THE LABOR PROCESS AT HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

by

Frank Holmquist

Laurie Nisonoff

Robert Rakoff

School of Social Science

Hampshire College

Prepared for presentation at the
Conference on Alternative Higher Education
The Evergreen State College
Olympia, Washington
September 8-10, 1981

I. INTRODUCTION*

Fundamental to the theory and practice of alternative higher education has been an ideal-type model of the committed faculty member. Rooted both in the tradition of the small liberal arts college and in the 1960's critique of the professionalized university, this model has envisioned teachers who would be wholistic and cross-disciplinary in their professional stances; who would foster students' independent learning through close, personal interaction; who would seek to define themselves as members of a teaching community in which the compartmentalization and competition of mainstream academic professionalism would be replaced by a shared dedication to the values of the institution as a community. Embodied in this model is a set of multiple expectations for faculty work which encompass classroom teaching (often collective and interdisciplinary), individualized tutorials, personalized narrative evaluations, academic and personal counseling, scholarly activity, institutional governance, supervision of extra-curricular activities, and, frequently, participation in the residential lives of students.

While those of us who teach in alternative colleges still believe strongly in the values which underlie these expectations, as well as in the importance (to us and our students) of the practical activities suggested above, it has become increasingly evident that the obvious satisfactions and benefits of this faculty model are sustained only at a significant cost. We find ourselves faced in our work lives both with the stimulating integrative

* Our thanks for concrete ideas and critical comment to colleagues Richard Alpert, Nancy Fitch, Joan Landes, and Fred Weaver.

experience imagined in theory, and with the reality of work intensification in the form of overwork, fragmentation of tasks, and speed-up, as well as loss of autonomy and the danger of long-term alienation from our institutions. Moreover, just at the time when such intensification reduces our capacity to engage in scholarly work within disciplinary frameworks, we are often faced with a partial return to traditional criteria of professional accomplishment in judging reappointment and promotion, as well as with stiff competition and reduced mobility in ever-tightening job markets. This noble revolution in the organization of faculty life and work seems to be devouring its own children.

As our colleagues at traditional institutions would quickly point out, however, we are not the only professional workers--and certainly not the only academics--faced with such dilemmas. Most recent literature[1] on the organization and experience of professional work suggests that even such traditionally autonomous professionals as doctors, lawyers, and architects are increasingly faced with a labor process in which overwork, fragmentation, speed-up, and loss of professional independence are prominent, particularly as that work becomes organized in hierarchical, bureaucratic fashion. The experience of faculty in most public colleges and universities certainly fits this pattern. But the fact that similar phenomena of work intensification should occur at small, experimental liberal arts colleges is an anomaly. These colleges, after all, are largely non-bureaucratic and non-hierarchical in their administrative structures, with faculty, singly and collectively, wielding significant authority. Moreover, in important respects, these colleges have rejected deliberately much of the specialization of disciplinary professional organization in favor of interdisciplinary programs in both teaching

and research. And, of course, these colleges are devoted particularly to liberal, humanistic teaching, an art that defies the rationalization and intensification inherent in the bureaucratic organization of other professional work. Why, then, do so many of these characteristics of work intensification appear to be endemic, also, to the labor process in these colleges?

In this paper, we shall argue that an adequate explanation for this anomaly requires not only an analysis of the stresses and strains inherent in the design of alternative colleges, but also, and equally important, an understanding of the way in which these colleges and their faculties have mediated the larger structural rationalization of professional, academic work. In short, we seek to place an analysis of the labor process at alternative colleges within the context of a critical understanding of the changing structure and experience of professional work in capitalist political economies. Only within that larger context, we believe, can we begin to acquire a critical perspective on the nature of our own labor problems and on the strengths and weaknesses of alternative solutions to those problems.

The empirical focus of this analysis will be the labor process at our own institution, Hampshire College. The discussion will proceed as follows. First, we will briefly review the recent critical literature on educated or professional labor. Second, we will describe the nature of faculty work at Hampshire. Third, we will examine the nature of work intensification at Hampshire in some detail showing how attention to the major changes in the external, political economic environment of the 1970s can help us understand and explain the emerging contradictions in the objective structure of our work, in our subjective experience of that work, and in our individual and collective responses to it. Finally, we will assess the prospects of

different strategies for overcoming work intensification while maintaining a distinctive, alternative blend of generalist and specialist, and will argue that only a strategy of collective faculty action can achieve a resolution that avoids the rationalization of bureaucratic organization and authority.

II. THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF PROFESSIONAL LABOR

Professional people began to organize themselves into professional organizations--and to think of themselves as professionals--in large part to protect themselves from a competitive and uncontrollable marketplace. While there may well be some benign reasons for professional organization and some substantive content to professionals' claim to control of the content and circumstances of their work, it is abundantly clear that professional organizations have sought to establish monopoly control over entry into and practice within their respective fields. The means for achieving such control have become familiar: control over training, licensure, working conditions, discipline, wage or fee structures, and the like. And in so doing, professionals (and would-be professionals) have relied upon a deep-rooted and persuasive ideology of professionalism--an ideology which, above all, and regardless of substantive field, justifies such monopoly control and its attendant privileges in terms of professionals' special scientific knowledge and training. As Fred Weaver has argued,[2] the development of academic disciplines in the early decades of this century fits this model of the politics of professionalism quite well. Like doctors, lawyers, architects, nurses, and engineers, academic teachers and researchers have relied upon the ideology of professionalism and the organization of self-regulating professional associations in order to acquire and legitimize disciplinary control over hiring, firing, tenure, and curriculum. It seems clear that for academics,

as for other professionals, the subjective satisfactions of thinking of oneself as a professional rather than as a worker complement the equally powerful objective, material rewards that come with monopoly control over work and ideas in one's chosen field.

These two urges, of course, are really two aspects of the same systematic response of educated workers to the changing context of labor in our time. The ideology of the professional may well hark back to the tradition of the independent craftsman, but the more important immediate referrent is the orginary wage laborer of industrial and monopoly capitalism. By the time of the great rise in professionalization in the United States in the early twentieth century, the industrial working force had been largely transformed from its craft and hand-manufacture origins into a complex, rationalized social organism. The extension of the control of capital had brought with it both the powerlessness of the individual worker over the conditions and rewards of his or her work and the debasement of the labor process itself through intricate division of labor and the elaboration of bureaucratic, managerial control over shop floor and office. Faced with such proletarianization, the only response available to workers was the political one of collectively organizing to free themselves from the anarchy of "free" labor markets.

Consciously or not, the response of professionals to potentially threatening attacks on their autonomous work has been analogous. The collective attempts of professional organizations to create and maintain monopoly control over their working situations have constituted a similar political effort to avoid the loss of autonomy, power, and privilege which would result from unregulated subjection to a professional job market and from extra-professional

control over the professional labor process. And, indeed, for decades this strategy seemed to be relatively successful in maintaining the traditional privileges and power of many professional groups over their own labor--that is, successful in preventing the "proletarianization" of professional labor.

