

**Breaking Loose from the Ivory Tower:
The Challenges for Academic Researchers with an Activist Agenda in Tourism**

Ross A. Klein, PhD
School of Social Work
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, NL A1C 5S7
rklein@mun.ca or ross@cruisejunkie.com

Paper presented at the International Critical Tourism Studies Conference V, June 25 – 28,
2013, Sarajevo, Bosnia & Herzegovina

Breaking Loose from the Ivory Tower: The Challenges for Academic Researchers with an Activist Agenda in Tourism

In training as academics we are encouraged to embrace critical thinking and the joy of discovery. Support is given to research agendas that break new ground, that provide new insights to the literature, and that illuminate undiscovered and misunderstood areas within our academic discipline. It is an exciting time as we embrace our aspired profession, and as we confront a world waiting to be researched, analyzed, and understood with new insights. If successful, we find ourselves in an academic institution that encourages us to continue our research agenda. Unexpectedly, it may at the same time introduce other expectations such as where research should be published, and that research garnering significant funding has greater value than research that does not have an economic benefit to the institution. We shift from our training as an academic valuing discovery and embracing new ideas, values that have traditionally been associated with the “Ivory Tower,” to a system of rewards and benefits focusing on economic benefits and “not rocking the boat.” Heaven forbid a research agenda is so cutting edge or have an activist agenda that it brings other than positive attention to the institution that pays our salary.

This paper is based on the author’s own experience of adopting a research agenda that has a critical element relating to a major international tourism product. While the research has received considerable positive attention from a wide range of nonacademic sources, it has been systematically devalued by the academy in which he works. One set of issues is that dissemination of the research has not been exclusively in traditional academic venues. Another set of issues is that the research has equal or greater value to grassroots community groups, some of which are activist, than to the academy. But the biggest issue is that the research isn’t liked by industry and industry has many ways to make their views known to senior university

administrators. The author's experience provides insight into challenges facing others who pursue nontraditional or critical research.

The Research Agenda

My research is focused on the international cruise industry. The interest emerged organically. I became a cruise enthusiast in 1992; by 1995 I was spending fifty days or more on cruise ships. Having been trained as a qualitative sociologist I couldn't help but notice the contradictions between the depiction of cruises in advertising and brochures and the product delivered onboard. It was also difficult to miss the disconnect between onboard representations about conscientious environmental initiatives and environmental practices – this was vividly demonstrated in 1993 aboard a Royal Caribbean ship that touted its "Save the Waves" campaign, claiming nothing was thrown overboard but then I watched every night as sea gulls dive-bombed behind the ship as they collected food waste and other trash (see Klein 2002a). It was also difficult to match proud claims about the international crew and how happy they are working on the ship without thinking about the exploitive employment conditions: 80 – 90 hour work weeks without a day off, contracts lasting 10-12 months, and remuneration for many of between one and two dollars an hour (see Klein 2001).

Adhering to my academic training I went into the literature to see what previously had been researched and written about the cruise industry. There was a paucity of research; none of the very few publications looked critically at the cruise product or the cruise industry. The timing was perfect. I was looking for a new area of research to pursue and found a totally undeveloped niche – an academic's dream. I spent the next several years, and more than 150 days on cruise ships, refining the substance of what would become my research focus and agenda. I spoke to passengers, to officers and crew, and explored the trade media. By 1998, I had made a commitment that this would be my area of research, oddly enough just months before Douglas Frantz, an investigative reporter with the *New York Times*, published his first article about the

cruise industry – an expose of sexual assaults (including sexual assaults involving girls under the age of 18) (see Frantz 1998). What else does an academic need to get motivated? My first book appeared in 2001, another in 2002, and subsequently two more books, six commissioned reports for nongovernmental organizations, dozens of articles and book chapters, and invitations to testify before legislative bodies, including the U.S. Congress. .

Being the only visible academic in the field, and the lone writer with a critical perspective, my career took on a life of its own. Because my writing concerned environmental issues I was invited by several nongovernmental environmental organizations to become involved in their active campaigns. Because my research included labour issues I was asked to become involved with International Transport Workers Federation and War on Want's "Sweatships" campaign. In time I became involved with a range of organizations, some national or international in scope (including International Cruise Victims Association), and many grassroots community organizations concerned about the growth and impact of cruise tourism. Issues included the environment (including people pollution); labour; crime and victimization; the economic relationship between ports and cruise ships; the socio-cultural and economic impact of cruise tourism; issues of health, illness and liability; and the relationship between the cruise industry and the media and legislators. My direct involvement spanned North and Central America (Canada, the U.S., Mexico, and Belize), small island states of the Caribbean, the UK, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Croatia, Australia, and New Zealand.

