

# **The University is a Panoptic Cage: The Disciplining of the Student and Faculty Bodies <sup>1</sup>**

December 1, 1991 [Revised: August, 1992]  
By David M. Boje

*{PLEASE DO NOT CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION!}*

Paper presented at the August National Academy Meetings Show Case Symposium (Joint with OMT, RM, and ODC) on Postmodern Management: Diversity and Change

Department of Management, College of Business  
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA 90045  
(310) 338-7415; Fax: 338-3000

---

<sup>1</sup> My thanks to Robert Winsor and Alan Cherry of Loyola Marymount, and to Stewart Clegg who visited LMU this summer, for their helpful comments and critique.

# The University is a Panoptic Cage: Disciplining the Student and Faculty Bodies

## Abstract

This is a Foucauldian analysis of the university institution. Like the prison, it has a dense network of disciplining mechanisms. These operate on its participants as subtle, but very complete controls to make humans docile, and dominate them by a panoptic apparatus of surveillance, examination, and normalization. The paper draws a number of conclusions about the operation of this system of discipline. Thinking of an institution such as the university in terms of its complex organization of disciplinary mechanisms which govern its various models of rationality takes us further than earlier 'control,' 'professional,' or 'contingency' models of universities as organizations. In the past, one reason we have not been able to significantly change institutions is we have not focused on their subtle and pervasive network of disciplinary machinery. The contribution to organization theory is to revise theory and to develop research interest in the phenomenon of panoptic discipline as a fundamental area of management and organizational behavior. Seen this way, university institutions offer less academic freedom than many might assume.

## I. Introduction

As a postmodernist, I am going to include my voice in this text. I believe that academic freedom is on the decline. On all fronts there is a sharp increase in control over the student and faculty "body." The concepts of Michel Foucault's (1977) prison analysis are applied to the university. From this perspective, the faculty and student body is responsively subject to rules, including the subdivision of academic disciplines, the dictates of presidents, trustees, deans, and department heads (Hetrick and Boje, 1992: 52). Foucault suggests that the point of disciplining the body is to control the person's mind (Boyne, 1990). Hence, I agree with Clegg (1989a) in his contention that "employers face at least two sources of resistance by virtue of their

employees having both discursive and bodily capacities that require some disciplining if some control is to be achieved" (p. 102-3).

I do like my job and my university does grant me more freedom than most. Nevertheless, to maintain my academic freedom is a struggle against a multi-faceted, multi-centered, and taken-for-granted part of academic life that few of us seem to notice. Calling the university a panopticon, a reference to Foucault's analysis of prisons, is not meant to suggest that universities have bars, wardens, and cell blocks.<sup>1</sup> Rather, the panopticon, as we shall explore, is an ingenious cage of control with a capillary network of mechanisms that erode academic freedom. Such conceptions may be unfamiliar. The power of the panopticon does not collapse into either structural contingency theory or into theories of power that center on elite or dominant coalition control. Foucault's capillary mechanisms are part of the fabric of discursive practices, not contexted in contingencies or human agency. Therefore, a study of the capillary control mechanisms rooted in university discourse presents an alternative approach to power and control. Being aware of the control over our own freedom also allows us to resist the erosion of our freedom. In keeping with Burrell (1988: 233) one concurs that "the reality of organizations is that they reflect and reproduce a disciplinary society."

Methodologically, I will use stories to capture how in the modern university freedoms that were once conceived as the sine qua non of the free scholar have eroded. Universities, as other organizational communities, have a rich oral tradition, an anthropologically profound repository of value and orientation to the cultural significations of their everyday life (Boje,

1991a; 1991b; 1992).

My thesis is that the university is a panoptic machine, where probationary tenure functions as a period of disciplined obedience to the rules; where surveillance is everywhere; where academic freedom, transformed from the Middle Ages, now means intellectual subordination to the more or less plural professorial paradigms. Some are much less plural than others. The disciplinary network of the total university machine makes both professors and students increasingly docile performers. The university superimposes models of organization, subordination and domination, imported from various institutional arenas: the family (a family of brothers, sisters, and elders); the army (commanded by a head and divided into colleges, and ranked from freshman to senior and from assistant professor to full professor, where people are numbers); a factory (with supervisors, foreman regulating the work, timing the movements, a brand of Taylorism); the judiciary (justice and reformation is meted out each day by minor officials judging the most minor offenses); the monastery (where the voice of religion speaks about idle time, the path to enlightenment through discipline, the solitude of cellular life, the sanctity of work, and a God who sees into your very soul, let alone your study, that modern monastic cell); science (technologies for measurement and normalization used to engineer conduct and monitor transformation and movement and accumulate knowledge through empirical observations, examinations, and scientifically valid interrogations); the professions (external accreditation monitoring and normalizing by AACSB); and, most of all, the prison (a system of penal disciplinary systems, regimentation of time, allocation of cellular occupations, and dormitory housing). Of course, no one of these is institutionally pristine: monasteries, perhaps

more than most, have greatest claim to primacy (See Clegg 1989b).

I take the position that university discourse has not passed in some grand paradigm shift from pre-modern, to modern, and now into the postmodern. Rather, the three historically-anchored discourses are in pluralistic-struggle in the university triplex, as elements of postmodernist discourse and practice increasingly penetrate the fabric of the institution (Boje and Dennehy, 1992).

Discipline has long been a central focus of management and organization theory from Weber through many of the classics, a tradition renewed in recent years by Foucault and the scholarship that he inspired. Henri Fayol (1949), for example, considered discipline as one of the key areas of management and leadership. "Workers should willfully obey the rules and leaders of the organization. Good discipline is the result of effective leadership, clearly communicated work policies, and fairness in the application of penalties" (Fayol, 1949: 19-42). By the time Luther Gulick had reduced Fayol's 14 principles, to "POSDCORB," discipline had ceased to be an academic or professional topic. The founding fathers, seemingly, had a less squeamish and pussyfooting attitude to the real politique of organizational behavior than their successors. Check the undergraduate textbooks on principles of management. If discipline is mentioned at all, it is treated as a minor aspect of punishment and reward motivation theories; somewhere between Maslow's hierarchy and Herzberg's two-factor theory. The dismissal of discipline and the imposition of penalty systems has also been treated lightly by organizational behaviorists. Herbert Simon (1957) challenged the principles of Fayol, Gulick and Urwick

(1945) as being "like proverbs... one can find an equally plausible and acceptable contradictory principle" (Simon, 1957: 20). In fairness to Simon, he does address the principal result of discipline: docility. The individual observes the consequences of his movements and adjusts them to achieve the desired purpose (p. 85). Mechanic (1962) hinted at the force of disciplines in organizations when he noted the power of clerks and secretaries being exercised over everyone else as they controlled information, persons, and instrumentalities. However, Mechanic missed the fact that it is the disciplinary machinery that controls those clerks and secretaries. Discipline begets more arbitrary discipline in the control struggle. By and large, it can be concluded that both management theory and organization behavior picked up Simon's challenge to the basic principles, of which discipline is one, and proceeded to ignore all of the multiple and pervasive apparatus of discipline. Once we marginalized the study of discipline, we substituted concepts like the control of "uncertainty" and "strategic contingencies" to "explain" the structures of disciplinary power created.

The current study seeks to redress this relatively recent neglect of discipline and thus reconnects with classic concerns. This is important because everything we do as academics in the classroom and in our studies is subject to discipline.

The structure of the paper begins with a review of the history of academic freedom; turns to the modernist reformation of academic freedom as specialized "time and space" disciplines, in which "signaling" is used to reconstitute students and professors; defines three categories of discipline: (1) the gaze, (2) recording, (3) penal mechanisms (ie. exams, normalization,

gratification-punishment, panopticism, and auxiliary penal mechanisms); summarizes the five principles for disciplining professors: (1) isolation, (2) regulation, (3) transformation by tenure, (4) coopting cycles of reform, and (5) recidivism. The paper concludes with a panoptic statement of the university graduation spectacle. For Michel Foucault, and for our analysis of the university, discipline is revealed as historically situated in university discourse.