Recent studies, however, suggest that this success is more apparent than real and that the claims of success in maintaining professional autonomy and privilege are large misinterpretations of the status and power of professional workers from within the ideological perspective of professionalism. Magali Sarfatti Larson,[3] in particular, has argued forcefully that as professional work increasingly is subsumed within bureaucratic organizations--whether in private corporations, state agencies, or research universities--such work is progressively "rationalized" in much the same way that manual work was proletarianized in an earlier era. In her review of recent trends in the organization of professional work, Larson identifies three major tendencies which have come to characterize the professional work process: (1) an increase in and rigidification of division of labor which has the effect of increasing the individual professional's dependence on the bureaucratic whole through the delegation of routinized tasks to lower level workers and, thus, diminishing his or her autonomy; (2) an intensification of work itself by increasing the absolute volume of work and, so, disrupting the traditional professional (or craft) work rhythm of accomplishment, inactivity, preparation, and accomplishment; and (3) the routinization of what were previously high level tasks and their assignment to management, its consultants, or its data processing machines.[4] These objective changes in the professional labor process represent, Larson argues, a kind of "de-skilling" that is analogous to the history of industrial work processes. Moreover, this professional transformation derives from analogous intentions and has similar effects--

namely, the extension of managerial control over work, the workplace, and workers in the name of efficiency, productivity, and profit. In the face of such a profound transformation in the actual process of educated labor, claims of continuing professional control become mere ideological legitimations of only relative material and status differentials vis-a-vis non-professional labor.

Why has this happened? Why has the seemingly secure monopoly of professionals over their own working conditions been under attack? At the most general level, the rationalization of professional work merely reflects the bureaucratic centralization of production and employment that is characteristic of state capitalism; no less than self-employed craftspersons or mechanics, the self-employed and independent professional is an endangered species. This change in the locus and structure of professional work has been exacerbated in the last decade by progressive deterioration in the market for educated workers, a market in which both the supply of and the demand for such workers have been fundamentally changed. On the supply side, from the early 1970s on, we have witnessed a veritable glut of college-educated entrants into the labor force, a glut that extends as well to professionally trained people. The relatively autonomous, disciplinary-controlled graduate training departments reacted very slowly in the 1970s to the emerging over-supply of professional graduates. Even when they reacted by cutting back or redesigning graduate programs, the large cohort of professionals trained in the expansionist days of the 1960s remained to provide intense competition for a dwindling number of jobs and to close off career mobility for newer entrants into the professional labor force. This oversupply situation has produced

the professional equivalent of a "reserve army" of unemployed and underemployed workers whose presence severely limits the traditional power and privilege of employed professionals in many fields.

At the same time, the demand for professional workers (in professional capacities, at least) has declined. While this decline is, in part, a product of the more general economic recession of the 1970s, some specific components of the deteriorating market for educated workers can be identified. These include: a decline in government spending for research and development and for social services; a fall in school budgets, in response to declining school age populations and to urban fiscal crises; a specific and intense slowdown in the economic growth of "college intensive" industries; a fall in the proportion of private research and development spending that goes to basic research; and, finally, the continuing "crisis" in higher education itself as it reacts to the perceived excesses and experiments of the 1960s.[5] In concert with the conditions of oversupply, this weakened demand has exposed professional workers to the same economic vulnerability in a time of contraction and crisis that their non-professional counterparts have long faced. And the result for those who do manage to hold on to professional employment is the presence of those proletarianizing tendencies in the labor process outlined above.

In the face of these objective changes in the labor process and its political economic context, the traditional organization and ideology of professionalism have lost their force. Control over the conditions of training and career entry has been weakened by the extension of managerial prerogative in both graduate universities and employing institutions. Moreover, the managerial imperative to reduce costs and increase productivity has often led to their legitimizing the proto-professional pretensions of alternative groups

of workers (e.g., social workers with B.A.'s only; legal and medical paraprofessionals) as a way of maintaining pressure on traditional professionals' diminishing autonomy over their own work. In this context, the ideology of professionalism no longer reflects genuine superiority in power, privilege, or autonomy, but only serves to rationalize their loss by legitimizing the remaining status differentials between professional and non-professional workers. In the short run, at least, both employers and professionals have their interests served in this process. Employers are able to retain the services and skills of highly educated workers and to do so at less cost in salaries (the cost of a symbolic title or a minor level of work autonomy is small) and with little potential disruption of institutional patterns of work and discipline. For their part, beleaguered professionals can still fall back on the subjective satisfactions of being deemed a professional by bosses and lower-level workers alike, much as manual workers find psychic satisfaction in the ideology of a free labor market unconstrained by class, racial, or sexual determinations. In both cases, ideology becomes a conservative force that reinforces the objective extension of rational control over workers and their work.

It is within this changing context that the labor process at alternative colleges has developed. These colleges have had to cope with the same sorts of economic transformations that have faced non-academic professionals, and they have done so in similar ways. Administrations have sought to rationalize the process of work in order to increase productivity and efficiency. Administrative offices have expanded to take on new educational functions; in the process, faculty control over the academic program and over their own work is threatened or compromised as pedagogical tasks become routinized and parcelled out to administrative functionaries. At the same

time, the sheer volume of work--already onerous due to unrealistic, original expectations built into alternative college structures--has continued to increase. Like their non-academic counterparts, faculty at such colleges have had no clear or effective responses to these changes despite innumerable individual and group initiatives. Faced with overwork, they seek relief in administrative remedies. But faced with those remedies, they fear erosion of professional autonomy and of academic quality and experimentation. Faced with overwhelming demands on them as generalist-teachers, and perceiving few employment prospects, they fear the loss of professional and research competence. But whereas non-academic professionals might find some solace in their professional identities, these faculty members, committed to an alternative model of the generalist-cum-specialist teacher, have no such ideological refuge.

These contradictory aspects of the labor process at alternative colleges suggest that while the "proletarianization" of professional labor has affected these colleges, the impact has been subtle and unique. To assess just how this process has proceeded, we now turn to an examination of the labor process at one, not untypical alternative college, Hampshire College.

III. THE NATURE AND STRUCTURE OF HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

Hampshire College is a small, liberal arts college located in the hills of western Massachusetts, the creation in 1970 of its sister institutions within the Five College consortium (Smith, Mt. Holyoke, and Amherst Colleges, and the University of Massachusetts/Amherst). There are approximately 1200 students on campus during any semester, with several hundred more on leave in more or less structured off-campus settings. There is a permanent faculty of approximately 85 (F.T.E.) members, situated within four divisions rather than traditional departments: Humanities and Arts, Language and Communication,

Natural Science, and Social Science. The faculty are employed under a contract system, with a complex system for reappointment, but with no tenure. Because the College is quite new, and given recent competition for diminishing foundation and government support, its annual budget is 80 percent tuition dependent.[6]

Objectives of the Program

In many ways, the goals of the Hampshire educational system appear to be the same as those of other liberal arts institutions. The key difference is that:

> At Hampshire full development of one's potential is seen as requiring a high level of active decision-making on the part of the student. To cope well in a changing society dictates that the educated citizen understand the modes of conceptualization, explanation, and verification of knowledge. It is less useful to memorize a body of "facts" that may soon be obsolete than to "know how to know." In other words, it is more important to learn to use the intellect than to be able merely to exercise it. The Hampshire program emphasizes conceptual inquiry, or modes of inquiry: "how to learn, use, test, and revise ideas, concepts, theoretical constructs, propositions, and methodological principles in active inquiry."

Each student progresses through the college with a personalized, unique program which focuses upon questions rather than a traditional disciplinary major. Officially, progress is measured by a series of examinations rather than by courses or credits. Each student must formulate ideas for thes examinations and create a committee of faculty interested in supervising and

evaluating them. Completion of six examinations is required: one "mode of inquiry" examination in each of the four Schools (Division I) usually taking the form of a research paper or studio project; a concentration examination (Division II) which typically includes the results of courses, research, and other activities over a three or four semester period; and an independent study project (Division III). While grades are not given in courses, faculty evaluate each student's performance in a written evaluation, and these supplement the extensive, personalized, narrative evaluations written for each of the six examinations. This means that much of the learning takes place in individualized settings as well as through the process of developing a program. Students select faculty to work with primarily on the basis of thematic questions, rather than disciplinary training, although disciplinary boundaries often correspond to the questions. Examination committees are often multi-disciplinary in composition,[8] and the need to respond to student-created demands often stretches faculty into areas that are outside their own focused expertise. Courses are viewed as tools, methods for acquiring the focus, interest, or information necessary to enable students to formulate or to complete examinations.