Community Engagement

When my work began there was talk in the academy of bridging the gap between "town and gown" – moving the ivory tower into the community and becoming involved with community-based issues (see Bruning, McGrew and Cooper 2006). In 2006, the buzzword became "community engagement." The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching had come up with a new classification. In April 2006, 145 institutions responded to the opportunity to

be classified; in December 2006, the foundation announced the inaugural selection of 76 U. S. colleges and universities to be newly classified as “institutions of community engagement” (Driscoll 2008). Under the scheme, faculty scholarship was seen as evidence of the institutionalization of community engagement and that it was part of faculty roles and rewards, rather than being an “add-on” to faculty responsibilities.

The issue of how community engagement fits into the promotion and tenure process is discussed in a blog on university-community engagement authored by Margo Fryer, appearing on the website of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (see Fryer 2013). As she points out, few institutions have tenure and promotion policies recognizing community engagement. Referring to the 145 applications to the Carnegie Foundation, Driscoll states, “...even among the most compelling applications, few institutions described promotion and tenure policies that recognize and reward the scholarship associated with community engagement” (Driscoll cited in Schnaubelt and Statham 2007, p. 18). While university rhetoric supports the concept of community engagement, the activity is not valued in promotion and tenure decisions.

A more critical issue is how community engagement is defined – the definition is elusive and often not clearly articulated. Churchill (2011), for example, asks why writing op-ed pieces for newspapers such as *The New York Times* and *The Boston Globe* is considered public engagement rather than community engagement. The lack of clarity about what constitutes community engagement means that some forms are more valued than others. For example, when I taught a course in community action, the university administration took a dim view when the students chose to develop a community action campaign that challenged the university and its interpretation of U.S. government policies that unnecessarily disadvantaged students; a year later that same administration applauded a student initiative in the same course that took on policies of the city government. My current institution espouses the importance and value of community engagement. It even has a centre that ostensibly encourages and facilitates such

activities, but community engagement continues to be devalued when it comes to promotion and tenure.

As an example, an invitation to become part of a coalition of 12 environmental organizations as they worked to develop a framework for the Clean Cruise Ship Act was discounted as being “non-academic” (see Klein 2007) – I was the only academic at the table. Never mind that members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate agreed to sponsor the draft legislation, which was subsequently introduced in the U.S. Congress, twice, although it did not succeed. Further, dozens of lectures sponsored by grassroots community groups, even when the venue was a university, were not viewed positively; nor was the extensive media coverage of many of these lectures. Even a request to testify before the U.S. Congress was viewed unenthusiastically; when I asked the university to subsidize my costs (a couple hundred dollars, maybe) to appear the university responded that it couldn’t afford it.

The problem for an academic who believes that academic work must have a home in the real world – the community – risks having that work devalued or ignored when it comes to promotion and tenure. The concept of *praxis*, a key element of much that is taught (particularly in a professional school, which is where I teach), is wonderful to espouse to students, but is not valued by the institution itself. Those who have an activist thread to their scholarship run the risk of having their research subjected to criticism and suspicion. This wouldn’t be the case if the work was positivistic or in the mainstream of what constitutes academic pursuits. Though community engagement as a broad concept is given lip service as being important, its value in promotion and tenure decisions may be quite narrow and limited, and only certain types of community engagement (that having economic value to the university) may be recognized as a reflection of scholarship.

It Isn't What You Publish, It is Where You Publish

Another challenge for an academic writing from a critical perspective, or one whose work has an applied element, is the stature given the venue where the work is published. The Collective Agreement at my university, like that at many, states that dissemination of scholarly work (usually through publication) is expected for promotion and tenure, however there is no stipulation requiring refereed over non-refereed publications, funded research over unfunded research, nor where research must appear. However, universities are increasingly requiring publication in so-called "first tier" journals, thereby devaluing publications in journals that are more specialized or that reflect nonmainstream views. The result is that many journals are shunned in favour of the few journals in the top tier. I see this as an associate editor of the *Journal of Tourism in Marine Environments*. Many academics submit papers to the journal only after having those papers rejected by higher stature journals even though the *Journal of Tourism in Marine Environments* is more likely to reach readers with a common, specialized interest as the author.