**Academic Freedom.** What is academic freedom? Academic freedom is something we have come to regard as being as fundamental as freedom of speech (Beale, 1936; Summers, 1954; MacIver, 1955; Hofstadter, 1955; Hofstadter & Metzger, 1955; Metzger, 1955; Lazarsfeld & Thielens, 1958; Califano, 1970). Ideally, in this discourse of 'rights,' to be free as an academic is to be liberated and independent of administrative regulation, to be able to select books and teaching practices at will, to be privileged to move in any knowledge direction, to be spontaneous in the classroom, and to act according to one's judgement without arbitrary control by external monitors such as AACSB, to be free of surveillance intrusions by Deans and department heads, to be free of rules and policies that standardize syllabi, texts and tests, to be free of conventions about grade distributions, to be free of traditions about pedagogy. In sum, academic freedom is the opposite of controls, restraints, hindrances, entanglements, repressions, and restrictions by some other person or some institutional power that infringe on our person and freedom of speech. Academic freedom is not being the servant of the state or of some theocratic ideology, with the threat of excommunication or the Gulag for discursive indiscretion.

**Discourse and Freedom.** The roots of panoptic control reside in a multiplicity of

discursive formations. There are pre-modern roots arising in the feudal origins of the universities (Kibre, 1962; Marti, 1966). For example, my own university, Loyola Marymount, is a Jesuit institution, among 16 in the US with practices linked to Ignatious Loyola in the 17th century (McGucken, 1932; Schwickerath, 1903; Annarelli, 1987). Hence, it is specifically institutionally rooted in the pre-modern era. All universities are derived from monastic roots. "Exercise is a way of ordering earthly time for the conquest of salvation" (Foucault, 1977: 162). Discipline is a religious virtue.

Pre-modern University Roots to the Panoptical Present Tense. The pre-modern university was like a craft guild in which master instructors of a like craft banded together to supervise themselves (Hofstadter, 1955; Hofstadter & Metzger, 1955; Metzger, 1955; Kibre, 1962; Marti, 1966). The pedagogy was one of apprenticeship in which the apprentice produced a master piece to demonstrate his/her acquired knowledge. Exams helped the professor learn the student's progress toward mastery, but repeated examinations in the modern era became a pedagogy of discipline in their own right.

The first university was founded in Cairo about 970. The European universities developed from church and monastery schools in the 1100s. University of Bologna, Italy came into existence in the early 1100s (Marti, 1966), while the University of Paris developed in the late 1100s. By the end of the 12th century there were five universities: Salerno, Bologna, Montpellier, Paris, and Oxford. There were two archetypal universities, Paris and Bologna. Bologna was patronized by the very wealthy and noble families. The teachers were free of



ecclesiastical supervision or jurisdiction, but the students being wealthy scholars set the terms to the teachers. Teaching centered around law, medicine, and theology. The Bologna form of university was a corporation of students that hired, and even elected teachers and controlled university policies. The University of Paris, as well as Oxford University, on the other hand, was a corporation of teachers, that collected fees from students and had Chancellors to direct the policies of the university. The University Paris model was based in the guilds. Each faculty elected its own head and held its own secret assemblies. Increasingly, (especially, in the United States), university control came under the direct control of a permanent body of administrators. Liberal-arts curriculum did not develop until the Renaissance of the 1400s.

**Paris Riot.** In 1228-9, there was a tavern brawl. The regent, Balnche of Castile, under advice from a papal legate sent a company of soldiers against the students, killing several. The masters suspended lectures in protest and threatened to disband the university of Paris within one month and keep it disbanded for six years. Most of the masters and scholars actually left for Oxford and Cambridge and some cathedral schools in France. The dissension lasted two years. Finally Pope Gregory IX recalled the papal legate and ordered the King and the Queen Mother to punish the offenders. The Pope enlarged the privileges of the university of Paris in 1231. The university was given apostolic sanction for the right to suspend lectures and there were serious limits upon the power of magistrates to punish scholars.

**Oxford Riot.** In 1355, Oxford had its own riot on St. Scholastica's Day. Townspeople assaulted the university scholars, beat, tortured, and killed scholars. The masters suspended

lectures for several months. The Bishop of Lincoln put the town under interdict and the king ordered a commission of inquiry. Scores of townsmen were arrested and the mayor of Oxford was imprisoned. After this, the charter for most of the government of Oxford and the regulation of its trade was turned over to the university.

In days of old, having a scholar to teach in your city was valued by both kings and bishops. In the 13th century, for example, there were few scholars and in order to keep them, kings and popes granted scholars many privileges and academic freedoms. At Oxford in 1209, Kibre (1962) tells the story of a woman who was accidentally killed by a scholar. The Mayor and the burghers of the city of Oxford proceeded to raid the offender's hostel, imprisoned several scholars and with the consent of King John had two or three of these executed. Now these actions were in violation of the Papal edicts concerning academic freedom, which King John generally endorsed. In that time, as in Paris, scholars were not to be prosecuted by local magistrates and if a scholar was arrested, he was to be immediately surrendered to a Papal representative or even to the Chancellor of the university. The teaching masters, in protest, ordered a cessation of all lectures, closed the university, and many scholars and their students left Oxford to go to more hospitable cities like Reading, Cambridge, and Paris. In 1214, scholarly privileges and freedoms had to be reestablished by Pope Innocent III. These were defined as:

1. **Provide an annual feast of bread, ale, soup and fish or meat for one hundred poor scholars.**
2. **Donate 52 shillings each year to the scholars.**
3. **Control the price gouging by local merchants by checking weights and measures**

and authorizing that scholar's food and other necessities was being sold at just and reasonable prices.

4. Rents were to be controlled for hostels and lecture halls. King Henry III would require the city to surrender to scholars any of the houses that had once been utilized by scholars for lecture halls or hostels.
5. Burghers were to uphold the tradition of immunity from lay justice.
6. Any arrested scholar was to be surrendered immediately to the Bishop of Lincoln or to the Chancellor.
7. In 1265, Henry III exempted scholars from serving on assizes, juries, or recognitions, as long as they attended to their studies and wore their clerical habit.

**Medieval Discipline.** The fact that masters and their students enacted such solidarity suggests discipline. The guild of teachers would undertake a cessation of lectures or even migrate as a body. The fact that the entire university could render corporate judgements on vital issues suggests some internal discipline and regime that would encourage if not compel agreement (Hofstadter, 1955: 9).

In these pre-modern times, Kings and Popes were guardians of the scholars. But, they also had to control for "fictitious scholars" who might try to partake of academic freedoms without carrying their share of the teaching load. In 1231, Henry III gave the Chancellor of Oxford permission to use the royal jail at the castle to punish any pugnacious, rebellious, and false scholars. For example, one rebellious student attacked a Papal legate and his retainers when they traveled through Oxford. In the armed attack, one of the legate's servants was killed. Lectures were suspended and students and masters were banned from the city. To lift this ban, the Abbot, the Canons, and the Regent Masters of Oxford University showed public penitence

Chancellor could also direct burghers to arrest lay people who threatened the freedoms. For example, in large cities like Paris and Oxford, there was an uneasy relation between townspeople and their university. The Paris butchers, for example, slaughtered large animals in the streets of Paris and threw the entrails and blood into the streets. Scholars became seriously ill from inhaling the ill-smelling stench. Sows roamed the streets while the acrid smell of melting tallow, to make candles, interfered with lectures and studies.