Multiple Faculty Roles

Fred Weaver perceptively notes that the formative documents of the college

> ...underestimated the amount of faculty resourcefulness, patience, self-confidence and <u>time</u> required to negotiate and renegotiate each step of each student's academic program. The underestimation seems to have stemmed from a hydraulic conception of educational effort which suggested that more academic responsibility for students

> meant less for faculty. The enthusiasm of the faculty and students led, in the first three years of the college, to the creation of an academic program which is even more ambitious than that which was envisioned by the college planners.[9]

The reality of the multiple roles that the faculty must play within this system defied the less-work theory and created tensions for each faculty member even before recent changes within the larger political economy began to affect the College. There is an apocryphal story about the student who left orientation convinced that there were <u>three</u> sets of faculty at Hampshire College: those who taught the courses, those who supervised examination work, and advisers. In fact, it's the same folks juggling many hats.

The primary task is advising and supporting students in the complex task of creating their own educational programs. Unlike traditional "major" advisers who may simply sign course slips for the semester and ensure the completion of a standardized curriculum with some distribution requirements, faculty advisers at Hampshire find that their responsibilities merely begin with course registration. They must listen patiently to help students articulate and focus their interests and then help match those interests with faculty, courses, and projects. Given people's natural reticence about giving and receiving advice, these relationships become more effective when they are long-standing and involve sharing on the part of the student and the faculty member. These relationships transcend office hours and office boundaries, and often follow the faculty into the swimming pool, the bathroom, and the home. The relationship is without clear boundaries, a particular problem for newer and/or younger faculty members.[10]

Another item the quotation from Weaver only touches upon is the intricacy of the negotiating and renegotiating of examination contracts. It may take several hours or several dozen hours spread over a week or over two years to encourage, and cajole, students in the process of refining and concretizing their examination plans. Many examinations necessitate the virtual equivalent of an independent study in a particular subject or in the appropriate methodology. There is no such thing as failure at Hampshire College. In other words, drafts of examination work are read, and extensively commented upon, and then returned with rewrites requested with the necessary supportive personal contact, in a manner that far exceeds the process of peer-review journals. At crucial moments in the semester, the faculty may be working over one hundred hours a week, reading and commenting upon portfolios, preparing for formal oral examinations, while continuing to teach classes and advise.

Despite all this individualized learning, the course is not dead at Hampshire. Most Hampshire faculty teach or co-teach four courses each year, and must teach during January Term at least once every three years. These courses are offered at all three Divisional levels to focus upon the respective goals of each level: mode of inquiry to understand a problem area for Division I; theoretical and empirical information of a broader nature for Division II; and integrative seminars that serve to place the individual student's Division III project within the context of a complex topic requiring the application of several disciplines.

One of the most time-consuming faculty roles involves writing discursive evaluations of students' course and examination work. Since these evaluations are a central source of diagnostic information to students and constitute the major elements of a Hampshire transcript, faculty try to remain

conscientious about their quality, comprehensiveness, and timeliness. Inevitably, however, their completion gets delayed, and they become major sources of anxiety for faculty and important sources of strain among the faculty, administration, and students.

Traditional governance is another faculty role. Faculty are on committees which administer the Schools, appointment searches, the reappointment process, curriculum development, adjudication, community governance, and Five College programs upon which we are especially dependent. Each faculty member has at least one significant responsibility each year. The reappointment process is particularly time-consuming and requires that each faculty member up for reappointment write an extensive, introspective evaluation of his or her own work which also presents plans for the proposed new contract period. Other faculty selected by reappointment candidates write evaluations which are also incorporated in open files, and students, staff, and outside colleagues are also invited to contribute to the file. Then a committee of faculty and students within each School deliberates and recommends to the School. The School meets on each candidate. A committee of five faculty and two students meets for the entire month of January to deliberate over the cases of reappointment and promotion from each School. In a faculty of 85, several dozen faculty are evaluated each year under this process, with another quarter of the faculty serving on the five committees involved. Despite its obvious merits, this elaborate process demands an enormous, perhaps inordinate, commitment of faculty time and energy.

The original plan for the College proposed that faculty would not only participate as members of a School but would also be active participants in the planning and governance of one of the residential houses, including teaching special courses there. Faculty were to blend their personal lives

with their daily participation in the houses, and this work, as well, was to be evaluated in the reappointment process. As will be noted below, however, house activities are now a marginal element in the work lives of all but a handful of faculty.

A final role is that of active scholar or artist. While Hampshire is, most decidedly, a "teaching" school, it has always been expected that faculty would be intellectually active, even if not in traditional, disciplinary forums. This expectation has received increasing faculty support, particularly since the overwhelming majority of the faculty have been trained in the nation's most distinguished research universities.[11] Scholarly output is high, despite the many other demands of the job, indicating both the intellectual stimulation of the College's environment and the impact of professional socialization prior to the choice of Hampshire. However, it is equally true that faculty report that "professional improvement" is the area that most suffers from insufficient time and attention.[12] As we will see below, this tension between professional, disciplinary activity and commitment to the demands of a generalist teaching model is an important component of the contradictions of Hampshire's labor process.

It is apparent that Hampshire faculty are confronted with an overwhelming array of job-related responsibilities. In fact, a study estimates that Hampshire faculty work approximately twice as many hours on college-related work as faculty at comparable institutions.[13] This results from the relatively high student-faculty ratio of 14.5:1[14] coupled with the multiplicity of roles which the faculty simultaneously perform. Moreover, it is potentially risky to establish a personal hierarchy of these tasks, as reappointment criteria assume substantial contributions in each area--the combination of

the Oxford tutorial, the Harvard course system, and the vestiges of the New England town meeting form of governance.

IV. WORK INTENSIFICATION AT HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

The original structure of the College established a series of contradictions in the faculty labor process that are analogous to the dilemmas faced by other professional workers. First, faculty were faced with two conflicting sets of work expectations. On the one hand, faculty were expected to operate as independent pedagogical agents in a system of education-by-contract, retaining a significant degree of autonomy in arranging their work. This promise of independence and autonomy surely has been a major attraction to faculty who have chosen to teach at Hampshire. On the other hand, we have seen that the educational structure requires faculty to fulfill multiple roles in their work. Responding to this expectation not only leads to the danger of overwork but also threatens to compromise the reality of individual faculty autonomy over the scope and rhythm of their work. This conflict appears to be analogous to the situation of professional workers more generally.

Second, this conflict between individual autonomy and educational structure is paralleled by the ideological duality built into the original faculty model, which expected faculty to be both generalist-teachers and specialist-researchers. Living up to both of these expectations magnifies faculty workload, creates constant anxiety about servicing students as well as professional needs adequately, and prompts faculty to search for ways to routinize and reduce at least some of the work they do. At the same time, the strength of subjective and shared identity is weakened: is one a teacher, a disciplinary specialist, both, or neither? This ideological confusion, too, is analogous to the weakening of professional ideology more generally, while the

turn toward routinization and delegation of faculty work parallels the larger bureaucratization of professional labor.