There are also metrics used to determine the impact of a publication – thereby giving greater value (or any value at all) to work that is more popular within one's field. When I was a graduate student in the 1970s the key metric was the degree to which publications are referenced in the *Social Sciences Citations Index*. I know many who would heavily cite their own work in order to increase their listings. However, the bigger problem is that popularity as measured by the number of citations (i.e., impact) is often related as much to the mainstream nature of the work as it is to falling within a narrow definition of what the discipline is about. Published work that is outside the mainstream, that utilizes non-positivist methodologies, and/or that forges into new and previously unexplored areas is likely to have lower metrics and thus be viewed as less "scholarly" or less valuable in the promotion and tenure process. This is particularly a problem for early-career, pre-tenure academics. They are structurally pressured to

produce work that is politically neutral and potentially academically unimaginative, but which has a large impact (however that is measured).

This is particularly a problem for those working from a critical perspective. Journals that are likely to publish their work are not likely to be “top tier”, and their work is not likely to be cited by those in the mainstream. It is a double whammy. Good quality work of a critical nature is not only difficult to publish but it is devalued. As well, if one is so unfortunate to be an early writer in a field, they are faced with reviewer comments asking for more references; there is no allowance for work in an area where there is not a literature on which to draw.

It isn't just a matter of journal publications. Each of my four books is classified as a “trade book.” They are written for a crossover audience – both academics and the general public. Unlike an academic book that will have a press run of 1,000 copies and viewed as a resounding success if it sells that many, trade books normally have press runs of 5,000 – 10,000 copies. My second book (Klein 2002b) sold out within a relatively short period of time, but when I applied for promotion it wasn't taken seriously because it wasn't published by a university press. The peer review process was no less stringent than a university press, but that wasn't an issue. Perhaps more disappointing is that the book had a major impact on the cruise industry, was used by several national nongovernmental organizations in their efforts, and ended up on the shelf of most academics and students in the field, but was not seen positively in the promotion and tenure process. Metrics important to me – that it be read, be used, and help stimulate social change – were not viewed as important to the university. If I had written in a stodgy academic style that was inaccessible, published with a university press, and sold 800 copies, my work would have had greater value to the university but would have been a flop with regard to social impact and readership. As a tenured faculty member I can afford to be principled, but my junior colleagues don't have that luxury.

There are also other types of publications. When I applied for promotion to full professor I had three reports published by nongovernment organizations. The Canadian Centre for Policy

Alternatives (CCPA), an independent “think tank” with a critical orientation (some would say leftist), commissioned two. The reports critically analyzed cruise tourism in terms of economic issues, environmental impacts, and labour (see Klein 2003b; 2003c). Bluewater Network, a progressive environmental organization based in San Francisco, with a national focus, published the third: an argument for why voluntary arrangements for environmental practices were not as effective as legislation (see Klein 2003a). The report was an extension of work done previously by the Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Each of these reports stimulated dialogue and directly impacted policy. Those with the CCPA received huge attention in the local and national media and caused a visible shift in Canadian government policy. The report published by Bluewater Network also received considerable media attention and impacted policy in several U.S. states. It also brought invitations to testify before several state-based legislative bodies.

Despite the impact of these reports and that they had much greater readership than most academic publications (two of my four reports for CCPA logged at the time among the highest downloads from the Internet of all reports they publish), they were discounted in the promotion and tenure process. The Dean of my school first criticized them because they were not peer reviewed – the peer review process was more stringent than anything I have experienced with a journal publication. He also criticized them because they weren’t academic. True, the reports lacked a traditional literature review because there was no literature to review, but they did contain a critical and systematic socio-economic analysis and a review of knowledge about the environmental impacts/threats of cruise tourism. Like my second book, these reports were widely read and they had a clear and direct impact on social policy, but in the academic environment, where lip service is given to community engagement, there were many who viewed them as not worthy of credit toward promotion and tenure. This is sad given that because the reports are freely available worldwide, they are among my most frequently cited work. A report I prepared for Friends of the Earth in 2009 (see Klein 2009) has become a

resource internationally for anyone focusing on the impact of cruise ships on the environment, but it would not be valued by traditional academic criteria.

