Toward Tenure: Developing a Relational View

RALPH T. MASON, CATHERINE CASEY
University of Manitoba

PAUL BETTS
University of Winnipeg

ABSTRACT: To make sense of their different experiences with tenure, three education professors inquire into tenure as an institutional process using postmodern constructs. Foucault's *panopticon*, with its subsidiary ideas of *surveillance* and *docile bodies* provided a fresh perspective for viewing the power differential between pre-tenure professors and those tenured professors who will judge their adequacy for tenure status. Second, the authors used Baudrillard's *simulacrum* to understand differently their colleagues' attempts to simplify the challenge of tenure through the provision of unofficial statements of expected outputs. The vulnerability of new scholars due to the power differential within tenure is substantial, but such vulnerability may be a coherent consequence of the institution's structure. Rather than reforming tenure as an institutional process, the authors suggest that conversations about identity-making and tenure take place within relationships with colleagues.

RESUMÉ: Trois professeurs en éducation, enquêtent sur la titularisation en tant que méthode institutionnelle par le biais de structures postmodernes et ce, pour donner un sens à leurs expériences différentes face à la titularisation. Le "panopticon" de Foucault avec ses idées connexes de "surveillance" et de "docile bodies," a apporté un regard nouveau sur la façon d'envisager le pouvoir différentiel entre les professeurs en attente d'une titularisation et les professeurs titulaires qui jugeront après de leur accord sur un statut de titularisation. Ensuite, les auteurs se sont servis du "simulacrum" de Baudrillard pour comprendre différemment les tentatives de leurs confrères à adoucir la difficulté de la titularisation à travers la clause de déclarations officieuses de résultats attendus. La vulnérabilité des nouveaux érudits, due à la différence de pouvoir au sein même de la titularisation, est considérable. Nonobstant, une telle vulnérabilité peut être une conséquence logique de la structure de l'établissement. Les auteurs

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 44, No. 1, 2010, 85-98.

proposent que des conversations, sur le façonnage de l'identité et sur la titularisation, s'organisent entre collègues plutôt que de réformer la titularisation en procédure institutionnelle.

Introduction

So here we are: a new scholar hired two years ago (Catherine); a person who recently achieved tenure (Paul); and a mid-career academic whose long-ago application for tenure is now primarily a memory of intense vulnerability (Ralph). In writing this article, we have attempted to avoid engaging in critiquing tenure as an institutional process; we will make no recommendations to how faculties and tenure committees can fulfill the purposes of tenure differently. Instead, we will provide an account of our inquiry into two aspects of tenure. With the infusion of two postmodern theorists' concepts, we adopted a critical/interpretive stance regarding the power relations of peer review as they relate to tenure, and with the phenomenon of colleagues' efforts to bring clarity to tenure standards by setting quotas for expected levels of production. Because we see the identity-making that a new professor does under the mantle of impending tenure to be a deeply personal subject, we have attempted to keep a personal tone to the discussion. We close with our views of how the identity making of the pre-tenure period is embedded in relationships, and that such views offer a narrative move beyond the critiques of the institutional processes of tenure already found in the literature on tenure.

Tenure is the period of time in which professors determine their legitimacy as employees of their university (Tierney, 1997). As such, tenure is a site where all the unresolved factors that relate to the mission of universities surface – the efficacy of various forms of dissemination, clashes in research purposes and approaches, the challenges of teaching well, and the challenges of determining quality of teaching (Coulter & Wiens, 2002). Even though fundamental issues remain unresolved in the academy about research, teaching, and service, a clear decision is made for every applicant for tenure that she or he may (or may not) continue in her or his career. Standards for the determination of tenure constitute contested terrain (Cochran-Smyth & Lytle, 1999). The same ambiguities arise in other peer-review deliberations – the consideration of conference presentations, manuscripts for possible publication, research reviews, and research ethics board determinations, for instance – but the stakes for the tenure applicant far exceed those for any other submission to a peer review

process. For those who are on a tenure track, the power differential between themselves and those who will ultimately determine their status is palpable. The vulnerability of the pre-tenure professor is real, and the uncertainty of facing a process that involves all the unresolved issues of the professor's faculty won't go away. We don't think the tenure process is going away, either, and since it's not going to change much, we know what we're dealing with. The three of us decided to deal with it *well.*

We are writing this article to complete a conversational inquiry, an effort to find a more enabling understanding of two factors of tenure that daunted us – the power differential and the ambiguity of its criteria. At first our talk about tenure turned too easily to rehashing generalities, retelling second-hand tales, and wistfully describing how it might be different (Cole, 1999). We needed a way to get analytical with the topic. We turned to theoretical terrain all three of us find both challenging and potentially too bleak for our purposes – discourse tools of Michel Foucault and Jean Baudrillard.