The papal legate forbade the reading or teaching at Paris of some works by Aristotle in 1210. The chancellors complained that the forbidden works were being read secretly. By 1240, Roger Bacon openly flouted the fading prohibition by lecturing on Aristotle's prohibited books. By 1255 Aristotle was prescribed reading in the faculty of arts at Paris. This was part of the struggle of the arts faculty to win their independence from the theology faculty (Hofstadter, 1955). Medieval faculty had the academic freedom and individual courage necessary to confront the Church and meddlesome colleagues. Great nobles and powerful clerics were among the masters who challenged the dominance of the Church and indeed won important concessions. Faculties of great universities: Bologna, Paris, and Oxford were consulted on vital questions of doctrine and law by popes and kings. In the Middle Ages, power was decentralized in medieval society, with the balance of conflicting powers resulting in an unusual plurality and diversity of interests of ecclesiastical and secular powers placing the universities in a position bargainer, consultant, and king-maker.

Pre-modern institutions were constituted even on the soil of what was to become the

world's premier modernist society. Harvard University, founded in 1622, is the oldest higher education institution in the United States. While early colonial universities were founded on a variety of religious denominations that preferred residence of both students and tutors, what is unique to American academic governance is their corporate control by boards of laymen. The trustee form of governance may have taken root because these early colleges employed tutors and fellows that taught undergraduate classes while they worked on their master degrees. They would frequently leave after two years to take up a ministry career. The trustees, and not the faculty (as a guild) or the students (as in Italy) legally hire and fire faculty members and make many of the institutional decisions.

This has hampered the development of organization, initiative, and self-confidence among American college professors, and it has contributed, along with many other forces in American life, to lowering their status in the community. Other professional groups have far greater power to determine the standards and conduct of their own profession (Hofstadter, 1955: 120).

The early U.S. settlers say these early colleges, such as Harvard (1636), William and Mary (1693), Yale (1701), Brown (1764), Queen's College (1766), and Dartmouth (1769), as a way to train ministers. Many small church colleges were founding during the 1700s and 1800s to teach liberal arts, rather than technical subjects.

In the nineteenth century, German Universities invoked two concepts of academic freedom that became adopted throughout Europe. These are *Lernfreiheit* and *Lehrfreiheit* - freedom to learn for students and freedom to teach for faculty. It is noteworthy that the idea of *Lernfreiheit* (freedom of students to learn) was not adopted in the United States until the

Vietnam War demonstrations of the late 1960s.

During the 1800s and 1900s, specialization in knowledge increased and fields like business and commerce resulted. Wharton was the first MBA program. It was founded in 1881. Dartmouth founded the Tuck School in 1900. In 1915, The American Association of University Professors was formed over concerns about dismissals. According to the 1915 "Declaration of Principles,"

... academic freedom is defined as comprising three elements: "freedom of inquiry and research; freedom of teaching within the university or college; and freedom of extramural utterance and action" (Annarelli (1987: 98)

By 1916, Deans of the Schools of Business organized the AACSB. The Educational Testing Services was formed after a conference on standardized testing for graduate school admission. The policy committee was made up of Columbia, Harvard, Northwestern, Rutgers, Seaton Hall, University of Chicago, University of Michigan, Wharton, and Washington University (St. Louis).

It is only very recently that the institution of the university has become organized upon much the same lines as mass production methods. Ironically, as the modern world fades into postmodernity, so the pre-modern world of the university slowly adjusts to the fading conditions. As the hegemony of the modernist system gained prominence, the pre-modern traditions of the professional scholar and the Socratic teacher have become marginalized.

**U.S. Universities Today.** Just as we retrieve a historical sense of place through histories,

stories of the past, stories of the present can locate for us, not just the world we have lost, but also that we have gained, perhaps without always recognizing it. This next story illustrates a modernist facet with one center, one logic of performance that is replete in the taken-for-granted fiber of academic life. It illustrates how complicit one has become in managing one's own docilization. It is the story of our control by the textbook industry. It is a story that I hypothesize is more prevalent in smaller universities.

**The Textbook Salesman Story.** I am holding office hours, when a salesman named Joe (not his real name) hands me a card from one of the major houses and initiates this discourse:

Joe: Can I have a few minutes of your time?

Dave: Sure.

Joe: What are you up to?

Dave: I have a book on postmodern management that is being published by a smaller house. Houses like yours won't touch it, why is that?

Joe: We have management - O.B. texts in seventh edition. Some houses have 11th edition texts. We'd be giving up a lot of investment to turn to something new.

Dave: These management books have not changed since 1950. I notice some are putting pictures of people of color in place of all the white male shots. Diversity shots are in. But, the books are...

Joe: These texts are instructor-proof!

Dave: What do you mean - instructor-proof?

Joe: Well, you do not need an instructor. The books are self-taught. Students get pre-tests, concept lists, vignettes, summary boxes, and the like. All the instructor is there for is to select items from the exam book, items from the exercise book, and items from the overhead kit.

Dave: I see. I hate textbooks. There is no more freedom to teach.

Later that same day, I was teaching Max Weber on bureaucracy and came across the passage in a speech which he made late in his life.

... each man becomes a little cog in the machine and aware of this, his one preoccupation is whether he can become a bigger cog... this passion for bureaucracy is enough to drive one to despair (Weber, in Mayer 1956: 127).

This encounter made me stop and think: "Am I just a cog in the University machine with no role in instruction other than choosing test bank items, exercises, cases, and overheads from some tool kit of instructional apparatus?" What happened to my academic freedom? Am I acting out very restricted, even pre-selected super-system options, in some grand disciplinary machine?

Within a modernist perspective, universities are machines of discipline with many parts and cogs moving in concert with one another to achieve a networked configuration that disciplines both the student and professorial body. Universities have adopted a language of discipline: academic disciplines, controllers, evaluation, registrars, ranks, tenure and promotion, semesters, classes, units, upper divisions. The university, like the prison, combines discourses (Brown, 1991) and architectures, coercive practices, scientific rationality, visions of utopia, programs of penal correction, and productive mechanisms with monastic heritage.

In the modern university, exams have replaced apprenticeship and mastery. The social sciences have contributed normative practices, such as multiple choice tests to the modern



disciplinary technology and pedagogy that was eagerly adopted by the university at the outset of the industrial revolution. Guild-apprenticeship pedagogy did not fit with mass production, and trustee-ownership. The modernist form emphasized surveillance of the professors. "Surveillance thus becomes a decisive economic operator both as an internal part of the production machinery and as a specific mechanism in the disciplinary power" (Foucault, 1979: 175). Judgment, evaluation, and ranking create distinctions and individualize faculty and students. The modern university is a disciplinary regime: an organization where normalization is the dominant technique of control. It is a disciplinary system that contains many juridical and penal apparatuses that pertain to a set of rules and offenses against them that did not exist in pre-modern university life (i.e. absences, lateness, inattention and lack of zeal, impoliteness, or disobedience). The disciplinary mechanism also rewards and awards through its system of ranks, offices with or without windows, access to executive education, and other means we shall explore.

In a modern university, the pressure of disciplinary power is to make every professor and student like every other professor and student. Examination, for example, is a normalizing gaze to qualify, classify, and to punish. Exams are also a highly ritualized ceremony of power to establish truth: one which "manifests the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectivication of those who are subjected" (Foucault, 1979: 184-5). The examination is the root of the gaze of one in power upon the less powerful, who are subject to the gaze. The students, through quizzes, presentations, mid-terms (sometimes there are 2 or 3), and final examinations are placed under an almost perpetual gaze. The modern university is organized

around the examination, as an "examining apparatus" The well-disciplined university is the counterpart to the university disciplines of knowledge.

Not only is the university the place where the regime of truth often comes into contact with the political regime that both supports the university financially and makes use of its knowledge for political ends, but the internal life of the university is also regulated by disciplinary strategies such as academic rank and tenure examinations (or reviews, as they are called)... the power of examination can eliminate or marginalize individuals and discourse even though these disciplines lack the most minimal theoretical consensus (Shumway, 1989: 131).

