

arship as an important professional contribution worthy of full consideration in faculty evaluations. This is the most controversial and difficult recommendation to implement, but probably the most important because no matter what the APSA does, if this work is not rewarded at the departmental level, no one will engage in it. The integration of research and instruction by innovative faculty must be encouraged, and those who present and publish their "findings" and techniques should expect to have that scholarship recognized. Peer recognition of these contributions would enhance the reputations of institutions and faculty alike and provide "hard evidence" of a commitment to instruction, while at the same time satisfying the scholarly standards of the profession.

Realistically, I know that there must be some trade-offs in a finite system, but they need not be dramatic. For example, the proposal to add a section on instruction at the APSA annual meeting with panels is not without cost. The logistics of annual meeting planning would require cutting back panels in other areas to make room. However, at the 1991 meeting there were 40 sections and 468 panels on the official pro-

gram. If we were to add one section on instructional scholarship with 10 panels, that would represent a shift of about 2% of our attention toward an area that occupies at least 50% or more of the responsibility of most political scientists.

In conclusion, I find it remarkable that even in this era of "political correctness" the APSA and the discipline as a whole does not encourage scholarly diversity. We continue to insist that those who wish to be recognized for their scholarship adopt the classic Anglo-European tradition of scholarship limited to basic research in accepted areas. Not only do we exclude instructional and applied scholarship from the category of "real" research, we restrict multicultural diversity as well when we tell black, Latino, and women political scientists that their scholarship must be in the "mainstream" of the discipline, which means that they must conform to the standards of a specific, culture-bound conception of scholarship and higher education. Scholarly diversity requires the "mainstreaming" of different scholarship, not that different scholars all do a specific type of "mainstream" research.

The real obstacle to diversifying

scholarship is the collectively conservative mind-set of a discipline so insecure about its "scientific" credentials that it is afraid to admit any nontraditional definitions of scholarship that might undermine the academic status we have struggled so hard to achieve. Any change will require confidence and courage on the part of those who now have the power to define the discipline to include those presently excluded; thereby ending our disciplinary apartheid and recognizing instructional scholarship as a legitimate and valuable contribution of the professoriate.

About the Author

Peter Zwick is Political Science Program Director and Coordinator of International Education Programs at California State University-San Marcos. As a professor at the first new U.S. public institution of higher education in a quarter-century, he has been devoting considerable attention to issues of academic values and scholarly diversity.

From Professor of Political Science to Professor Emeritus

Albert Somit, *Southern Illinois University at Carbondale*

On a previous occasion, I described what it was like to move from president to professor ("Notes of a President on Returning to the Faculty," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 11, 1988). That change is one that relatively few academics will personally experience. Now, three years later, I find myself in a position to describe a transition that all faculty (who survive) will ultimately undergo—formal retirement. (As for the final metamorphosis to late professor, I am prepared to wait indefinitely.)

To be sure, the transition to pro-

fessor emeritus is one we have all witnessed many times and to which most of us have probably given considerable thought, especially after we enter our sixties. As president, in fact, I had often both commented on and sought to modify (usually quite unsuccessfully) the folly of many university retirement practices. I use the term "practices" deliberately because much of what we do is simply the result of custom and inertia, rather than of thoughtful policy. Nonetheless, it is one thing to observe, reflect, and perhaps empathize; it is quite another when we ourselves are

personally and directly involved.

Nor is retirement a matter primarily of concern to the individual rather than to the institution. The experiences of those now retiring will surely influence the decisions made by many faculty when mandatory retirement is outlawed a year from now. These choices, I think it is safe to say, may become a matter of considerable significance to universities. This is a point to which I will subsequently return, for it involves a potentially important area of institutional policy, one where change may be long overdue.

What are the first few months of retirement like? To answer that question, I will draw on my own impressions and those of a dozen or so of my colleagues around the country who have also recently crossed the Great Divide. (After drafting this article, I visited a long-time German colleague—and former rector—who has also just retired. His description of the post-retirement situation at his university was almost identical, point for point.) My strictly unscientific sample is drawn from retirees who desire—as in my own case—to remain professionally active. We intend to continue our research and writing, retirement notwithstanding, albeit at a somewhat more leisurely pace.