These structural contradictions have, unfortunately, been exacerbated by the economic crises of the last decade which provided the context for the maturation of Hampshire. Recurring inflation, of course, has pushed the Hampshire administration to try to reduce the growth of basic expenses (including real wages, which have actually fallen) and promote greater efficiency and productivity in a labor-intensive enterprise. In both obvious and subtle ways, this has magnified the existing contradictions in Hampshire's labor process. Moreover, economic crisis has affected colleges like Hampshire in special ways. First, rising tuition costs, along with a shrinking pool of potential applicants, have demanded greater attention to the problems of attracting and retaining students. Second, the deterioration in professional job markets and the consequent loss of mobility for faculty, has heightened the tensions inherent in the generalist-specialist model noted above. Together, these external pressures have exacerbated the built-in tendencies toward work intensification at Hampshire.

The Student Retention Problem

A consequence of the shrinking pool of college bound students, coupled with a student withdrawal rate of 33%, has been an administration led, and by and large faculty supported, effort to retain students. The withdrawal rate is not abnormally high for schools with individualized study programs that often include off-campus work. But the withdrawal rate boosts the costs of beating the bushes for students. And, by the mid-1970s there appeared to be more parent complaints that students had little or nothing to show for a year or two of college--courses were not completed and exams were stillborn while

tuition costs rose.[15] As a result of these pressures the late 1970s saw considerable thought and effort put into ways to engage students productively early in their college careers and, since the majority of withdrawals occurred prior to filing a Division II contract, special attention has been paid to advising and to the Division I process.

In-house Hampshire studies pointed out that student "success" at Hampshire usually means having close ties to at least one faculty member who may be the adviser.[16] The renewed emphasis on advising meant trying to improve it qualitatively but also, and inevitably, subtle pressures developed to do more of it. Discussions were held in a variety of contexts in order to improve each faculty member's practice. As a result, advising performance has become a somewhat more significant, though decidedly secondary, factor in reappointment considerations. Because students appreciate good advising and faculty status among students can be enhanced in this manner, most faculty pay a good deal of attention to it. These pressures to deal with the retention problem have only added to the substantial advising burden already built into the system.

The second way to deal with the retention problem was to get students through the Division I process, by engaging them intellectually early on and thus cut down on "floundering." Again after considerable discussion involving faculty and administration it was decided to launch pro-seminars for entering students. These would be taught by an adviser to a class of his or her advisees and would be designed as a benchmark orientation to the Hampshire system as well as an early, diagnostic tool for entering students of perhaps lesser average ability than those in the early years of the College. The special attention to Division I courses marked a return to early Hampshire

experience when a lack of advanced students prompted considerable creativity and attention to the design and execution of first and second year courses. Later on, as upper level Division II classes and Division III seminars proliferated, the Division I courses received less faculty attention and on occasion School deans had to go through complex persuasion and bargaining maneuvers to induce faculty to offer Division I courses. The renewed Division I emphasis, the apparent need to design more carefully class process as well as content, meant more work was required. This pressure was felt very unevenly by the faculty. Some ignored the effort and some had no need to change their emphases. But for many this solution for the retention problem required extra effort.

The Resurgent Classroom

The late 1970s also saw a growing faculty attention to classroom work in general although this greater emphasis was not felt uniformly across the College, and its causes remain multiple and unclear. There was some student, and even indirect parent, pressure for more "orderly" learning through the classroom, but for many faculty the retention problem was simply interpreted to mean that the classroom was the most efficient way to stimulate students and facilitate their progress by examination; and while this meant imparting the skills for more independent exam work, it also involved fine-tuning classes, developing more cogent, focused, up-to-date lectures, and carefully designing frameworks for class discussion. There was also a greater concern for the content of the class--a feeling that ultimately only compelling ideas would elicit student imagination and interest.

Another subtle incentive for classroom emphasis came from the comparatively high Hampshire "export rate" of students to Five College institutions.

While a high export rate is to be expected in a student-directed curriculum without departmental requirements for graduation that tend to keep a student on campus, the tendency for students to take a high portion of classes off-campus provoked anxieties among some faculty that the practice would eventually boomerang and other colleges would eventually refuse our export and their overload. At the same time, students appeared to be voting with their feet against Hampshire classes, especially when they took analogous classes elsewhere. Students sometimes complained that they preferred highly organized, well thought out, classes off-campus as opposed to somewhat less integrated and occasionally more chaotic classes at home. Partly to save face, some Hampshire faculty began to design more elegant, and occasionally lecture-prone, classes that inevitably required more time and effort.

Greater attention to the classroom may also be a product of recent recruitment of new Ph.D.'s who perceive the classroom, as opposed to exam work, as their definition of personal challenge and avenue of success. In this perspective, the classroom, and lectures in particular, are the ultimate demonstration of a teacher's "craft". Gradually this younger faculty element has brought classroom performance to a greater prominence as their numbers are felt in reappointment decisions.

The high percentage of co-taught courses at Hampshire also seems to put special emphasis on classroom performance and especially the "idea content" as opposed to the "process content" of teaching. Co-teachers expect to learn and be stimulated as much as students, and subtle competition among them for provocative ideas, arguments, and synthesis of materials may mean that co-teaching requires as much work as solo teaching efforts.

Resurgent Research and Scholarship

While there have been pressures to improve and spend more time and effort on advising and Division I courses, as well as more subtle, though uneven, pressures to up-grade the classroom, somewhat greater emphasis for reappointment purposes has also been placed on scholarship and research which usually connotes publication and performance--the products of traditional professional life. This deviation from what has been termed an anti-professional ethos in the early stages of the College[17] has its roots first, at the institutional level in a declining student pool, creating a perceived need to upgrade faculty credentials and make the College more attractive over the long run; and second, at the individual faculty level in perceptions of a declining market for their talents outside the College prompting a personal marketability effort through the augmentation of existing standard professional credentials.

At the institutional level the scholarship emphasis is unevenly distributed through the four Schools of the College, and while the concern has seen peaks and valleys within each, the overall trend is clear. There has been no administrative edict charting this direction, nor is reappointment precluded without standard scholarly products. Instead, even in the early years of the College persuasive individuals on formal and informal occasions have quietly spoken for a scholarly concern or have supported the recruitment of faculty with strong scholarly potential, in order to maintain and continually up-grade the intellectual quality of the College, keep it lively, and help insure its survival. As some of the most "successful" faculty members, defined in Hampshire's own unique terms, are also seen to be productive scholars, and as their ranks expand, scholarship has increasingly become part and parcel of the definition of a good faculty member. And as the faculty

market produces a surplus of rather spectacular talent recently out of graduate school, there is a subtle process of deflating the standing of faculty who may otherwise perform extremely well on other non-scholarly dimensions.

At the personal faculty level there is probably a greater desire to want to retain an active professional life than was present among faculty in the early years of the College. The character of the faculty is changing as a larger percentage consist of a post-1960's graduate school generation with more of an a priori professional identification. And as the faculty perceives a declining ability to be mobile outside Hampshire in academic or non-academic jobs, as job opportunities for employment in Hampshire-type institutions approach zero, as faculty perceive Hampshire's survival as something less than certain, and as they see exceptional talent behind them at reappointment time, faculty increasingly see professional credentials as their only safety net. As a result they try to pursue scholarly activity in Hampshire's otherwise extremely demanding work environment, which, in turn, raises the level of their frustration.

Experiencing Work Intensification

We have argued that an initially very demanding faculty work situation has been exacerbated by external changes in the form of declining student pools and collapsing faculty markets. The shifting external environment has created an intensified work process in the specific form of more attention to advising, first and second year Division I classes, a growing emphasis on classroom work in general, and the rise of scholarly criteria for reappointment. The faculty has experienced this intensified work process in several ways. First and foremost there is a feeling of chronic work overload to the extent that a recent survey of the faculty found 62 percent saying that their

role as an educator was compromised because of it.[18] An average work day or work week is hard to pin down and averages would mask an uneven experience, but for most there is a feeling of total immersion in work. Evening and/or early morning work is routine and weekends are hard to find. By Thursday many faculty members simply look bad--and sometimes act bad--due to progressive lack of sleep over the week.