For Foucault, there was no postmodern university, just a steep rise in the modernist mechanisms of normalization (particularly in Colleges of Business, one might add). We are increasingly dominated by a power that is not our own. It is not the power of a Papal tyrant or a ruling class, it is the network of power of the institutional discourses that produce the disciplined student and professor bodies.

Secondly, for Foucault, the resistance, like the power, is not centered anywhere, it is spread over the surface of the capillary-power network. Therefore, the Marxist formulation of power, where an oppressed class of students or faculty seize control from a dominating class through revolution, is irrelevant. The cessation of lectures and the migration of masters with their loyal students died as resistance tactic, once Medieval universities became endowed with foundations, permanent libraries, and other properties (Hofstadter, 1955: 41). The Faculty that championed Aristotle and Copernicus in the face of the Inquisition, said "no" to Henry VIII's divorce, and demanded the Pope respect the freedom of its Liberal Arts inquiry has become too timid and too immobile, and far too financially dependent on sovereigns, princes, parliaments, trustees, and accrediting agencies to threaten the powerful with mass migrations and lecture

cessations. The autonomy of the pre-modern university, gave way to meddling in its internal affairs, including the appointment and discharge of professors by outsiders. There have been spurts of lecture cessations, such as the McCarthy Inquisitions which saw scores of professors dismissed or denied tenure without much resistance (Summers, 1954; Cantelon, 1969; Califano, 1970). In the Vietnam years, a tactical naivety characterized the resistance movement. Strategic responses by administrators to student resistance have contributed to the diffusion of many of the panoptic mechanisms, such as student representation on admission committees, student-letters for tenure files, etc. In the 1990s, the university is such a dense network of power that there is only repetition of the same old reforms and no substantive or postmodern change at all. Any resistance appears feeble and local. Except for AACSB, there are few centers of power to focus our resistance.

## II. The Disciplining of Time, Space, and Signaling.

### Disciplining Time

The disciplinary time of a military organization has been imposed on pedagogy. In my university everything is regulated by the clock. Time is broken down into 14 week intervals. Each discipline breaks its subject down into simple elements that can be arranged into interval steps to develop more difficult elements across the 14 weeks. Pedagogy is meticulous in detail as complex disciplines become strings of simple elements like debit, valence, do loop, niche, tactic. Totalization of the elements is left to each student; they must recombine the fragmented elements of instruction after they leave the university machine. The machine pedagogy has fragmented knowledge to allow students to easily traverse the time table in parallel paths called

majors, as they move in one rhythmic march to graduation.

Time seriation. Within the finely segmented time seriation, students are drilled in repetitive exercises and tested and examined at the close of each segment. Discipline along the time path occurs by correction, punishment, elimination, reprimand, minor humiliation.

There is a military system of hierarchized ranks as students progress from freshman to senior rank. Rank has its own privileges. Recruit and alumni are also ranks. Rank is grades. Students are permanently classified, documented, recorded, and numerically summarized as objects in relation to other objects. These numbers are hand carried by professors to the registrar who acts as the accountant in the student disciplinary process.

### Disciplining Space

Cellular Segmentation. The disciplinary space of a military organization has been imposed on pedagogy. Students are spatially distributed and regimented into class programs as they sit in rows and columns during 50 minute time intervals. In each classroom cell, repetitive exercises are performed as the student body moves rhythmically in time and cellular-spatial segmentation. This is the ascetic life in the university machine.

The student is a mobile element repeating discipline programs in time chronology and spatial intervals. It has been so since the classical age of Socratic apprenticeship gave way to the mechanical technology of knowledge production. But is it knowledge that universities

produce, or do they merely extend a chain of regimented discipline to make adults docile that began in "element-ary" school and is polished off at the university to produce the cogs for the military-industrial-bureaucratic complex? It was announced at Northwestern University that their MBA program would offer a joint engineering-MBA track in which Northwestern, by one newscaster's account, would be: "manufacturing MBA's for the manufacturing industry." In sum, the unstated objective of the university machine is to manufacture docile subjects.

### **Disciplining Signals**

When the bell rings, the hour begins or ends. The students take their seat in their row and column. They posture their body to receive the lesson. At the signal bell, they immediately "hear and obey." The program of the body is absolutely disciplined. Signals allow the repetitive positioning of students to one another in their ranks in relations to different ranks, in majors in relation to different majors, and in college disciplines in relation to other college disciplines. This total machine controls the body movements through gentle coercions as bodies progress from hour to hour, class to class, and rank to rank. The cogs appear meticulously subordinated as they are perfected along learning tracks advertised for their increasing difficulty, in a discourse that cloaks much that is less rational and more disorderly. It is a particular type of subordination: subordination to the discourse of the university machine.

### **III. The Instruments of Discipline**

The university machine is a network of many subtle mechanisms of discipline.

1. **Gaze Mechanisms.** Universities coerce discipline by observation. The eyes are

everywhere in a encompassing network. Universities were once part of the feudal palace and architecturally-designed as buildings to be seen. Universities became fortresses within castles to observe the external perimeter. In modern times, universities gaze at their interior space to make visible the objects and subjects of their discipline. The gaze process runs parallel to the entire length of the production technology. The gaze is a multiple, automatic, continuous, hierarchized, and anonymous power functioning in a network of relations from top to bottom, from bottom to top, and laterally holding the whole university together, functioning like a piece of fine machinery, seeking to eliminate all recesses and shadows in which to hide (Foucault, 1977: 175-80). It seeks to be omnipresent.

a. **Hierarchized Surveillance.** The pedagogical machine of time and space intervals is fitted with a network of viewing windows for continuous surveillance. Spatially, classes are arrayed along long corridors like a series of small cells with administrative office placed at regular intervals. Most cells keep their doors open to subject themselves to the gaze. The gaze is calculated in its distributed multiplicity of surveillance. The pyramid is the perfect gaze apparatus. Because you can not see into all the cells simultaneously, the gaze is sub-divided and networked at relay points and levels.

b. **Instructional Surveillance.** Pedagogy requires a disciplining gaze. Teachers do roll calls, mark down absences and lateness, and mark down who did and did not do their exercises. The gaze is defined, regulated, and inscribed at the heart of teaching practice (p. 176). Once more, a story can explicate what analysis dictates.

Gazing Professors Story. I collected an instructional surveillance story from a Pennsylvania Business School Professor.

Rob: We are observed by two colleagues for every semester till we are tenured and once a year by our Chairman. The current head of the tenure committee does not believe in that kind of evaluation. He spends two minutes in the room and writes up the report. He recruits others who think the same way.

Dave: Do you do this?

Rob: I spend 20 minutes and I spend the 20 minutes because I had to at least go through the motions. Unlike the senior colleagues that walk in and walk out. We already knew what we were going to write, but being untenured, we were coerced into sitting for at least that long.

Rob: We are unionized. The Dean is not allowed in our classroom. But, in the last faculty meeting he let us know he expected to be invited to our classes.

Dave: So do you have surveillance there? Do you mean there is a whole system for professors observing each other and reporting on what they see? That seems like the gaze to me.

Rob: It is. Particularly for new faculty, then they sit in for the entire class.

2. Recording Mechanisms. Clerks treat students severely. This is part of their job. Clerks (even student work study clerks) treat students with superiority and contempt. Clerks are the watchers of time, the counters of spaces, the observers of waste and inefficiencies, the informers of (non-)discipline in the clockwork and cell work of the university machine. Do not waste time and space!

MBO (Management By Objectives). MBO is supposed to align individual and organizational goals so that expectations are clear and performance standards get realized.

However, MBO is also the gaze.

Dave: At my university, we write MBO service reports. At the beginning of the year we submit our plans for teaching, research, travel, university service, consulting and the like to our department head. He reviews the objectives, writes some feedback, and then discusses the MBO document with the dean. The dean gives his input, and if needed, the document is revised. I then have to write an end of the year report justifying my behavior over the year to show how I did or did not accomplish my goals.