The Institutional Power of Tenure

The power relations inherent in the tenure process are an enactment of the principle of peer review in a judgment that imposes significant vulnerability on the pre-tenure professor. To freshen our thinking about peer review as a power relation, we turned to the theory of Michel Foucault (1980, 1983). One particular conception of Foucault (1979) is that of the *panopticon*, an analogy grounded in a theoretical design for prisons, in which *surveillance* of prisoners is carried out by the prisoners themselves. In such a prison, the most dangerous criminals, occupying the inner rooms in a floor-plan of concentric rings, are held under the watchful gaze of those less dangerous who occupy outer rings. The prisoners acquiesce over time to the behavioral expectations of those who watch, including adopting the responsibility in turn of becoming watchers, and the institution's goals are achieved – compliance (Shore & Roberts, 1993), and the transformation of inmates into docile bodies who with minimal management will make the institution's goals and methods their own. Catherine's initial reaction was one we all felt: "That's just too BLEAK!" But we decided to persist, and see how panopticon served us as an interpretive device. It had already disrupted our perspectives.

Others before us have invoked panopticon as a device for thinking about tenure and power within educational contexts. In general, we

found such critiques to be too global in their framing and too critical in their orientation – our goal was coming to amenable terms with a process we must live with, not to critique or provoke. For instance, we do not accept the necessity for full compliance with tenure's pressures which follow from Krier and Staples's (1993) synopsis: "Within any bureaucratic organization, be it office, school, or prison, it is exemplary performance in conformity with established rules that leads to promotion and tenure" (p. 122). Nor do we accept Sosteric's (1999) belief that all scholars respond with complete compliance: "Because they facilitate actual shifts in thinking, panoptic systems thus function as systems of behavioral and ideational (hegemonic) manipulation and control" (p. 1). And we want to accomplish a repositioning, not just more discussion, the only action recommended by Wicks (2004): "The purpose of this Foucaultian discussion of the effects of tenure is to show that there is a side to tenure that is not widely discussed – one that places faculty under close scrutiny, discourages academic freedom and increases managerial control" (p. 625). Even as we saw their statements as too broad and too bleak for our lived realities, we were grateful to the examples of their thinking – thinking we had to do for ourselves to position Foucault's concepts of power relations usefully with our conception of tenure.

In our search for an understanding of tenure that will help us help each other and our colleagues, the panopticon image works well in part because it is too strong for metaphoric comparison with tenure. It works in part because it doesn't fit very well. The image of the pre-tenured professor in the inner circles of a prison disrupted our original more territorial image of academia with the inner circles reserved for the privileged and vigilant full professors on the tenure committee. It disrupted our notion of new members of a group being restricted to the margins, as is implied by concepts such as Lave and Wenger's "legitimate peripheral participation by apprentices in communities of practice" (1991). Disruption of our preconceptions was why we had turned to these concepts in the first place. For the sake of our consideration of the power relations, a postmodern reversal of the inside and outside in the model helped our critique of our preconceptions (Hlynka & Mason, 1998). Yet the notions of surveillance and docility seems to fit for us: in institutions such as our faculties, individuals are difficult to manage, and unconstrained mavericks among the faculty would/does make it even more difficult. Is tenure structured to make faculty members more docile, more acquiescent to shaping themselves

toward an institutional image of the professorial identity? Consider the act of submitting an application to a tenure committee, or even the less defined acts of submitting to the institution's unspecified standards of tenure before applying. Is submitting an application a submissive act, an acquiescence in part to the surveillance of those empowered to engage in peer review? Foucault's interpretive tools have helped us to think about our own tenure experiences with fresh intent.

In light of the idea of docility under surveillance, Paul's tenure-track story makes different sense to us now. As a new professor of mathematics education, Paul found himself reliving the complexities of his dissertation research (Betts, 2005), which was a study of the dissonance faced by elementary preservice teachers in courses that prepare them to teach mathematics. While some preservice teachers had little difficulty imagining themselves as effective teachers of mathematics, many wanted neither to teach it as they had been taught, nor to accept the challenge of learning a wholly new way to teach a subject they did not like. When Paul engaged students with that dilemma, he felt that some students projected that discomfort onto the professor that led them there.