Coupled with the feeling of chronic overload is a sense of fragmented work and constant and emotionally draining mental gear-shifting. The crowded schedule and constant role juggling makes it hard to find closure, to have a sense that one task is done and energy can now be devoted to another. Classes end but evaluations linger on and if possible, tend to be postponed to Christmas and summer vacations. Because the faculty knows that the exam system and classroom activity demand self-pacing by students that often plays havoc with deadlines, class papers and exam papers come in at any and all times with the former often signaling the need for a class evaluation months, or even years, after the fact. Exam papers are read, but due to time pressure the evaluations are usually written up much later requiring at least a partial re-reading to augment earlier notes--which is especially taxing when a Division II portfolio includes from four to eight or more papers. Office hours are long and crowded, the phone is active, governance work requires attention, recommendations are requested, colleagues are evaluated, classes need preparation and co-teaching requires coordination, exam meetings are scattered throughout the week, lunches are often the working variety, and the to and fro of communication with the professional world requires attention. Work feels like a constant interruption and nothing seems to be done right as brief amounts of time are devoted to multiple tasks. Sacrifices are made and the faculty

believes that it comes primarily out of professional development and secondarily, advising.[19] Nancy Goddard's recent study also found the faculty feeling "...that they are spread too thin to do an adequate job of teaching."[20] Class preparation almost always requires work at home which is hard to schedule because of the multiple demands for a hands-on presence at the College. Richard Alpert sums up the nature of fragmentation and mental gear-shifting this way: "At different times with the same student the faculty member must be adviser, friend, registrar, advocate, counselor, task-master, or evaluator. Faculty must not only have a broad repertoire, but also must know which role to play with which students."[21]

The built-in and evolving pressures toward overwork, fragmentation, and excessive gear-shifting in the performance of multiple roles, makes it difficult to retain or deepen a specialization. Many faculty say they experience a drain on their expertise because there is little time to pursue a specialty; they feel most compromised here.[22] Because the demands of student contact and classroom work are very difficult to duck or put aside, very few faculty do significant research or writing during the school year, and one to three weeks of evaluation writing during Christmas holidays and the summer further dinimishes the time available for scholarship.

The process of de-specialization is not directly analogous to the loss of skills involved in industrial proletarianization. Rather it involves the process of multiplying and intensifying existing skills. The College's original design requiring faculty performance of multiple roles coupled with externally induced work intensification pressures means that the faculty pursue many tasks and demonstrate a variety of skills but at the risk of a corresponding loss of depth in any specialty.[23] Lack of time to do research and to write is further exacerbated by internally generated incentives to be

a generalist rather than a specialist. This of course squares with the original design of the College and the personal goal of becoming generally educated by even the most professionally oriented of the faculty. But the problem comes when theory is put into practice in the current context. Responding to student suggested examination topics inevitably pulls the faculty member into new directions. But other pressures toward generalization rather than specialization also occur in the classroom. Faculty are formally allowed to teach virtually anything they wish and consequently could teach courses exclusively in and around a particular expertise. But very few do and many are pulled far afield because of the genuine excitement and enthusiasm of two or three colleagues who enjoy teaching together and want to plumb the depths of an old topic or open a new one together.

More subtle incentives and pressures are also at work. Because of the faculty contract system with its frequent reviews and diffuse and ambiguous criteria for reappointment, individual faculty survival at Hampshire depends a great deal on one's position in colleague social networks and even student networks. Thus, for reasons of reappointment it is advisable to co-teach with others in order to become a known and valued entity. It also means becoming a magnet for students--ideally to develop a small following who do exam work with you, take your courses, and ultimately applaud you at times of reappointment. In lieu of significant internal faculty power based on seniority or tenured status, new faculty members cannot attach themselves to one or two patrons in order to get assured protection and advancement. Good strategy implies that one should be a part of whatever interesting is happening--a key course with dynamic co-teachers who will also refer students to you, or perhaps a new "program" that may evolve unconsciously over the years, or appear

suddenly over beer in a bar. And one should teach courses that draw students, not so much for the sake of enrollment, but in order to define one's expertise in a subject matter and encourage students to do related exam work. These pressures usually take the young and more vulnerable faculty members well beyond their original scholarly focus. In most cases the result is enormously stimulating and exciting for faculty and students, and it may lead to a new "teaching specialty" for the original teaching cohort and other faculty who may rotate in and out of the course over the years. But only in exceptional cases does the process lead to a new research specialty for any of the participants. And given the limits of time, old specialties may begin to atrophy producing considerable anxiety for the faculty member. Subsequent efforts to respecialize inevitably bring back the risks mentioned above and may create tensions among the faculty when one or two become overwhelmed by exam work in a particular field that is generated by many.[24]

The intensification of the current work process would, one might expect, prompt rampant faculty cynicism, disengagement from a positive emotional attachment to the College, and annual attempts to escape altogether. But by and large this does not happen. Instead we find, to a surprising degree, genuine attachment to the institution, its design,[25] colleagues, and students --in short a remarkable loyalty and commitment. This pattern is partially explained by the self-selection of faculty who chose to come to Hampshire. Until recently, and now only in selected disciplines and specialties, most faculty could have gone elsewhere to institutions of equal status. They chose to come, of course, for a variety of personal idiosyncratic reasons, but also because most wanted first, an environment congenial to good teaching; second, the chance to become generally educated beyong their specialties; and third,

the opportunity to pursue their specialties--often initially seen by the new faculty member as the opportunity to "teach what you want."

But once at Hampshire, and especially in the second and third years, the contradictions among the initial three goals create anxieties which are usually resolved in favor of remaining. Gearing up for the first reappointment in the third year involves "psyching out" the place, trying to cover oneself on the multiple and ambiguous criteria for reappointment, and in the process fitting oneself to the Hampshire mold. New faculty members by choice, and by the incentives of the reappointment process, generally adapt with astounding speed and are occasionally among the most articulate supporters of the original College design. The informal strategies for reappointment are usually clearly perceived and in the process firm intellectual, and often social, friendships emerge, sometimes exhilirating co-teaching arrangements develop, compelling future plans are drawn, and intense and generally satisfying, if exhausting, contacts with students are made--all of which tends to bind the new faculty member to the institution and its people.

As time passes, these bonds to the institution, friends, and the locality often deepen while other factors come into play. Multiple roles and work intensification tend to run down the faculty member's "expertise capital," a progressively collapsing faculty market is perceived, individual scholarly credentials may be respectable but not exceptional, and more seniority means that the faculty member becomes more expensive for other financially-starved institutions to hire. In the face of these realities there is a tendency to become even more committed to the institution because, at least in darker moods, Hampshire appears to be the only thing between the faculty member and the abyss. One increasingly becomes a loyalist out of "necessity" rather

than choice and in the process the faculty member is likely to exhibit greater concern for College-wide issues of institutional survival.

V. RESPONSES TO WORK INTENSIFICATION

Individual Responses: Allowing the Rise of Central Administration

We have discussed the ways in which external trends of the 1970s have merged with Hampshire College structure to increase faculty workload and threaten faculty control over their own everyday labor process. We have also indicated what the result "felt like" from a faculty point of view. We now turn to the several faculty efforts to alleviate the effects of work intensification. These attempts will be discussed in terms of two broad categories --individual responses and group responses. We begin with ad hoc individual efforts.