The Paradox of Funded Research

Another expectation increasingly becoming part of the promotion and tenure rubric is funded research. Many faculty members, especially those in junior ranks, spend more time trying to generate funding for research projects than actually undertaking the research they want to do. Funding has become a goal unto itself. While this approach might make sense if funding were freely available, that is not the case. In Canada, like elsewhere, there have been huge cutbacks in the amount of research funding available. In 2009, the government announced plans to cut \$8.2 million from its Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council budget over the next three years by eliminating the Research Time Stipends program that provides funds to allow faculty adequate time for research, and by cutting \$5.6 million from health-related research. In addition, it cut from Canadian Institute for Health Research \$40 million over three years by ending the Open Team Grant Program and by discontinuing the Intellectual Property Mobilization program. And it cut from the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council nearly \$70 million over the same time period (see Wells 2009). By 2011-12, the three granting councils had a shortfall of \$147 million. In real dollars, the amount of money devoted to research funding has consistently decreased. Over this same time, the government has discontinued support for Statistics Canada, making unavailable for academic research census data and other traditionally-available data sets. In addition, the granting councils are increasingly favouring targeted research. This means that research having commercial value or fitting into one of the pre-determined government priorities are given preference over other research. Innovative, critical, or basic research is undervalued and is unfunded.

This means that while university administrations increase pressure for funded research, available funding is disappearing. Many junior faculty members receive an evaluation of their

research grant proposal that indicates they qualify for funding, but the pot of money is exhausted before their proposal comes next in line. Also common is that grants are reduced from what has been requested in order to allow money to be spread around to more people. The result is dismal for academics whose research requires funding. It is also dismal for faculty at universities adopting a model first introduced at the University of Texas whereby faculty are assessed by the proportion of dollars they bring in or earn to offset the amount they receive in salary. The university publishes this data to show which faculty members are earning enough (or more) to cover their salary and which (and to what proportion) faculty members are viewed as free-loaders who aren't making for the university as much money as they are paid in salary. This is truly draconian and anathema to the very nature of the academy. Getting funding for research has become a higher priority than undertaking research and disseminating the results.

It isn't just that faculty members are expected to have funding, but the type of funding is also important. My commissioned reports are all funded, but the money does not go through the university so it doesn't count. It isn't just a matter that one's work is funded, but that the university receive a cut of that funding – that it make money for its coffers from the academic's work. This was driven home to me when in 1989 I had a proposal funded for one million dollars per year for a multi-year program. The Dean of my school called with enthusiastic congratulations, but when he learned that the money was for funding an innovative community-based program assisting youth on public welfare to transition from the public purse to employment, and that the university would not directly benefit, his enthusiasm turned to disappointment because I had spent time doing something that didn't directly benefit the university. Never mind that the program would change the lives of more than 100 youth every year. There is funding, but then there is the right funding.

Competitive Colleagues with Big Egos

Researchers with a critical perspective may experience other issues when undertaking projects that are highly visible in the media or on campus. My success has been problematic for colleagues in very unexpected ways. Rather than celebrating the visible impact I have had, and the attention given to my work by the international media, those I work with harbour petty jealousy. This is reflected in peer evaluation, but also in the nature of relationships in the corridors and in meetings. When an arbiter reviewed my application for promotion, which had been turned down by my colleagues and the university administration, the first words out of his mouth at the arbitration were, “you can’t turn someone down for promotion because you don’t like them” (see Klein, 2005). I was subsequently promoted by the same arbiter two years later.

To put it bluntly, many colleagues resent when someone is successful as they see it as detracting from them and/or colouring their achievements as somehow less worthy. I have three times testified before the U.S. Congress, yet in no case was this visibility of the School through my participation valued or appreciated. To the contrary, my appearances have been viewed by colleagues with contempt and have been downplayed. They fail to appreciate that this accomplishment is all the more amazing given that I often appear on a panel of 5 or 6 and am the only non-industry person and the only witness to present a critical view of the industry. As a personal thing, each of these appearances has not only been fun (it is true theatre), but has validated my work and keeps me moving forward.