The form used for student evaluations of Paul's teaching defined good teaching as a non-problematic content distribution process in which students learned by listening, taking notes, and doing well-delineated assignments. With the watchful gaze of his tenure committee embodied in those evaluations, how could he honorably embrace the troubling identity issues his students faced or avoided as they pictured themselves teaching mathematics? Paul found himself living in tension. On the one hand, he wanted students to interrogate their discomfort with mathematics. On the other hand, he wanted to scaffold their engagement with the challenges of teaching mathematics, providing comfort to them, and being seen by them as providing comfort. Paul decided that he must, to at least some degree, help students to agree to course evaluation statements like, "The instructor provides lectures that I can take good notes from" as the course evaluation forms said. Perhaps, he told himself, they will find sufficient enough comfort in such lessons that they will be more able to embrace the complexity of preparing to teach mathematics well. The rules of tenure suggested that the committee would consider other evidence of the quality of a candidate's teaching, so Paul arranged for Ralph to observe a class and write an observational report. Paul's motivations weren't to legitimately complement the student evaluations – it was because the rules of tenure

privileged written evidence. Paul uses Foucault's terms now, when he tells his story.

> *I made it work, and I don't mean just that I got tenure, but I mean it worked because I am a good professor now and I am effective in my teaching, my research and my service, it was the fear that pushed me. I felt their surveillance, and I submitted to their standard definition of good teaching and scholarship.*

More generally, viewing the power differential within tenure as a panoptic structure has helped us to acknowledge that efforts to control the individuals within the institution comprise a *natural* quality of institutions. Townley (1993) also came to terms with these processes of human resource management using Foucault:

> Power is not associated with a particular institution, but with practices, techniques, and procedures. ... Objects are rendered amenable to intervention and regulation by being formulated in a particular conceptual way. Governmentality places an emphasis on regulatory systems, processes, and methods of thinking about or perceiving a domain, especially those which may be translated into written inscriptions that claim to authentically depict it. (p. 521)

We now find ourselves able to see this power differential as inevitable, and choose to exercise our own power to mediate its effects on vulnerable colleagues, rather than viewing the power differential as an evil to be exorcised or somehow incised from the institution. If the power differential is mediated, could new scholars align their intentions and efforts to shape themselves into the academics they desire to be with the institution's intentions to grant academic freedom only to those who have demonstrated themselves worthy?

Making Sense of Tenure Standards

Not all tenure-oriented activities within our faculties are made coherent through the quite manipulative lens of Foucault's panopticon analogy. For instance, faculty members, both institutionally and informally, as collectives and as individuals, attempt to reduce the complexity of tenure to delineations that specify products. Surely, they might argue, the unpredictability of the evaluation of applications for tenure could be reduced if general standards are changed into lists of outputs. With increased predictability, there is hope for decreased uncertainty and vulnerability. We don't find such benevolence in intention to be well-explained by the ideas inherent to the panopticon analogy.

We do need to understand and to question the notion of reforming tenure by specifying what every applicant should achieve in the pre-tenure portion of their career. A single delineation of what a tenure-track professor should accomplish may constrain what academics value. For instance, the three of us are all education professors in curriculum areas, and even among professors of curriculum, differences about relationships with schools, scope, and approach of research design, and priorities for our public voices in conferences and publications make us distrustful of any notion of a common standard for our academic identities. We worry that benevolent efforts to defang tenure's power differential through the negotiation of explicit standards will be too constraining of the identity-making we have come to see as the central purpose of the tenure-track portion of a professor's career. We believe that at the beginning of our professorships, we found the idea of defined quotas of products appealing because it reduced the uncertainty of what was enough production, but we had to decide for ourselves how to position ourselves with such informal statements of tenure standards. Catherine and Paul felt that conversations with Ralph have been crucial to their negotiation of that decision for themselves – but none of us could say how those conversations worked. To think freshly about this concern, we turned to a different theorist's concepts.