Although faculty loyalty and commitment to the institution remains high there is a contradictory trend toward a centralization of power in the administration, a process which risks long term faculty alienation from the institution, but one in which faculty members have been complicit. Data on the comparative expansion of administrative and faculty personnel and remuneration indicate that the administration has recently expanded in numbers faster than the faculty and its consumption of college financial resources has increased at a slightly faster rate than those consumed by the faculty.[26] The administration's expanded numbers have also, according to some, signaled an accumulation of more power at the expense of the faculty. The all-faculty Academic Council gave way to an elected Senate which has, in turn, seemed to atrophy in recent years, thereby bestowing power on the administration by default.[27] In the early years of comparative budget largesse the budget was not a major faculty concern. But now, in a time of financial retrenchment,

it is a matter of faculty anxiety, but there is no indication of greater faculty involvement in the budgetary process nor is there significant faculty effort to gain entry to the process. In general the faculty retains a strong veto role but it has recently exerted less collective initiative than in the early years.

The precise degree of administrative power expansion, and the extent to which it has been at the expense of the faculty, cannot be resolved here. The important point is that the faculty has, on the whole, held a very ambiguous attitude toward the administration. On the one hand, the faculty has been complicit in bureaucratic expansion, often seeing it as a short term solution to faculty workload problems.[28] In the early, and somehwat chaotic, administrative environment of the College, some routinization was thought necessary for minimal predictability. Later, under the pressures of the everyday workload, and perceiving vague and ill-defined threats to the institution's existence, there was an element of the faculty, or a side to most faculty members, which increasingly saw the administration as a compatible support structure. In this view, the administration should take on, for example, some of the less consequential faculty administrative burdens and provide basic student services as well as deal with the cases of "difficult" students so the faculty will not be bothered by them. There is a tendency among an overworked faculty to give work to whomever will take it--especially work which does not appear directly related to the immediate educational mission. Most faculty are also sympathetic to the argument that the College needs to "come of age" and rationalize its procedures, particularly those related to the outside world. In order to secure long-term survival, it is implied that viable programs are necessary for alumni, parent, and general public relations as well as grantsmanship for the institution and the faculty.

All of these trends, of course, parallel the routinization of tasks that is characteristic of the rationalization of professional work generally.

But while some faculty some of the time will acquiesce to apparent administrative solutions to the workload problem and problems of institutional viability, the faculty is very ambivalent toward the apparent expansion of administration power. Many fear the possible consequences of work routinization and more elaborate division of labor that may enmesh them in new hierarchies. Some fear that rather than alleviate the workload, the administration expands it; that rather than support the faculty, the administration tends to summon it to help solve real or manufactured problems--or, at worst, to legitimize administrative decisions already taken. The faculty also fears it is losing potential faculty positions that could directly alleviate the workload. While the faculty appears to solve some of its workload problems by cutting back on time devoted to governance,[29] some faculty occasionally panic when they think they see an aggressive administration taking power unto themselves. It also appears that with tighter budgets, coupled with a maturing faculty with more curricular program ideas, the administration tends to become the arbiter of innovation.

We do not wish to exaggerate the loss of faculty power, although we see a trend in that direction in which the faculty has been complicit. It is likely that the Hampshire faculty remains exceptionally powerful in any comparative sense because of the latitude for faculty self-management built into the original design; because College trustees are new and assume the maintenance of an educational model of decentralized learning giving power to the faculty; and because the alumni are few, lack economic clout that could give them power in College affairs, and tend to support the Hampshire model of

limited administration. Without strong trustee and alumni backing, the College administration cannot assume broad powers. The administration also lacks an alliance with the student body despite some financial incentives to do so.[30] Individual administrators generally lack systematic, long-term ties to individual students. Affective ties are also minimal because the administration applies rules that students tend to see as cluttering their landscape, proliferating paperwork, unnecessarily rigidifying the system, and not really facilitating their self-paced advance through the College.

Individual Responses: Decline of the "Community" Model

The need to find some relief from the pressures of the work process means that some faculty have actively distanced themselves from the governance system, while a similar withdrawal has taken place from broad-based campus community life, particularly that centered around the house system of student residence. The early model of the College and the early expectations of many faculty and students built in reaction to the impersonality of the "megaversity," were that work, community, and social life would be integrated and that much of it would occur in the houses. But this prospect began to fade early on and has now almost totally disappeared as faculty have successfully segregated the workplace from their private and family lives. The workload built into the design of the College, coupled with its progressively intensified character, found faculty trying to "escape" in order to get some distance from the place and have a social life where Hampshire affairs were never mentioned. When work and private life were more integrated the latter tended to be swallowed up by the former. An index of increasing faculty distance from community life is the fact that faculty almost always have to be begged to serve on Community Council; meanwhile the faculty becomes increasingly ignorant of student life.

Individual Responses: Passive Resistance

A common faculty coping device for dealing with the workload problem is what we might call passive resistance to a large number of expectations. Broadly speaking, this means breaking rules and regulations and occasionally involves the conscious development of ignorance about them so one cannot be bothered by them. The major form of passive resistance is delaying written evaluations of student work. Some faculty may be months or even years in arrears. This behavior is, for many, something of an active protest, but it is also an almost necessary means to gain some breathing space when the College is in session and an effort to find quiet space to do justice to student performance. An additional, analogous form of resistance is the scaling back of available office hours--regardless of student demand or official expectation--as a way of rationing time and energy.

Individual Responses: The Cult of Bitching

Another coping device is what we might call the cult of bitching. On the one hand there is something of an ethic that one should not protest too much because it is, after all, boring, and overwork is not "news" to anyone. And one should, through sheer intellectual brilliance, rise above it all and not, for example, have to spend long hours preparing lectures. As a result, some of the real pain of overwork is carefully hidden. But on the other hand, individual misery requires some company for the therapeutic assurance that one is neither crazy nor totally incompetent. As a result, the cult of bitching about overwork is thoroughly institutionalized in faculty culture and its ritual observation is carried out in a variety of encounters from occasional conversation between nodding acquaintances on sidewalks to long conversations between friends wallowing in collective self-pity.

Individual Responses: Learning to Say "No"

The most simple and natural way to obtain work relief is to say "no" to excessive demands from students to work with them on examinations and other projects. While most faculty do say "no" at times, and new faculty members are urged to say "no" for their self-protection, there are dangers and limits to its use. As we mentioned earlier, it is good reappointment strategy to be in demand by students which also affords one visibility to other faculty members on student examination committees. Also, student work not assumed by one faculty member inevitably is assumed by another which only adds to burdens borne by colleagues having similar interests and abilities. This form of work displacement risks creating tensions with colleagues, and particularly those with whom one normally works closely. On top of the calculated risks taken by saying "no" too often, most faculty members have difficulty escaping the institutional ideology, and ultimately the structural necessity, of servicing the students' chosen direction. In the back of the faculty mind is a small voice that asks, "What would happen if everyone said 'no'?"

Group Responses: Differential Staffing

Individual responses to work intensification have alleviated burdens to some degree and they have provided an ad hoc flexibility and measure of relief according to personal taste. But the feeling of work intensification is ever-present and, consequently, collective efforts have been tried. The differential staffing technique involves faculty member specialization in a particular role occasioned by Hampshire's structure, such as Division I examination work, courses, or governance. Thus, a kind of specialization creeps in the back door but it is quite different from normal professional specialization. This form of specialization cuts down on the feeling of fragmentation

due to almost simultaneous performance of multiple roles and it allows some individuals to carve out a niche that is more comfortable for them. The device is used sparingly and unevenly across the four Schools of the College but where it occurs it is usually sanctioned by an understanding at the School level. However, given the multiple criteria applied at reappointment time, this device too has built in risks which limit its more extensive use; and it risks the development of status hierarchies among the faculty.