Probably the best way to begin is by distinguishing between those changes which one notices almost immediately and those of which we become more gradually aware. Regrettably, the former tend to be the more vexing, to put it charitably. It is with these, then, that I should start.

For many, perhaps most of us, retirement means the loss of the office we have occupied for years, if not for decades. The standard justification is that space is at a premium and the retiree's office is urgently needed for others. In partial extenuation, some departments (since this is the level at which the matter is traditionally handled) try to set aside an office for the collective use of the emeriti faculty. Some will offer a desk in rooms otherwise assigned to graduate assistants or nontenure track appointees. And occasionally the department either cannot or will not provide even this minimal accommodation.

All of these alternatives, of course, are psychologically as well as physically disruptive. At best, the emeriti must move from familiar—and in a relative sense, prime—quarters into much, much less attractive facilities. Personal files almost certainly must be taken home; the hundreds of books we have amassed must similarly be moved, given to colleagues and students, or thrust upon a manifestly reluctant campus library.

Secretarial and clerical services, rarely abundant, diminish or even disappear. Yesterday, as senior pro-

fessors, our needs commanded the highest priority, such as it was; today, with luck, we are at the end of the queue. (Emeriti who have the poor taste to complain are gently reminded that they themselves, not too long ago, were among the most insistent that secretarial and clerical preference be given to the “regular” staff.) This particular deprivation can be mitigated, in theory, to the degree that the retiree-to-be has taken the precautionary measure of mastering the word processor. But not all of us, I can ruefully testify, have found this to be a practicable solution.

Few emeriti expect, and even fewer are given, research assistants. For even this fortunate handful, though, further lessons in humility are to be learned, unless they are emeriti of Nobel or equivalent stature. Senior faculty normally have the pick of the graduate students—the brightest, the best trained, and possibly, it is sometimes alleged, the most personable. After retirement, however, the choice alters drastically. Barring some grave miscalculation, we get the least promising of the incoming class, the dullest of the second and third year complement, or Third World students who, no matter how intelligent and hard-working, have yet to master spoken, let alone written, English.

One more loss requires mention. For the past several years, travel money has been in short supply at most schools; at many, departmental chairs have been hard pressed to provide funds for even a single professional meeting annually for each of their staff. Understandably, the emeriti are almost automatically excluded from this allocation. For them, however, participation in these meetings is an integral aspect of their continuing scholarly and scientific work. But the attendant expenses can be a troublesome drain on (almost invariably) reduced incomes and, since they are officially retired, may not even be deductible for tax purposes.

So much for this brief introduction to a few of the unattractive aspects of retirement to which the new emeriti must adjust. Now for the other side of the ledger. There are some quite positive entries here although, as I indicated earlier, it

usually takes a bit longer to become fully cognizant of them.

First, there is the gradual realization that we can now come and go as we choose. Over the decades, many faculty develop fairly fixed habits. We get to the university at a given hour; our classes tend to fall, year after year, at the same day and time; and we take it as a fact of life that vacations and travel must be accommodated to these constraints.

This routine frequently tends to persist even after retirement. Then, one day, it occurs to us that we don't *have* to be at the office by a given hour—or that we don't even have to go in at all. Next, there is the dawning awareness that out-of-town trips, even overseas jaunts, need not be tailored to class sessions, innumerable campus commitments, or examination schedules and grading deadlines, but can take place at our convenience. In short, we are finally liberated from the tyranny of the academic calendar.

Second, there is the discovery that our working hours, even if fewer, are immeasurably more productive. There are no lectures to prepare or revise; no committee meetings to attend; rarely any students to advise; no exams to compose or grade; and we can blithely ignore the interminable forms which administrators devise to keep their staffs occupied and the faculty harassed. In short, we can accomplish a good deal more (in terms of research, reading, and writing) in much less time.