Simulacrum is a conception that Baudrillard (1988) offers, identifying a phenomenon in which representations of things evolve from *standing for* the thing they represent to *standing in for* that thing. A simulacrum is a symbol system that has come to replace the thing which it originally represented. A simulation is a simplification of a phenomenon; a simulation becomes a simulacrum when it is placed in front of the phenomenon it simplifies, and obscures the phenomenon from view. In education, we see this phenomenon often. For instance, curriculum documents (or on a lesser level, course outlines), which were originally scant outlines of the intended learning that was to occur, have too often become the precise specification, the delineation of the ends of the course. Final examinations, which were originally representations of parts of the curriculum that could be tested legitimately, have replaced the curriculum, as when teachers teach to the test. The mark in a course can be a simple representation of students' relative success in learning, a synopsis of the relative success a student had within the complex processes by which learning happens. Too often the mark or the grade has been adopted by students as their goal, not as a simple representation of the understanding we would prefer they desire but as

a *replacement* (Abeles, 2005). In each case, a representation of an end goal is placed in front of what it originally represented, obscuring it, and becoming the end in view.

Although we would prefer to use Baudrillard for finer-brush detail than whole-system characterizations, Abeles (2005) exemplifies the troubling clarity that a notion like simulacrum enables when applied to universities and tenure.

> Scholarly exchanges, because of the current system for promotion and tenure, has the faculty participating in this simulacrum in the same manner, but expanded across both brick and click space. Both faculty and students are engaged in the popular game of "treasure hunt" where participants have a list of items they need to acquire in order to win a prize. For students, it's a degree and for faculty it's tenure and promotion. (p. 1)

Although there are further layers to Baudrillard's development of the simulacrum, we will not elaborate, and risk the irony of further clarification of the concept obscuring what we wish the concept to illuminate. (We recommend Brown & Marston, 1997, for a more rigorous interweaving of simulacrum with tenure.)

For the three of us, the notion of simulacrum is a way to reframe our concern about the efforts of colleagues to simplify the scholarly aspects of tenure to a prescribed set of accomplishments. Approaches to that prescription differ. In our contexts, the universal unit of exchange seems to be a peer-reviewed publication in a scholarly journal. On such a scorecard, this article would then be worth one (1.). A publication in conference proceedings might be worth half as much. A large-scale research grant and a publication resulting from a scholarly grant would each be worth more. On one level, this is a helpful process – simplifying the complex question of what evidence of scholarship is, so that it can be talked about, questioned, and developed into goals by tenure-track professors. What can be wrong with seeing the achievement of tenure as being the compiling of documented accomplishments sufficient to achieve the standards of one's institution? Paul remembers wanting to write for publication based on his dissertation. He could choose to complete two shorter manuscripts for medium-prestige journals, or, in about the same time, write a more complex piece suitable for a high-prestige journal with an intimidating acceptance rate. Should his decision be based on what best reflected his intentions as a scholarly author and a professor-in-the making? Or should it be a tactical reflection of his colleagues' stated expectation of new scholars that they would have two publications

(or their equivalent) per year of scholarly activity? Paul's spouse, herself an academic, recommended the tactical choice. In conversations with Ralph, Paul found himself torn, resenting the imposition of tenure on his scholarly intentions but wanting to minimize his vulnerability by adhering to his colleagues' informal tenure scorecards. If colleagues' expectations *determine* a professor's priorities during the pre-tenure period of a career, they become simulacra, obscuring what they were meant only to simplify, the set of indicators of an effective beginning to an academic career. In part because Paul had multiple conversation partners throughout this difficult period, he was able to find a pathway that blended the development of his scholarly focus and the number of achievements that his colleagues expected.

Like Paul in mathematics education, Catherine acknowledges the inherent and different challenges in teaching preservice physical education to future specialists and generalists. Catherine came to professorship after considerable time enjoying the challenges of teaching and school administration. Now she is delighted to be in a tenure-track position, enjoying all the challenges that professorship entails. Developing a service relationship with schools in a new province isn't easy, and simultaneously attending to writing toward publication from her dissertation and writing research grants has at times threatened Catherine's personal life priorities.