What is interesting to me is that I deny the validity and impact of the MBO process. It does not help me perform better because I can not plan out a year in advance what I will be doing at a micro level in all these areas. It is not helpful to me professionally. What it does do is document me and inscribe me such that my academic zone of freedom is reviewed and re-reviewed at two levels. I am gazed at.

3. **Penal Mechanisms**. The university has adopted some of the prison models and at the heart of every discipline system is a penal mechanism (p. 177). The university, in fact, is an arrayed network of minor penal mechanisms enabling disciplinary power to be both subtle, discrete, and omnipresent. The objectives of the penal mechanisms are to control stealing, cheating, abuse, but also grander things like quality, teaching discipline, perfecting the soul, learning limits, intelligence, adulthood; not to forget the docilization of the generation. In fact, straying from the norms of correct behavior transmitted in handbooks, memos, orientations, and stories is to be dealt with sternly by penal mechanisms. Students in universities are caught in a universality of punishment and penitence that is drawn from the fabric of prisons, armies, and monasteries.

Penal mechanisms police violations of time (lateness, absence, interrupting exercises);



activity violations (negligence in attention, lack of zeal); behavior violations (impoliteness, disobedience, disrespect, insubordination); speech violations (idle chatter, insolence, racial stereotypes); body violations (incorrect attitudes, irregular gestures, lack of cleanliness; physical and sexual abuse); sexuality violations (impurity, indecency, abuse).

Micro-penalty mechanisms. Intensify instructional training by repetitive exercises and lessons. Reduce in rank anyone who does not keep up with the pace of the university machine. Correct defects in the student's speaking, writing, computation, calibration, and also attitudes, attention, gestures, and deportment.

A. Examinations. Teachers judge. As the inquisition fell out of favor, the examination of everyone in every way became the unlimited providence of every institution and every petty bureaucrat, military inspector, including teachers. In the old university, the examination was more visible, more of a joust among pupils pitched against each other in verbal combat while the Master controlled the battle. The Ph.D. oral examination remains the most direct and ritualized carry-over from the Spanish inquisition; a spectacular display of power potency; a manifest gaze of the sovereign; an inversion of visibility. Now the gaze is more individuated, segmented, and less the visible spectacle. The power is invisible, but the subject's visibility is compulsory. Students are situated in a network of writings that capture, fix, classify, transcribe, average and norm them into a cumulative system of binary computer data.

There are interesting assumptions about exams. Exams combine an observing hierarchy with normalizing judgements. Exams discipline. Exams punish. Exams classify, select, and exclude. Exams establish truth. Exams are ritual play of questions and answers (stages include the visit, question, diagnosis, deliberation, judgment, sentence). Exams mark the end of apprenticeship in the basic elements of a discipline. Exams are scientific appraisals of student performance. Exams segment, rank, and differentiate students. Exams are part of the informational case reporting that tracks student-progress through the transformations in the university machine. Exams extract and constitute a knowledge of student as a case file, computer file, an accumulation of info on the student's body. It is part of the penal accountancy of merits and demerits, privileges and impositions, carrot and stick. Exams hierarchize good and bad students in relation to one another, distribute people by aptitude, conduct, quality, skill, hierarchize penalty in terms of grades. Exams are one of the primary gaze mechanisms. The teacher views the work of the students, but it is a one way mirror. In sum, the exam is a constantly repeated ritual of power; dominance and subordination, authenticating the movement of knowledge elements from master to pupil.

#### Exam Story.

Rod: At [British University] I score the exams done at Hong Kong University. In the British system, you submit your exams to external reviewers who say, that is a stupid answer, sometimes they say that is a stupid question. ... Oh yes, they would look down their noses at a university system where professors just scored the final exams.

B. Normalization Mechanisms. The penal mechanism operates the normalization mechanism that holds the student in a mechanism of objectification. Pedagogy has turned

to science to rationalize the disciplining of students. Norms are judgement, objectification of human performance into categories, subjectification of human conduct to the partitioning dimensionality that summarizes, indexes, and transmits their scores. Normalization is coercion in teaching in order to normalize class behavior, supervise quality workmanship, and discriminate between bodies. The classification by hierarchization and distribution of object-scores determines rank and privilege distributions. The subject is objectified into an array of binary computer scores scrupulously and meticulously maintained at the office of the registrar. The dominant power manifests its potency by arranging and transforming the subjects into objects and records of objects. Normalization depends on a rigid system of registration and documentation accumulation, classification and categorization, transcription, normalization. Exam scores are sacred and teachers are penalized should they entrust scores to assistants or secretaries. In my university final grades are to be hand-carried by the instructor to the office of the registrar in the prescribed manner, during the prescribed time interval. Science is the means of the university to attain power over the student bodies through the normalization process (p. 191).

Dave: I work at a university that has unofficial grade quotas. We are expected to give higher grades to grad classes than we do to undergrad classes. If our grades are not "normally-distributed" we get a letter in our file, or a message from the department head, and it can affect our merit pay. I think it is because our MBAs are funded by aerospace and other firms who will not reimburse any courses that are less than a B grade.

The historical account of a person is their resume. The scientific verbal and math scores of the GMAT determine admission to MBA programs. Real life is transformed

into a single numerical score that determines one's admission rank into an MBA program. The scientific exam fixes the individual in measurement space as a case, an object of power, an object of knowledge, an element of the hierarchical gaze, and a normalized judgement. The transcript and the GMAT are apparatus in the disciplinary function of distribution and classification in the university machine; the fabrication of cellular, organic, genetic, and combinable individuality by the modality of these subtle power mechanisms to normalize individual differences. Before GMATs administrators had to be in the visible presence of the students being gazed for possible admission. A scientific mechanism is not as painful an experience for the invisible gazers. If any hero of the middle ages, such as Sir Lancelot, applied to an MBA program today, they would first be required to take a GMAT.

In the last century we have seen the proliferation of what has been termed the 'psy' complex: clinical medicine, psychiatry, child psychology, educational psychology, management, as well as public accounting. Social science contributes greatly to the smooth transition from the inquisition to the examination, from the combative exams of Harvard B-schools to the silent exams of the university classroom. Empirical measurement sciences help to classify, objectify, and rank students by statistically reliable and valid norms. They offer normalization without end, analytic observation without end, investigation without end, examination without end, measurement without end, chronology without end, registration without end, and the gaze without end. Personnel and students come and go, participants in an evolving ritual of discipline.

C. **Gratification-punishment mechanisms.** The more one possesses power or privilege, the more one is marked in the university as an individual (p. 192). The disciplinary regime of individualization descends as power becomes more anonymous and functional, exercised more by one-way gazes than by visible ceremony, by normative comparison, more than by interview. As students accumulate rewards, they can trade these rewards for privileges in the token economy: they become cadres in their own domination, trade credits to remove sanctions. Teachers make their rewards more frequent than their penalties if they want popularity. Teachers encourage the lazy to desire rewards. In each class there is a formal and informal penal accountancy of merits and demerits, a punitive balance sheet for each student, a micro-economy of privileges and impositions, a hierarchization of the good, the bad and the ugly and their relation to one another. Measurement precision is a prerequisite for the gratification-punishment mechanism. Grades are a reflection, not only of exams, but of one's performance in the penal accountancy. Good cogs get more rights and privileges.

The student reward system is inextricably linked to the reward system for teachers. Teachers administer the student reward system, students participate in teacher-reward systems. The administrative rationale for external control of teachers is the implied acknowledgement of the inherent bias toward higher than normal distributions rooted in this reciprocity.