Group Responses: Going by the Book

Hampshire faculty have also sought work relief by the traditional tactic of "going by the book"--interpreting rules rigidly in order to minimize required work. Four such initiatives deserve mention. First, since the rules did not specifically limit advising to faculty members, that responsibility has been shared with a number of qualified staff members who have been accepted as associate members of some Schools for this purpose. Second, many faculty have sought to reduce their time-consuming Division I examination supervision by urging students to develop their exam ideas within the context of courses. Third, many faculty have tried to limit their advising load by becoming the official advisers for Division II and III students with whom they are already working. Fourth, there has been an apparent expansion of team-teaching (usually two to five faculty) which is sanctioned at the School level and, quite apart from the intellectual rewards accruing to faculty participants, cuts down on the time that each devotes to bureaucratic functions and provides some respite from the rapid-fire rigors of constant classroom preparation.

Group Responses: Changing Formal Rules

Several notable attempts to change the formal rules through collective action in order to provide work relief might be briefly mentioned. First,

over the years the faculty has pressed for and won a rather liberal leave and sabbatical policy. Second, the previous requirement of two faculty members on each Division I exam committee was changed to one faculty member plus a student. Third, the initial teaching requirement of five regular courses and one during January Term was changed to four plus one January Term course every three years. Fourth, there have been recent faculty-designed changes to the reappointment procedures partially justified in terms of easing constant reappointment anxiety, cutting down on the number of mutual references for colleague reappointment over the years, and generally reducing the emotionally taxing time that everyone devotes to reappointment considerations. The two major changes called for a third contract period of ten years rather than the previous seven; and for a provision that consideration for the second contract be confined largely to the School level unless substantial disagreement required extensive consideration at the College level.

Fifth, the School of Social Science proposed that students be allowed the option of substituting two successfully completed courses for the normal Division I examination process. Aside from a variety of pedagogical reasons for the move, the proposal appealed to many faculty because it would ease the burden of the individually negotiated contract process. The proposal was torpedoed, however, by an almost united student opposition as well as by considerable faculty opposition from other Schools.

Sixth, discussion of faculty unionization has come and gone over the years, and in 1977 the faculty were only a few votes shy of enough signatures to signal an NLRB election. This was the most significant attempt to date, and yet there was a certain lack of enthusiasm even among the leadership, while a kind of weary consensus was evidenced among most faculty who believed

that it should be tried. Prospective gains were, however, couched almost exclusively in terms of salary and fringe benefits rather than matters affecting the work process. A variety of factors and attitudes contributed to the failed attempt: the inevitable reluctance to view oneself as "just a worker" thereby compromising residual community and professional consciousness; a perceived limited slack in the College budget allowing for only minimal income benefits; anxiety about the benefit of a national union affiliation; unease about potential struggles with non-unionized staff and with the student body,[31] and fears that the union would bring the faculty more meetings to attend and another role to play with the promise of only minimal potential gains in their wake.

VI. CONCLUSION

We opened this essay noting the evolution of professional labor with its characteristic work intensification, routinization, and growing division of labor. We have indicated why and how those characteristics, particularly work intensification, developed in small, alternative colleges like Hampshire. We pointed out why the changing political economy exacerbated declining student pools, collapsed faculty markets, and served to intensify a work process that was already more demanding than originally intended. The external changes prompted somewhat greater faculty attention to advising, lower-level classes, classroom teaching in general, and scholarship. Intensified work was, in turn, experienced as chronic overwork, fragmentation, constant mental gear-shifting, and professional de-specialization. But rather than massive disaffection from the College in the face of these trends we found a surprising degree of faculty loyalty and commitment due to some combination of a conscious, positive, and continuing choice in favor of the Hampshire educational model, the socialization process associated with reappointment, and

gradual professional de-specialization and longer-term perception of personal immobility beyond Hampshire.

Over the years, the Hampshire faculty have asked themselves "What is to be done?" and have responded with a remarkable variety of individual strategies: complicity in the expanding rationalizing authority of the central administration for purposes of short-term work relief and long-term institutional survival; abandonment of the community model of intense faculty relationship to College and student life; passive resistance; a therapeutic "cult of bitching"; and selective use of "NO" as a short-term escape from excessive student demands. Collective efforts were also attempted: differential staffing; "work-to-rule" tactics and formal changes in the rules of the work process; and a still-born effort to unionize.

The faculty has pursued these means for work relief with mixed results. But few faculty would say the problem was behind them and most want to do something about it. In conclusion, we would like to offer some thoughts about what may happen in the future. We will assume, optimistically, that the relevant dynamics of the student pool, the faculty job market, and the general fiscal environment will not change significantly very soon.

Work intensification in the 1970s has laid the groundwork for a growing degree of faculty collective consciousness coming out of a structure that allowed little room for it. There are three broad models of faculty relationship to themselves and their surroundings--the community, professional, and union models--and while, for reasons we will point out, the first two are more or less out of the question, the third remains a conflicted possibility.

The community model of close faculty relationships to the campus and student life in general was an early casualty of the unexpected demands of

the work process coupled with 1970s trends toward intensifying work. While an atomized student body remains strongly attracted to the community model, the "College family" proved too intense for the faculty and triggered their escape to non-College life whenever possible. At the same time, post-1960s graduate students recruited as faculty members were somewhat less attracted to the community model than were the founding faculty. Added to this trend is the changing family situation of many faculty and spouses which has increased their need for quiet, family time away from Hampshire's demands.[32] However, with this demise of the community model, the way has been cleared for a greater degree of faculty collective consciousness--an attitude which was originally defined as a somewhat illegitimate, selfish interest in a "community" of "equals".

The professional model has not fared much better as a guide to faculty organization and ideology. An attack on this model was a promise of Hampshire's founding, and subsequent external changes in the 1970s (an oversupply of aspiring academics and a declining demand for them) have reinforced that attack. While some recently recruited faculty have tried to respecialize, or maintain specialized standing in the professional world for reasons of insuring personal mobility options and long-term institutional viability, only a small minority, if any, of the faculty would seriously suggest the professional model for Hampshire's future and students would oppose it en masse. Such a move would undermine Hampshire's raison d'etre and its fundamental asset in institutional competition for a declining student pool, and it fails to square with the conscious and continuing choice of most faculty to avoid the problems of narrow personal specialization, departmental exclusiveness, and distance from students that most believe compromise quality undergraduate education.

The collapse of the community model and the lack of broad support for the professional model, leaves room for the unionization model or some variant of it. Work intensification and concomitant faculty perceptions of an oppressive workload, coupled with a progressive clearing of the ideological terrain of alternatives makes the unionization option attractive although it presently is a vision without a program. Agreement over the desirability of higher income and more fringe benefits is not hard to find, of course, but the multiple work roles, fragmented work process, and semi-autonomous School "cultures" have encouraged precious little historical faculty agreement over what to do about the work process.

We believe that the latent consciousness of collective faculty interest may best be realized through the organization of a hybrid "professional union" seeking to preserve and extend the faculty-based self-management model built into the College. It would identify the faculty's shared interests not (or not primarily) in opposition to the College administration, but rather in concert with the students. It is they who have the most to lose from faculty over-work. And it is in the name of their quality education--defined in terms of Hampshire's threatened ideal of specialist-cum-generalist pedagogy--that such an effort has the most promise.