Catherine's conversations with her husband, a former professor and dean, often turn toward the necessity of achieving particular markers of success as a beginning scholar, and Catherine appreciates these frequent reminders of the minimum achievements she must accomplish in a relatively short time. But overall, especially in hallway conversations with Ralph, Catherine insists that she won't let the delineations of tenure by her colleagues and her husband define how she perceives the process of developing her career. For instance, she has not scaled back on opportunities she values that might restrict her time for scholarly outputs, such as taking on leadership opportunities in the faculty. At the same time, Catherine has chosen to pursue funding for a larger-scale long-term research project with multiple partners, at the expense of the smaller, higher-certainty grants that her institution recommends to beginning scholars. She has well articulated short-term and long-term goals for herself in the areas of teaching, research, and service. These goals were not carved from the tenure criteria but rather from Catherine's passion to learn and to become more fully effective as an academic. Catherine asserts that because her goals exceed the

minimalist viewpoint of those who propose tenure rubrics for her to use, she is entitled to dismiss those viewpoints. (Note – between first drafts and final editing, of this manuscript, Catherine has been informed of the success of her team's large-scale grant. Her happiness isn't based on the significance of this achievement and the publications that will follow on her future application for tenure. It is because of the personal academic goals that the funding will enable her to achieve.)

Paul and Catherine portray two very different orientations toward tenure and scholarly identity-making. During the first years of his career, Paul dedicated himself to achieving the unofficial requirements of tenure. Paul relied on conversations with his spouse and trusted colleagues to bring the honorable intentions that were hidden behind the lists of products for obtaining tenure back into view. Now, in hindsight, as he begins to support the new scholars around him, Paul recognizes that he succeeded in finding a balance. In quite different conversations with Ralph and with her husband, Catherine ensures that her idealistic insistence on pursuing her own goals subsumes, rather than ignores, the full range of tenure expectations. The self-directed construction of a unique and confident scholar that is not just every new scholar's responsibility. It is their right. A delineation of tenure requirements intended to clarify the significant goals of the pre-tenure period, if it is taken as the goal to be achieved, the true goal can be obscured and perhaps lost.

The notion of simulacrum has helped us to think about and discuss the conflicting purposes at stake. Tenure scorecards may be benign in their intention and may reduce the vulnerability of ambiguity that pre-tenure scholars experience. But identity-making by processes of pursuing and achieving a delineated set of achievements is more likely to create a compliant servant, a docile body, rather than an independent and self-directed scholar.

Relationship and Tenure

Our inquiry into tenure hasn't led to recommendations for the institutions to replace or amend tenure as a process. It wasn't intended to. Rather, it has led us to see a personal and interpersonal action to make the tenure-track process more navigable. It's not an institutional response – it's collegial. Simply put, we recommend acting on the power differential that creates vulnerability in pre-tenure scholars by talking about it. In particular, experienced scholars need to foster relationships

with beginning scholars, relationships that can handle the challenges of talking about tenure personally, tentatively, and strategically.

The image of relationship that the three of us are describing is neither that of the sage advisor guiding a person who is enduring an apprenticeship period, nor that of the grizzled veteran helping the youngster un-jam a photocopier and rephrasing the first paragraph in a proposal. The development of an independent and self-directing scholar isn't something that is accomplished by advising a new scholar what to do or solving a new scholar's problems. Yet advice and practical help might well be part of the relationship-building that would precede discussions of personal goals. The vulnerability and uncertainty of academic identity isn't easy to discuss with anyone, so a relationship needs to be fostered before addressing matters related to the decisions a scholar faces. When relationships emerge naturally, there may be trust enough to discuss sincerely the biggest challenge young faculty face – shaping a personal professorial identity while preparing to qualify for tenure.

In documenting our own investigation of the tenure phenomenon, we have attempted to illuminate two kinds of processes that helped us tame our concerns about tenure. One is intellectual, even scholarly in its orientation. We turned to post-modern theory to disrupt our unrefined view of the tenure process in our universities. When we attempted to map Foucault's notions of the panopticon, surveillance, and docile bodies onto the power relations active in tenure, no great truth emerged. Instead, we found ourselves acknowledging the tension between preserving autonomy and identity during the pre-tenure period and acknowledging the conformity which tenure encourages. Despite the difference in power, the difference in vulnerability between the candidate for tenure and the adjudicators, the evaluation of a candidate's body of accomplishments operates within contested terrain between two operational principles, peer review and academic autonomy. In our engagement with the notion of simulacrum, we found a sense of the *legitimacy* of our faculties' efforts to simplify the notion of what deliverables should be expected of applicants. The real meaning of the pre-tenure period is academic identity-making, and yes, the scorecards, informal as well as formal, could easily depose that meaning that they try to represent, simplify, simulate. But that too can be resisted as the complexities of the pre-tenure period are negotiated.