D. **Panoptic Mechanisms.** At the center of the ideal panopticon is a great tower with a clock and windows from which one administrator can gaze on the workings of each of

the classroom cells, each dorm room, and each gathering place. The university as panopticon-perfect would be a circle of cells on floors with windows opened to the gaze of the central tower and no windows to view (some still have no windows) the reality beyond the university circle of classroom cells and dorm rooms. Some universities do not have a central tower and instead order the classrooms and dorms along great corridors and quads in the shape of a star or cross. Some have both corridor and tower, "Panopticism induces in the inmate a state of consciousness and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault 1977: 201). The tower inside a circle is the perfect image of the perfect gaze. Even more perfect if the gazed can not discern if anyone is now gazing or not. The power is perfect because the internalization of the panoptic consciousness renders its exercise unnecessary. Foucault refers to this as Bertham's Principle: power should be visible and unverifiable. At Loyola Marymount, that our tower is a symbol of panoptic power is manifest by the proliferation of this symbol on virtually every piece of university paper and souvenir. The students have become the principle of their own subjection (p. 203). The university, like the prison, is a cruel and ingenious cage. The panopticon combines the best disciplines of prisons, monasteries, hospitals, and armies into one overlaid, multi-layer, multi-faceted system of panopticism.

**The panoptic machinery is no longer architectural. The gaze has taken on more subtle forms: registration, examination, normalization, etc. In the middle ages, the university geometry of buildings and the seating of the classrooms was more materially**

panoptic than today. Today we have computers; science has normalized the inquisition process. Technology has indeed superseded the tower.

Bill: My high school had microphones and speakers in each classroom. These could be monitored surreptitiously.

Yet, it is today an extensive network of mechanisms that are everywhere and always alert, penetrated through and through with disciplinary mechanisms, running the university as an uninterrupted space and time machine (p. 209). The model college of the Jesuits is still panoptic, but so to are the non-Jesuit universities. The academic disciplines have been unlocked from their perfect panoptic cage, but still operate in a polyvalent way using more subtle coercions and gazes.

The central inspection hall is the pivot of the system; without a central point of inspection, the gaze ceases to be guaranteed... the more accurate and easy the surveillance, the less need will there be to seek in the strength of the buildings guarantees against attempted escape and communication between the inmates" (p. 250).

Walk down the central hall of any teaching machine, see the entrances of all the classroom-cells and gaze into the goings on inside. They leave their doors open. The ingeniousness of the panoptic system is that the sovereign president does not have to wander the halls or do what Tom Peters calls MBWA (Management by Wandering Around). Any of his administrators, student cadres, or a mere visitor can do the MBWA and the cell-occupants will police their own behavior; the occupants care not who does the MBWA, its conscious internalization is discipline mechanism-enough for them.

Each successive level of the education system leading to university has fewer

elements of disciplinary control. The assumption is that by University the students have been programmed into self-discipline and "self-control." It is the selection process (or elimination process, more correctly) that selects those who are most docile and controllable at each successive level.

**Postmodern Organization Design: A Panopticism Story.**

Dave: I decided to change the title of my MBA class on organization design by one word. I wanted to add the word: "postmodern." I asked the Dean of the MBA program what to do.

Dean Smith: So, you will not change the content of the class, but only want to add a word to the title. Sounds OK to me, but check with the registrar's office. I think when you change anything, it has to get a new course number.

Registrar: Right, a new number must be issued even if it is just one word. But, you have to get the number from Ann at the MBA office. She keeps the number list.

Ann: Dave, the next number is 614.

Dean Smith: The Dean (This is the Dean of the entire College) kicked back your request for the word change. He wants you to take it through your department for approval.

(On Jan 23, 1992, I wrote a letter to my department head:

Re: New Course Number

"I would like to change my MBA 613 course title to reflect the direction the course is going. To do this I need department approval for the new number (614) and name (Postmodern Design and Control)."

Department Head (in writing): "The management department has approved this course title change." {signed}.

Dean Smith: You have department approval, but the Dean (his boss) said he wants you to take it through the curriculum committee.

Chuck: (Chair of this committee writes this note to me): "Write a half-



page rationale to committee members - writing to non-management types. Don't give them your syllabus. It might blow them away!"

Dave: (At a meeting of the Ad Hoc Planning Committee which advises the regular CBA Planning Committee, I retell the above story line).

Dave: That's the story, but now the head of the curriculum committee is on sabbatical. I do not know who to contact next.

Beth: I am on the committee, so is Ben.

Ben: Right, and this is ridiculous. Give us some paper and we'll declare a meeting now, and approve it right now.

The morale of the story is that faculty, such as myself, face a maze of bureaucratic silos, sign offs, loops, and delay tactics to prevent any substantive changes. With the interlocking curriculum, department head, advisory, ad hoc, department, and planning committees, very small changes can bounce endlessly about the system. By the way, I did get my course change, but during the process, a colleague advised me:

Rick: Look just don't tell the bastards what you are doing. I learned a long time ago that it's a mistake. Tell em what they want to hear. Use whatever book they give you. Then just do your own thing. Assign another book, have students take the assigned book back to the bookstore. They get to paint whatever picture they want to the committees and AACSB, you get to teach whatever you want.

Dave: Don't they know what's going down.

Rick: Maybe, but don't help them by telling them what you're doing. That's how I survived and how I do things that matter in class.

**E. Auxiliary Mechanisms.** A variety of auxiliary mechanisms gaze at the students,

professors, and even those who are least subject to the normalizing gaze: the administrators.

1. Course Evaluation and Related Penal Mechanisms. The inverted student penal Mechanism (Gazing at the Professor). The gaze is inverted when the students gaze at and report the behavior of the professor: time (lateness, absence, interrupted office hours); activity (inattention to detail, negligence in delivery, lack of teaching zeal); behavior (impoliteness to students, disobedience of university policy); speech (idle chatter, insolence, racist and sexist language); body (incorrect attitudes, irregular gestures, lack of cleanliness); sexuality (impurity, indecency, abuse). Students report these matters on course evaluations, visits to administrations, petitions for removal, and stories told along the university corridors. It is a power that is visible to the professor but mostly unverifiable. Everyone sees the professor, without being seen. Just as the student has a file, each professor is their objectified file and summarized by the numbers in their computer file. The origin of this inverted gaze is monastic. As in the movie, '1984,' children are asked to gaze at their parents to insure they follow moral codes, tithe their resources, and behave in a Christian fashion. The bad behavior of a professor is a pretext for the administration to question his neighbors and interview his department head. "What are his teaching habits?" The number of anonymous and temporary observers of a professor gives him an anxious awareness of being gazed at, categorized, ranked, and subjected. He

participates in his own self-gaze and self-reporting as he fills out university service, teaching, and research reports. Do not forget travel reports, research reports, and sabbatical reports. All very necessary mechanisms. The professor, however, is but a cog that is disciplined to mesh effectively and efficiently with other cogs in the university machinery. Do not be late for class, turn in the sabbatical report on time, turn in three copies of your syllabus, get your book orders initialed by your Department Head and Dean, finish the service report by tomorrow, attend the faculty meetings, show up for office hours. There is more regimentation in the body life of the faculty than outsiders imagine. Academic freedom has been shrinking in direct proportion to the proliferation of panoptic mechanisms dispersed throughout the university production system. Freedom is an illusion. The faculty are disciplined, characterized, classified, specialized, distributed, hierarchized, examined, qualified, validated, and invalidated even more than the students.

2. The Registrar Penal Mechanism. The registrar and its cousin, the controller, do the penal accounting for the institution. Their task is to code the continuous behavior of students, staff, and faculty. They are like the FBI, CIA, IRS, and Motor Vehicle all rolled into one. The registrar is the most stern, multi-faceted, and disciplined of all the disciplines of control. Their penal programs involve monetary mechanisms such as: fines, late charges, processing fees, and strict conformity to regulations not even the most seasoned clerk knows in totality.