A professional union of faculty seeking to maintain a healthy and innovative teaching environment would have many positive benefits. It would provide a non-antagonistic forum for all-faculty discussion of daily work and long-term goals--a forum that does not now exist. In particular, the pedagogical intent and implications of the existing program and possible revisions, and the nature of our working conditions, could be addressed. It would assist in overcoming lingering faculty suspicion of unionization, whether

based on professional self-image or on family and class background. It would afford the faculty a legitimate basis for participation in long-term planning for the College, a task increasingly monopolized by administrative staff. Most importantly, it would provide a vehicle for collectively managing overwork--with neither bureaucratic centralization nor disciplinary over-specialization. A union, for example, could press effectively for a reallocation of resources (including targetted fund-raising) toward the hiring of additional faculty, thus reducing directly the burdensome student-faculty ratio to a more realistic figure. A union could also promote the expansion of existing, ad hoc collective responses to overwork, and do so with fewer problems of power and authority than could the administration.

We offer these thoughts about unionization every mindful of the limits of such proposals. As we have argued throughout, the intensification of work at places like Hampshire has partly been a response to more fundamental transformations in the political economy of labor in American capitalism, transformations that are likely to continue unabated. If these external trends of the 1970s made it more difficult for faculty to deal effectively with labor process issues, it is likely that only external changes will allow fundamental relief. But understanding the structural and ideological roots of our particular condition, we need not be slaves to or victims of seemingly unstoppable forces. If the "experiment" at places like Hampshire is to survive during continuing economic crisis, the absolutely central role of faculty in that experiment cannot be sacrificed to imagined administrative or fiscal necessity. And only faculty themselves, acting together, have the potential for preventing their own, and the College's, disintegration.

FOOTNOTES

1. See, in particular, Harry Braverman, Labor and Monopoly Capital (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974); Dan Clawson, Bureaucracy and the Labor Process (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1980); Rosalyn Baxandall et al., Technology, The Labor Process, and the Working Class (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976); Magali Sarfatti Larson, The Rise of Professionalism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Magali Sarfatti Larson, "Proletarianization and Educated Labor," Theory and Society, 9, 1980, pp. 131-175; John and Barbara Ehrenreich, "The Professional-Managerial Class," Radical America, XI,2, March-April 1977.
2. Frederick Stirton Weaver, "Academic Disciplines and Undergraduate Liberal Arts Education," Liberal Education, forthcoming.
3. Larson, "Proletarianization and Educated Labor."
4. Ibid. pp. 163-164.
5. Ibid., p. 158.
6. Hampshire was planned to be a tuition-dependent college. See Franklin Patterson and Charles R. Longsworth, The Making of a College (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1966), pp. 233-244.
7. Nancy Thornton Goddard, Progress by Examination (Amherst, MA: Hampshire College, 1981), p. 2. The internal quotation is from Patterson and Longsworth, The Making of a College, p. xiv.
8. Frederick Stirton Weaver, Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching at Hampshire College (Amherst, MA: Hampshire College, 1980), pp. 13-19.
9. Ibid., p. 26.
10. Alpert ascribes this problem of ever-expanding student/client demands

to the pre-paid, rather than fee-for-service, nature of Hampshire faculty. Moreover, we are, he argues, "general practitioners" rather than specialists. Richard M. Alpert, "Professionalism and Educational Reform: The Case of Hampshire College," Journal of Higher Education, 51, 5, 1980, pp. 497-518.

11. Weaver, Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching, pp. 26-27.

12. Survey data kindly supplied by Professor Nancy Goddard.

13. Goddard, Progress by Examination, p. 47.

14. "This figure may seem workable, but it is misleading. New faculty are not assigned advisees during their first semester at Hampshire. Sabbatical leave replacements (temporary, short-term faculty) do not know the system well and are not assigned advisees, nor are other short-term faculty. The resulting advising ratio ranges from 18 to 21:1. Even this ratio is further skewed by the multiple ways a professor often works with a student, usually one on one. Hampshire's ratio of 14.5:1 is higher than that at most comparable colleges (Marlboro, 8:1; Amherst, 10:1; Smith, 9.8:1; Mt. Holyoke, 11:1)." Ibid., p. 46. The current official 15.4:1 ratio is an improvement over the original 16:1 ratio. The improvement occurred in the mid-1970s when a declining applicant pool brought a slightly lower student enrollment while faculty, and some administrators, successfully argued for keeping faculty numbers constant.

15. College data indicate, however, that tuition costs have not risen as fast as the cost of living index.

16. Goddard, Progress by Examination, p. 24, and Garry Dearden and Malcolm Parlett, Ways and Byways Through Hampshire (Amherst, MA: Hampshire College, 1980, pp. 13-14.

17. Alpert, "Professionalism and Educational Reform," p. 505.

18. Goddard, Progress by Examination, p. 44. The survey yielded a 51 percent faculty response rate.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Alpert, "Professionalism and Educational Reform," p. 507.

22. Goddard, Progress by Examination, p. 44.

23. Larson sees this as a general result of work intensification in college teaching.

24. Generalizing tendencies coupled with work intensification may also provide incentives for a certain kind of scholarship. Given the limited time available for research and writing, coupled with an evolving general education for faculty through co-teaching and the exam process, there may be a tendency for faculty to opt for interpretive and theoretical writing as opposed to detailed empirical work.

25. Goddard, Progress by Examination, p. 3. Goddard reports that 90.6 percent of the faculty responding to her survey say they are strongly committed to the Hampshire system.

26. Data from the College's "People Budget" show that from 1975-76 to 1979-80 Administration FTEs increased 16.7 percent, while instructional FTEs increased only 6.6 percent and non-instructional staff FTEs remained unchanged. During the same period, the percentage of total personnel expenses going to instruction has remained constant, while the percentage going to administrative and student services has increased. Among the major beneficiaries are the central offices of admissions, development, and student affairs.

27. Causes of the Senate's apparent decline are not clear but might include

the preferred attention by some of the most vigorous faculty members to school (the level of greatest personal political significance) rather than College-level governance, indirect control of the agenda by the administration and consequent trivialization of Senate business, and a feeling that faculty time and attention paid to this level of governance has few payoffs.

28. Cf., Larson, "Proletarianization and Educated Labor," p. 162.

29. Goddard, Progress by Examination, p. 44.

30. Both have an interest in limiting faculty wage increases. Although no conscious administration-student alliance has emerged, tuition increases have been slightly under the rise of the cost of living index, while the real wages of faculty have declined.

31. The staff unionization attempt was vigorously opposed by the administration of a previous president.

32. Female spouses of male faculty members are beginning careers once children are grown, while several female faculty, now in their 30s, are havtheir first-born.

REFERENCES

Alpert, Richard M. "Professionalism and Educational Reform: The Case of Hampshire College." Journal of Higher Education 51 (1980), pp. 497-518.

Baxandall, Rosalyn, et al. Technology, The Labor Process, and the Working Class. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976.

Braverman, Harry. Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Press, 1974.

Clawson, Dan. Bureaucracy and the Labor Process. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1980.

Dearden, Garry, and Parlett, Malcolm. Ways and Byways Through Hampshire. Amherst, MA: Hampshire College, 1980.

Ehrenreich, John and Barbara. "The Professional-Managerial Class." Radical America XI, March-April 1977.

Goddard, Nancy Thornton. Progress by Examination. Amherst, MA: Hampshire College, 1981.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. "Proletarianization and Educated Labor." Theory and Society 9, (1980) pp. 131-175.

----------. The Rise of Professionalism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Patterson, Franklin, and Longsworth, Charles R. The Making of a College. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Weaver, Frederick Stirton. "Academic Disciplines and Undergraduate Liberal Arts Education." Liberal Education, forthcoming.

----------. Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching at Hampshire College. Amherst, MA: Hampshire College, 1980.