The other process we have discussed here is relational. Catherine and Paul each found a very different positioning for themselves in the

tension between constructing oneself as an academic according to one's own image of oneself and using the guidance of formal and informal delineations of standards for tenure. Because there is no one ideal pathway to tenure to be mapped, there is no one ideal stance for conversation partners to take. At a particular time a relationship might occasion dialogue leading to guidance. We believe that such conversations should at times disrupt the participants' taken-as-true presumptions about tenure, the purposes and power relationships in play both generally and in the specific context of the pre-tenure professor's personal pathway. To enable tenure-track academics to consider *both* the institution's expectations *and* the necessity of crafting a personally appropriate academic identity, conversations with a trusted colleague about academic goals and identities may be troubling or reassuring.

All three of us began this interrogation of tenure concerned about tenure's potential to dominate the early experiences of academics. Subjecting our notions of tenure to a postmodern filter has led us to see our current and recent experiences with tenure as healthy, in spite of the power differential and vulnerability inherent in it. All pre-tenure professors deserve opportunities to discuss the big decisions they face, early in the process that constructs their academic identity, including the scholar's personal choice regarding the pressures of the tenure process. It is a healthy thing to inspect the power relations inherent in tenure, and as new academics lay down their pathway through the contested terrain that leads to tenure, discourse with trusted colleagues can enable new academics to choose their first steps well.

REFERENCES

Abeles, T.P. (2005). E-Learning in the new university. *E-Mentor, 4*. Retrieved 2009 March 28 from http://www.e-mentor.edu.pl/artykul_v2.php?numer=11&id=204

Baudrillard, J. (1988). Simulacra and simulacrum. In M. Poster (Ed.), *Selected Writings* (pp.166-184). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Betts, P. (2005). *Transforming images of mathematics/teaching: A study of pre-service teachers/teaching.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regina, SK: University of Regina.

Brown, N.A. & Marston, P. (1997). The co-production of knowledge and power: A postmodern critique of tenure. *Enculturation, 1*(1). Retrieved 2009 March 28 from http://enculturation.gmu.edu/1_1/brown.html

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher, 28*(7), 15-25.

Cole, A.L. (1999). Teacher educators and teacher education reform: Individual commitments, institutional realities. *Canadian Journal of Education, 24*(3), 281-295.

Coulter, D. & Wiens, J.R. (2002). Educational judgment: Linking the actor and the spectator. *Educational Researcher, 31*(4), 15-25.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Knowledge/power: Selected interviews and other writings.* New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. 1983. The subject and power. In H.L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hlynka, D. & Mason, R.T. (1998). PowerPoint in the classroom: What's the point? *Educational Technology, 38*(5), 45-48.

Krier, D. & Staples. W.G. (1993). Seen but unseen: Part-time faculty and institutional surveillance and control. *The American Sociologist, 24* (3-4), 119-134.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Piaget, J. (2001). *The psychology of intelligence.* New York: Routledge.

Shore, C. & Roberts, S. (1993). *Higher education and the panopticon paradigm: Quality assessment as "disciplinary technology".* Paper presented at Society for Research into Higher Education Conference. ERIC document ED368243.

Sosteric, M. (1999). Endowing Mediocrity: Neoliberalism, information technology, and the decline of radical pedagogy. *Radical Pedagogy, 1*, 1.

Tierney, W.G. (1997). Tenure and community in academe. *Educational Researcher, 26*(8), 17-23.

Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, power/knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management. *Academy of Management Review, 18* (3), 518-545.

Wicks, D. (2004). The institution of tenure: Freedom or discipline? *Management Decision, 42*(5), 619-627.

Ralph Mason and *Catherine Casey* are colleagues in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at University of Manitoba. *Paul Betts* is in the Faculty of Education, University of Winnipeg. Ralph and Paul's core teaching and research interests involve mathematics education; Catherine is a teacher educator and researcher in physical education.

Authors Addresses:
Ralph Mason and Catherine Casey
Faculty of Education
Education Building
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, MB
CANADA R3T 2N2
EMAIL: masonrt@mts.net
caseyc@cc.umanitoba.ca

Paul Betts
Faculty of Education
The University of Winnipeg
515 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, MB
CANADA R3B 2E9
EMAIL: p.betts@uwinnipeg.ca