This sort of interest and validation has also been seen in my research on sexual assaults on cruise ships. My findings that one is 50 percent more likely to be sexually assaulted on a cruise ship than on land, and that as high as 30 percent of the victims are girls under the age of eighteen, has garnered media attention around the world. This has brought considerable visibility to my university and to my academic unit, but there has never been an expression of acknowledgement from administrators or colleagues. It logically makes no sense, except that the research isn’t funded (much of the data is acquired through my work as an expert witness in

lawsuits brought against a cruise line by a victim) and until recently the results were not reported in a peer-reviewed journal (see Klein and Poulston 2011).

The other factor, as already mentioned, is fragile egos. It isn't just research done from a critical perspective, but any researcher who is more successful than his/her senior colleagues risks retribution. Some may be quietly congratulatory, but many will see a junior colleague's productivity and success as a threat to their status and potentially as a source of embarrassment. How does a senior faculty member explain that they publish half or a third of what a non-tenured, junior colleague produces? While the university's outward claims suggest productivity is valued, informal networks and political undercurrents often give a quite different message. The phenomenon is like that of a "rate buster" on an assembly line (i.e., a pieceworker who produces to the utmost of his/her ability despite opposition by his/her fellows who fear that his/her high productivity will place greater expectations on their productivity). In academia, "rate busting" leads to "mobbing," brilliantly researched and exposed in the work of Kenneth Westhues (1999; 2005; 2006) focusing on "mobbing in academia."

The Threat to Academic Freedom

Political undercurrents and contradictory messages in many ways are a problem for all faculty members. However, an academic whose work is critical in nature (especially if it has a "leftist" bent or an activist element) is doubly vulnerable. It isn't only the emotional response that some have to a colleague who is on the political left (a Marxist, or even worst a communist or a social anarchist). There can also be influence exerted – direct or indirect – by local, national and/or transnational business interests. I was removed from my city's Cruise Committee as a result of direct pressure by the cruise industry. I know that senior administrators at my university have been approached, if not directly than by those with close ties to the industry, and told that my research activity is neither appreciated nor should it be supported. Because this happens behind closed doors it is difficult to know the extent of these conversations, except when an

industry allows information to slip, as was the case when the president of the International Council of Cruise Lines proudly suggested on a radio program in San Francisco that his group was at the root of my removal from the Cruise Committee. I have also been made aware by media personalities by whom I was interviewed of the scale of pressure put on their station (including major national networks) to keep me off the air. And on a lecture tour of Hawaii I was confronted at the end of my first lecture, held at the law school of University of Hawaii, by a fellow who said I would be seeing a lot of him over the next week – he had been hired by the cruise industry to shadow me everywhere I went and to record everything I said. One knows they are doing good things when industry responds in this way.

All of this poses a threat to academic freedom, especially when the pressure impacts one's treatment by the university. As a tenured senior faculty member, I consider myself somewhat immune from much that I have described; the greatest effect is that opportunities may be closed and potential limited. But I regularly see these issues in various ways in my role as president of the 1,000-member faculty union as faculty bring grievances and seek advice on how to deal with threats to their academic freedom to pursue the type of research that captures their curiosity. Academic freedom is not only under threat but, at times, under siege. Junior faculty members have limited ability to stave off informal pressures and potential sanctions.

The Canadian Encyclopedia defines academic freedom to include the freedom of professors to research and publish, and to address public issues as citizens without fear of institutional penalties (see www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/academic-freedom). The encyclopedia identifies serious threats to academic freedom coming from those who hold the purse strings – wealthy benefactors, provincial and national governments (including those who fund research), governing boards, and academic administrators. The challenge for the critical researcher is to maintain a sense of freedom as an academic in the face of funding bodies that may not support their research because of the appearance of a political undercurrent, or when administrators and colleagues choose to criticize the work as not

mainstream or not germane to the mission of the academic unit or university. In my case, a promotion and tenure committee, and subsequently an administrator, told me that nothing I had done was relevant because I taught in a school of social work and it had nothing to do with social work. I reminded him (it was a man) that social work includes a concern with and commitment to social justice and that this was an underlying principle in my work, but his ears were deaf and his mind was closed.