Registrars register, record, key punch, code, re-code, summarize, monitor, and accumulate a centralized body of evaluative-knowledge on every single person in the university. They monitor all aspects of the university body, regulate the calendar of time: the mighty time table, assign the classrooms, hand out the diplomas at graduation, and control most reward systems. Cross the registrar and you will discover where the most powerful forces of the disciplinary machine converge, intersect, and manifest. The registrar has full possession of university bodies. The registrar registers time, space, ranks, grades, graduation, and money.

3. The Housing Penal Mechanism. Housing is patterned after the penitentiary and the military barracks systems of discipline. Penal mechanisms are needed to quell the fear of student rebellion, looting, disease, abuse. Housing separates and controls the dangerous mixtures of students in a hierarchy of surveillance. The monastic origins of university housing posit a utopia of the perfectly governed university, exercising disciplinary power to yield a disciplined student suitable for a disciplined society. Containment and supervision against evil deeds have adopted the penal mechanism of correcting, fining, disciplining the student to make them better citizens. Housing has the penal mission of making the abnormal, unruly, evil student into the binary opposite: the normal, ruled, and good student. At the center of each dorm complex and at the center of housing is a penal mechanism to impose fines, solitariness, and expulsion of the more evil

beings. Therefore, housing operates from visions of fear and from correction. Housing is divided into districts in buildings distributed along the periphery of the university. Here each is governed by a priest or nun, or in some universities, their secular equivalent, and attended by resident cadre called "resident directors," and "resident assistants" (called RDs and RAs, functions which in prison would be known as "trustees" and in the military would be "cadre."). They receive special privileges and compensation. Their job is to survey for unlocked doors, mayhem, drinking violations, curfews, and to be alert to theft and debauchery. Tenants are registered, oriented, trained, reported, observed, assigned, moved, and if necessary reprimanded, sanctioned, and removed. RDs and RAs know all residents by name and find out if beer kegs or unauthorized guests are being concealed from their gaze. Dorm surveillance is based on a system of permanent registration, reports from the controller, and reports to the registrar. RDs and RAs do the work of inspecting for cleanliness, order, and sign off the sealing of doors and windows before students may graduate. Dorms are enclosed, segmented spaces, observed at every point by people in fixed locations, observers of slightest movements, constantly recording, documenting, linking the center to the periphery. Power is exercised in a continuous disciplinary hierarchy "by which each person is constantly located, examined, and distributed among living beings... the constituents of a compact model of disciplinary mechanism" (p. 197). The power of housing is omnipresent and omniscient, penetrating a mechanism of regulation into the smallest details of

everyday life, a full capillary functioning of power.

The effect is variable, of course: they vary with institutional features such as denominational/non-denominational status; the legal ages for consent, maturity, alcohol consumption, etc. Britain, eighteen is the age at which students can drink and also the age at which they enter university. Sixteen is the age of sexual maturity; typically neither sexual nor alcoholic proclivities are monitored today. The role of 'in loco parentis' is always institutionally, legally, constituted.

In sum, the prison in many ways is the model of university rehabilitation. Cells are similar to dorm rooms, classrooms work somewhat like prison factories, Registrars are like the Parole Boards which count the days until graduation, the security force is the prison guard force, and the president is the warden. In prison, the closer an inmate gets to being released, the lower the security level of the holding penitentiary.

4. The Admissions Penal Mechanism. The first order of business is to classify the entrants. People need to be assigned to the right time patterns, sent to the right spaces, admitted to the right housings. Admission orients the mob, fragments, classifies, and starts the recording system. The admission tests are done, the examination of the written application and the obligatory essay is completed. Cadres of students and faculty and administrators orient the parents and the students. Even the siblings come to the events. It is a festive spectacle.

There is public speaking, food sharing, and idle chit chat is tolerated. The parents and the students view the polished side of the machine.

5. The Rank and Tenure Penal Mechanism. Tenure is a system of graduated ranks, a disciplinary-perfecting of the professor from visitor, to assistant, to associate, to full, and even to emeritus ranks. Tenure's primary function is to correct and to perfect the professor's research, teaching, and institutional service. The visibility of the gaze into the tenure progression is a trap. The professor is in a panoptic machine of discipline, a perfect cage. The professor submits all manner of report, paper, travel information, teaching evaluation, speaking engagement; he reports his every body movement, his every articulation, his every whereabouts. But, the professor does not know if anyone is reading all this documentary evidence, but since they might be reading, the professor, like the student, learns to internalize the panoptic asymmetry of the gaze. Rank and tenure, as a committee, is an ideal panoptic mechanism. As in Zimbardo's famous prison experiment, the student subjects, in this case professor-subjects, adopt the role behavior of the actual prison guards and prisoners. They mete out penalty and reward. They see but they, are unseen. Pupils fill out observations on each professor, writing them on the back of course evaluations. In this way each professor becomes a case, an array of comments and summary statistics, an object of knowledge that becomes part of the "tenure case." Rank and tenure can delay the case until the professor documents his practices. The dean must

comment on every single case and justify and rationalize the rank and tenure case. Tenure is an efficient technology of power disciplined to fabricate capital return to the institution in the form of research visibility, marketable teaching reputation, and service to the disciplinary panopticon machinery. Rank and tenure is the most coercive and most artificial theater used to catalog, evaluate, examine, and judge the life of the professor. It combines surveillance, inspection, interview, reporting, and judicial penalty into one theater, a theater that is visible in its effects, yet invisible in the puppetry which produces them. Rank and tenure must rationalize and document the historical journey and formation and reformation of the professor through the progression of ranks and steps until one emerges as what one is documented and decided to be. Rank and tenure is the discourse of power in which dangerous professors are corrected and transformed by the rites of passage, and the ceremony of judicial discourse.

6. The Research Penal Mechanism. This is one of many committees that reviews documents and makes decisions without speaking directly to candidates. The faculty record is examined, judgements are rendered, and correct faculty are rewarded; non-correct faculty are excluded from funding or offered more minimal funding. The applicants never get to read the letters of their deans and department heads. In this sense the gaze is asymmetric. The panoptic tower windows are one way mirrors. Some faculty might be agitated if they did read the comments of their supervisors. The purpose of this penal mechanism is to



define correct and incorrect research agendas. It is a mechanism of normalization; it is a mechanism of examination of the faculty track record, and it is a mechanism of correction. The faculty needs rehabilitation: he can not write a decent proposal; she does not deliver a proper schedule of work; the project is not an important scientific endeavor; they are proposing something that is dangerously close to pedagogy improvement; the Academic Vice President will not approve this one.

7. The Scheduling Penal Mechanism. When you get fined \$100 for not meeting the conditions of your room reservation for a special class, you know you are in the presence of a panoptic penal mechanism. Sign this form, return it in 48 hours or receive a \$20 penalty. The computer has not registered your reservation, come back tomorrow. The allocation of space and time receives the most scrupulous and meticulous of controls. More people work in the office of scheduling than most other functions of equal rank.

8. The Delinquent's Parallel Penal Mechanisms. The university defines delinquents to be members of sororities and fraternities. It is ironic that within these cabals, the lording of discipline is an ancient, honorable, and highly efficient practice. These delinquent societies practice all forms of the panopticon in miniature and at an accelerated pace. The greeks initiate pledges through

minor forms of physical torture (push ups are forbidden by university policy); minor forms of humiliation (wear old clothes to initiation events though the university expressly forbids humiliation); question and answer examinations that would make the Harvard B-school inquisitions by professors of the strategy class seem mild and ineffectual. There is penal review when you do not pay your dues, reveal greek secrets, behave in a way that brings dishonor on the brothers and sisters. There is a merit and demerit system in operation, especially in the pledge class. This strict and stern disciplinary force must in the space of a semester inculcate the norms that will carry their organization into the next generation. Pledge class officers often become mentored to become fraternal officers. One would think that in a milieu of university disciplinary machinery, the administration would welcome the rigorous trainers of the ancient and secret disciplinary arts. It is no secret and a proud fact that many greek students go on to run all manner of business and social organization. They have been well trained in the university's delinquent boot camp.