Third, apart from an occasional doctoral examination or dissertation, we are relieved of the judgmental responsibilities that constitute a recurrent aspect of academic life. We need no longer spend endless hours worrying about the grades of students, the comparative merits of applicants for graduate admission and assistantships, the qualifications of job candidates or, most agonizing of all, whether a colleague of many years is to be promoted, given tenure, or terminated. All these decisions, which often profoundly affect the lives of others, are no longer ours to ponder, to make—and sometimes to regret.

Finally, we find ourselves increasingly disinclined to invest unlimited time, energy, and emotion in depart-

mental, college, and university politics. Campus issues that once seemed of monumental importance take on a lesser dimension. We can contemplate the most egregious manifestation of administrative incompetence and arrogance, of faculty spinelessness, or even the prospect of shamefully minuscule salary increases with growing equanimity.

From the perspective of the "active" retiree, do these benefits sufficiently offset the unattractive features of emeritus status? In my own case, the answer would be "yes"—but I have admittedly enjoyed special treatment (though the winds grow somewhat cooler). For many, if not most, of the others in my unscientific sample, I fear, the answer would more likely be either equivocal or a flat "no." This is in part, to repeat an earlier comment, because one experiences the negative, well before one fully appreciates the positive, aspects of retirement. But, to be sure, only in part.

We have here, I believe, the makings of a potentially serious problem for American higher education. Over the next decade, about 25% of our faculty will reach the magic age mark and, under present law, will have the choice of retiring—or of continuing on. Many of them, no doubt, will elect to leave "no matter what." A sizable fraction, though, eager to continue some type of productive activity but understandably loathe to become members of a manifestly less privileged caste, may elect to postpone their retirement indefinitely. (Although a recent survey taken by the American Economics Association suggests that relatively few will do so, the survey has already drawn critical fire; I forbear to comment on economists' predictions in general.) The possibility of faculty declining to retire, especially at graduate institu-

tions, was specifically raised in a recent report of the National Research Council's Gomery Committee (*Science*, May 31, 1991, p. 1246). If even a small percentage of faculty choose to stay on, our schools will face a situation to which they have manifestly given little thought.

There are really two quite different considerations involved here. First, that of the individual—the need to treat retirees in a more thoughtful and humane fashion; second, that of the institution—the budgetary and other consequences to the school if any sizable number of senior faculty elect to continue their employment well past what has previously been the normal retirement age. Both considerations (and the first alone should have sufficed) argue for substantive changes in present practices and, where they actually exist, policies.

Specifically, I would propose the following:

1. That the "benefits" to be provided retirees be seen as a matter of institutional concern and decided, therefore, at the university/college, rather than the departmental, level;
2. That emeriti who wish to continue in an active scholarly role, and whose careers justify that expectation, be given alternative *private* office space if their previous quarters cannot be held for them;
3. That parallel measures be taken to provide the professionally active emeriti with a fair share of available secretarial and clerical services;
4. That these emeriti remain eligible, *de minimis*, for the assignment of research assistants, as their needs and the departmental situation warrants;
5. That emeriti be considered, on the same basis as other departmental faculty, for travel, research, etc., support.

A recent publication (James Mauch, et al., *The Emeritus Professor: Old Rank, New Meanings*, 1991) urges, in fact, the creation of a new academic rank to be called "working emeritus" for those who wish to combine retirement with professional activity. This would be one say, manifestly, of formalizing the above proposals.

These measures would cost relatively little. In most instances, they would simply require modification in the manner in which our schools ration already existent resources. Even if there were slight additional costs, these would be more than offset by the greater readiness of senior—and comparatively high salaried—faculty to retire sooner, rather than later. Furthermore, this institutional demonstration of concern and solicitude could be a critical factor in the willingness of many otherwise disenchanted retirees, active and inactive alike, to "give to the university," a consideration to which many administrators seem remarkably purblind.

Not least of all, these changes would do much to make retirement—and emeritus status—a much more attractive, rewarding, and productive experience. We have here one of those happy instances when enlightened institutional self-interest and the dictates of a humanitarian personnel policy clearly coincide.

About the Author

Albert Somit

Albert Somit was president of Southern Illinois University from 1980-87, and Distinguished Service Professor from 1987 until his retirement.