A further problem for critical researchers is outlets for publication. Journals that are most favoured by institutional promotion and tenure committees may not be accessible for critically-oriented research and, despite all of the claims to value community engagement, nontraditional publications or publications in nontraditional venues may be devalued or ignored. These are further ways that academic freedom is threatened. The message is to do mainstream research (ostensibly quantitative and positivist so it has the greatest likelihood for publication), avoid research that has political overtones (in other words, helps business instead of people), and resist the temptation to do critical analysis. Critical thinking is something we purport to teach students, but is not generally valued among the professoriate unless it is turned against the critics.

Despite threats to academic freedom, many junior faculty members find it difficult to resist. They are vulnerable until they are tenured. Sadly, many universities are dismantling the tenure system through systems of post-tenure review and increasing use of contractual and limited-term appointments, which means vulnerability will be a constant in academic careers. This has serious implications for individuals, but also has a cooling effect on the development of critical thinking and research having a critical focus on tourism and tourism products.

Implications for Critical Tourism Research

There are two levels on which critical tourism research is affected. One is the life of critical thinking and critical scholarship on an institutional level. The other is the impact on the individual

– can junior faculty members pursue the areas of research that capture their interest and curiosity.

The Institutional Level

On the institutional level, academic research that is critical in nature is increasingly marginalized and devalued. Given the lack of support and reward for such work, there is a clear threat to whether such research will continue. Some may see this as an extreme example, but the Ivory Tower may to some extent be replicating the McCarthy era in U.S. politics in the 1950s when anyone who had leftist leanings could be accused of being a member of the Communist Party and thereby lose their job and their source of income. McCarthy's attacks were blatant. The systematic shift of academic priorities is more insidious. It not only reflects a change in government policy and a conservative wave in many countries, but is similar to the various ways that Mary Daly describes victimization of young women through cultural structures that have the young woman's mother or other women mete out the horrifying methods of subjugation and dehumanization (Daly 1990). In the case of academia, it is one's academic colleagues (some of whom, themselves, have done critical work) that carry out the will of senior administrators. Once one has tenure, and especially after promotion to full professor, many hold junior colleagues to higher standards than they ever met or could have met. I had a colleague who was promoted to full professor with not a single publication, but he consistently held very high standards for anyone else in terms of the number and the types of publications. The only exception was, as a sexual predator, those women who he was able to exploit and victimize.

There is a perversity in the system of peer review in the university. Rather than seeing themselves as advocates to the administration for junior colleagues, most promotion and tenure committees unquestioningly adopt the administration's views and standards and they do the administration's bidding. Consequently, it is very difficult through a grievance process to reverse a decision of a peer review panel (although not impossible – my promotion to full professor was ordered by an arbitration panel); there is much greater success when peer reviews are positive

and then reversed by administrative levels. We have had success in two such cases during my tenure as union president.

It is necessary for a shift in culture in academic units. If critical thinking and work in critical tourism is to thrive. Colleagues need to celebrate each other's achievements and the diversity of views and types of work. Equally as important, peer review committees need to see their role as advocates and supporters of their colleagues; not as gatekeepers who want to shape a discipline in their own image or as pawns of administrators who want to reward academic work that fits within a narrow box. Members of my academic unit often say "we eat our young," referring to the way junior faculty members are treated, but they are unwilling to take steps to institute change. Perhaps they are afraid of losing the few crumbs senior administrators throw their way to keep them in line.

The Personal Level

The implications of this discussion for the individual with a critical perspective are troubling. Does one pursue the work that captures their passion, or do they succumb to the system and do what they are supposed to do. As tempting as it is to do the latter, in the end one loses their soul. I have seen so many colleagues who say that after they receive tenure they will pursue the type of work they really want to do, but the tenure process has robbed them of the imagination and critical perspective that they initially brought to their academic career. It isn't a matter, as Marx would say, of the ends justifying the means, but as Bakunin would say, the ends are the means. If we put off doing what we want until we receive tenure, then at that point we are likely to think, well I'll stay the course and when I am promoted to a high rank I will then do what I truly want. Sadly, it isn't going to happen.

Fundamentally it is a matter of integrity and whether one can live with themselves. One's career may be less smooth and extrinsically rewarding, but it will certainly be more intrinsically rewarding. On a practical level it might mean finding a balance between one's personal politics

and methodological preferences and what our employers demand of us – giving away some isn't giving in and losing our soul. The academic system can be likened to a game and it is a matter of knowing the rules and then playing the game in ways that advantage oneself – playing the angles and using the system to provide benefits.

