *An aristocracy of everyone: Professors and the demise of higher education*. New York: Ballantine.
- Batille, G. M. (2007, May). Bataille shares peer review team reports with faculty, staff for input. *UNT Insider*. Retrieved November 12, 2007, from <http://www.unt.edu/president/insider/may07/peerreview.htm>
- Bernard, C. I. (1968). *The functions of the executive* (30th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bormann, E. G. (1972). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: The rhetorical criticism of social reality. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58*, 396-407.
- Bormann, E. G. (1976). General and specific theories of communication. In J. L. Golden, G. F. Berquist, & W. E. Coleman (Eds.), *The rhetoric of Western thought* (pp. 431-449). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Bormann, E. G. (1982). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: Ten years later. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 68*, 288-305.
- Bormann, E. G. (1985). Symbolic convergence theory: A communication formulation. *Journal of Communication, 35*, 128-138.
- Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cheney, G. (1991). *Rhetoric in an organizational society: Managing multiple identities*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Cheyney, E. P. (1940). *History of the University of Pennsylvania: 1740-1940*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1972). *Confronting identity: The community college instructor*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: prentice-Hall.

- College of Arts and Sciences. (n.d.). Retrieved July 22, 2008, from <http://www.cas.unt.edu/casfacts.shtml>
- Crable, R. E. (1990). "Organizational rhetoric" as the fourth great system: Theoretical, critical, and pragmatic implications. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 18, 115-128.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Cresswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Diamantes, T. (2004). Online survey research of faculty attitudes toward promotion and tenure. *Essays in Education*. Retrieved May 25, 2003, from <http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol12winter2004.html>
- Diamond, R. M. (1999). *Aligning faculty rewards with institutional mission: Statements, policies, and guidelines*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Douglas, G. H. (1992). *Education without impact: How our universities fail the young*. New York: Carol Publishing.
- Ehninger, D. (1968). On systems of rhetoric. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1, 131-144.
- Fairweather, J. S., & Rhoads, R. A. (1995). Teaching and the faculty role: Enhancing the commitment to instruction in American colleges and universities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 17, 179-194.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2000). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5, 1-13.
- Foss, S. K. (2004). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration & practice* (3rd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Foss, S. K., Foss, K. A., & Trapp, R. (2002). *Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Furniss, W. T. (1981). *Reshaping faculty careers*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Gunn, J. (2003). Refiguring fantasy: Imagination and its decline in U.S. rhetorical studies. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 89, 41-59.

- Hambright, W. G. & Diamantes, T. (2004). An analysis of the experiences of a first-year tenure-track faculty member. *Education, 124*, 436-438.
- Jackson, B. G. (1999). The goose that laid the golden egg?: A rhetorical critique of Stephen Covey and the effectiveness movement. *Journal of Management Studies, 36*, 353-377.
- Jackson, B. G. (2000). A fantasy theme analysis of Peter Senge's learning organization. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 36*, 193-209.
- Jasinski, J. (2001). *Sourcebook on rhetoric: Key concepts in contemporary rhetorical studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Kasten, K. L. (1984). Tenure and merit pay as rewards for research, teaching, and service at a research university. *Journal of Higher Education, 55*, 500-514.
- Kendall, J. E. (1993). Good and evil in the chairmen's boilerplate: An analysis of corporate visions of the 1970s. *Organization Studies, 14*, 571-92.
- Koplik, S. Z., & Welsh, J. F. (1993). Tip the delicate balance. *Trusteeship, 1*, 22.24.
- Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Lucas, C. J. (1996). *Crisis in the academy; Rethinking higher education in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Mallon, W. T. (2001). *Tenure on trial: Case studies of change in faculty employment policies*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Mawdsley, R. (1999). Collegiality as a factor in tenure decisions. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation, 13*, 167-177.
- Mooney, C. J. (1992, March 25). Syracuse tries to involve others in teaching-vs.-research debate. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A16-A17.
- Ovington, J., Diamantes, T., Roby, D. & Ryan, C. (2003). An analysis of prevailing myths regarding promotion and tenure. *Education, 123*, 635-637.
- Rushing, J. H., & Frentz, T. S. (1999). The gods must be crazy: The denial of descent in academic scholarship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85*, 229-246.
- Silverman, F. H. (2001). *Teaching for tenure and beyond*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Tang, T. L., & Chamberlain, M. (1997). Attitudes toward research and teaching. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*, 212-227.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. New York: State University of New York Press.

UNT Peer Review Team Report. (2007, May 9). Area recommendations: Academic affairs. Retrieved November 12, 2007, from <https://web3.unt.edu/peerteamreport/aacompletesummary.cfm>

Wolfgang, A. P., Gupchup, G. V., & Plake, K. S. (1995). Relative importance of performance criteria in promotion and tenure decisions: Perceptions of pharmacy faculty members. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 59, 342-347.