Another important ingredient is having a social support system of like-minded academics, if not at one's home institution then in the region or around the world. When I took my first academic position I lamented to my PhD supervisor that there was no one else at my university doing the type of work I did. His advice was that the colleagues who would provide intellectual and social support are across the country and around the world – he said I needed to develop that network if I were to survive and succeed in the academy. This doesn't mean that one shirks relationships with colleagues in their own institution. Quite to the contrary. As I have seen over and over again, tenure decisions are not often made based solely on one's academic record; they are based on a decision by colleagues as to whether they can live with you for the rest of their academic careers. Being a thorn in their side (which I often have been) can create a rocky road. Being collegial and likable (in the "good old boys" network, often more difficult for our female colleagues) can usually serve as a barrier against decisions that are arbitrary and based on like/dislike. Peer review committees use standards against those when they want to get rid of someone they don't like; they often ignore those standards when they want to tenure or promote someone they do like. This is all part of the game.

REFERENCES

- Bruning, S. D., McGrew, S., Cooper, M., 2006. Town-gown relationships: Exploring university-community engagement from the perspective of community members. *Public Relations Review*, 32(2) (June), p. 125-130.
- Churchill, M., 2011. From community engagement to public impact. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 11. <<http://chronicle.com/blogs/old-new/from-community-engagement-to-public-impact/463>> (Accessed March 20, 2013).
- Daly, M., 1990. *Gyn/ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Driscoll, A., 2008. Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 40(1), pp. 38-41.
- Frantz, D., 1998. On cruise ships, silence shroud crimes. *New York Times* (November 16). p. A1.
- Fryer, M. 2013., Is the focus on tenure and promotion a red herring? *Taking the plunge: A blog on university-community engagement* (February 19). <<http://www.universityaffairs.ca/taking-the-plunge/is-the-focus-on-tenure-and-promotion-a-red-herring/>> (Accessed March 9, 2013).
- Klein, R. A. and Poulston., 2011. Sex at sea: Sexual crimes on cruise ships. *Journal of Tourism in Marine Environments*, 7(2), pp. 67-80.
- Klein, R.A., 2009. *Getting a grip on cruise ship pollution*. Friends of the Earth, Washington, DC. 2009.
- Klein, R. A., 2007. The politics of environmental activism: A case study of the cruise industry and the environmental movement. *Sociological Research Online*, 12(2) (March). <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/2/klein.html>> (Accessed April 5, 2007)
- Klein, R. A., 2005. You can't turn someone down for promotion because you don't like him. In: K. Westhues. *Winning, losing, moving on: How professionals deal with workplace harassment and mobbing*. Mellen Press, Queenston, ON. pp. 53-75.
- Klein, R. A., 2003a. *The cruise industry and environmental history and practice: Is a memorandum of understanding effective for protecting the environment*. Bluewater Network, San Francisco and Ocean Advocates, Seattle.
- Klein, R. A., 2003b. *Charting a course: The cruise industry, the Government of Canada, and purposeful development*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Ottawa.
- Klein, R. A., 2003c. *Cruising - out of control: The environment, workers, and Atlantic Canada's ports*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Halifax.
- Klein, R. A., 2002a. Left in its wake: The cruise industry prefers a voluntary approach to environmental responsibility but performance has been poor where tough regulatory controls are not in place. *Alternatives Journal*, 28(4) (October), pp. 23-27.

- Klein, R. A., 2002b. *Cruise ship blues: The underside of the cruise industry*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, BC.
- Klein, R. A., 2001. High seas, low pay: Working on cruise ships. *Our times: Canada's Independent Labour Magazine* (December/January), pp. 29-34.
- Schnaubelt, T. and Statham, A., 2007. Faculty perceptions of service as a mode of scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Fall), pp. 18-31.
- Wells, P., 2009. Let's play cut the granting councils! *Macleans* (February 23).
<<http://www2.macleans.ca/2009/02/23/lets-play-cut-the-granting-councils/#more-38265>>
(Accessed March 10, 2013).
- Westhues, K., 2006. *The envy of excellence: Administrative mobbing of high achieving professors*. Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, NY.
- Westhues, K., 2005. *Workplace mobbing in academe: Reports from twenty universities*. Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, NY.
- Westhues, K., 1999. *Eliminating professors: A guide to the dismissal process*. Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, NY.