9. The Police Penal Mechanism. Universities have centralized police forces to conduct university surveillance. It is the security guards, symbolic of police, that operate many of the wheels that together produce university order and harmony (p. 213). Omnipresent surveillance through reports, registrations, patrols of the university to watch for plots, opposition, movements, revolts, agitations, counter-

power resistances, spontaneous gatherings as well as theft, alcohol abuse, and sexual abuse. Do not forget parking. The police levy fines, perform minor detention, and recommend expulsion. Police manage crowds at drinking and sporting events. In the main, the police are an inadequate network to monitor the full production system of the university. Direct supervision is too expensive to do round the clock time-tables, collective training, disciplinary exercises, hierarchical supervision, spacial deployment rounds. They are too costly and if not paid well, become corruptible. They are visible power, where invisible mechanisms of control have proliferated to make university police less a need in effecting the docilization of university members. They play a minor role in the centralization and production of knowledge about university subjects, a mere strand in the web of panoptic techniques. The greater the dispersion of a variety of discipline mechanisms, the less the need for full police supervision. Rarely do university police bring in outside police.

10. Food Services Penal Mechanism. Self-explanatory. What student does not think of their cafeteria food as penitentiary food?

11. Alumni Penal Mechanism. After graduation, alumni are tracked by the registrar, the alumni association, groups in every college, fraternities, sororities, and the like. The graduate's diploma is a passport to show to everyone, everywhere they go. Workers who get promoted and noted in the Wall Street

Journal get even stricter gaze. Pulling alumni back for alumni picnics and class reunions and parties before and after athletic events --- affords a minor mechanism. The alumni has its own hierarchical system, its own penal codes, and its own disciplines.

12. AACSB (American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business). The recent AACSB sponsored study: Porter and McKibbin (1988), has made recommendations which the AACSB Board of Directors adopted in its new accreditation standards in their Annual Meeting in April, 1991. The panoptic implications of AACSB are manifold:

Who is the AACSB?	It is an association of Deans.
Who pays for their studies?	AACSB collects member dues.
What do Deans want to control?	Faculty and students.
What do they control?	Content, process, tenure, class size, what constitutes a professor. etc.
Who benefits?	Colleges with accreditation derive a competitive advantage, in terms of attracting paying students away from colleges without accreditation.

Harvard, Yale and many others schools with Ph.D. programs have avoided AACSB control. The new strategy of mission-specific accreditation includes a plan to capture Ph.D.-granting schools of business. AACSB also has a plan to capture the 600 plus schools of business who have not been remotely eligible for AACSB accreditation. The rhetoric is that AACSB is getting away from its modernist command and control model which normalizes all colleges into one mold and into a "flexible, adaptable, self-defined, and mission-specific mode." While this sounds "empowering," I think it is

panoptic control in a more devious form. This strategic move, it seems, would help counter a new and rival accrediting association that has set out to take market share away from AACSB.

Why is it that administrators get full copies of the AACSB documents, but faculty get briefings, excerpts, and interpretations? Could it be, that as with the early distribution of the bible, the priests kept the book to themselves so they could privilege their own interpretation of the knowledge and ask for fees to get departed relatives into heaven? Gutenberg's invention of the printing press was revolutionary because it put bibles and other potentially revolutionary writings in the hands of the common man. Early on this did not matter much, since only priests and nobles could read anyway. But, even if the faculty possesses the old and new versions of the AACSB "testaments," the "visiting team" of deans interprets how a given college is to be scored. Since the team is made up of deans this process privileges the "Dean's" voice and marginalizes the voices of students, parents, faculty, and corporations.

In all well-attended academy sessions on AACSB, few people are asking one critical question: "Why?" "Why do we need to be controlled?" "Why do we need big brother looking over our shoulders?" "Why are we more interested in AACSB than in our academic freedom?" These two words: "Academic Freedom" are as fundamental as "freedom of speech" in our bill of rights. If AACSB has its way, we are going to be seeing a tightening of the external panoptic normalizing mechanisms which will also steadily tighten the interior time, space, gaze, and other panoptic mechanisms in ways

that increasingly make universities resemble prisons.

#### IV. A Summary of the Principles for Disciplining Professors.

**Principle One: Isolation.** Isolate professors from the external world and monitor their trips into that world. Isolate professors from one another and let them combine only in ceremony, ritual, or under hierarchical surveillance. Isolate the professor population into homogeneous departmental groupings (an imprecise solution at best). Isolation is a precondition of submission derived from the monastic and prison models of administrative discipline. Isolate professor in a strict hierarchical framework with all lateral relations discouraged, and punish communications that do not follow the strict trails of the hierarchy. Rank by stages in the professorial transformation.

**Principle Two: Regulation on the Treadmill.** Professors are too dangerous to let them be idle. Before prisoners did productive labor as part of their rehabilitation, the earliest prisons had prisoners work in fixed time intervals on treadmills. Work is good for the soul as well as a punishing discipline. Workhouses are another model of organization that regulate away all idle time and all idle contracts. Regulation bends the time inclination of professors to rhythmic movements as they are controlled, assigned, distributed. The longer the period of regulation endured, the more docile the professor becomes. Regular exposure in a hierarchy of surveillance makes professors more docile still. Regulate professors according to the norms of a research and teaching and service society. Let the professors movements in relation to other

cogs in the productive machine be exactly and mechanically predictable. The tenure clock is ticking away. Sit in your cell and observe the time go by.

**Principle Three: Transform the Professor during Tenure.** Control the length of rank through the transformational value of each professor's teaching, research, and service. Promote a professor who has demonstrated corrective perfection and send the professor to the rank and tenure committee for review. Actually it is worse, you send the record, not the body. At least, criminals have the right to face their accusers and their jury. Rank and tenure will examine his rigor by investigating his past, interviewing his neighbors, and pouring over his accumulated case record. Put those who demonstrate improvement and docility in charge of departments and key committees. Select those who know professor character traits and can influence mental attitudes most effectively and reprimand professors who stray from the correct path. Give the professor research grants and training in order that they might perfect themselves. Research work is an essential element in the transformative progression and in the socialization of the professor. Reform the evil-doer into a "good" researcher. Professors enter a progressive system of ranks and steps whose pathway is illuminated by moral lectures from Deans and Department Heads. Use punishment and rewards to give professors respect for university disciplinary mechanisms and the faculty handbook. Grant professors monetary rewards, research grants, better assignments, merit pay, and reduced committee workloads once they demonstrate requisite docility. The essential transformation function of the disciplinary mechanisms is to reform the professor and mold him through administration, supervision, and normalization into the "good" professor, a professor reformed by his encounter with the disciplines of scientific training, the

life academic.

**Principle Four: Coopt the Professor through Cycles of Reform.** Reform of the university reproduces exactly the same arrayed network of panoptic discipline mechanisms. Despite the idealism, the rhetorics, the documentation, the vision quests, and the approving documents, the reform is isomorphic to the system it was before the reform was initiated, yet again and again. Let the professors form small groups, but keep them constantly stimulated by collective issues of curriculum redesign, book adoptions, fine-tuning policy minutiae, restating other people's statements of other people's visions and grade them on the manuscripts they fabricate. Doing this while subjecting them to rigid hierarchical surveillance to insure they reproduce and do not disturb any disciplinary mechanisms.

**Principle Five: Practice Recidivism.** Universities fabricate scholars who return as masters students. Some recidivate to become doctoral students. A few are so addicted to university regimentation that they become permanent inmates; they become professors. Students are secretly recruited and programmed to commit recidivism. A life of high recidivism is rewarded with a life sentence to university life. Even those who are denied rank at a university are paroled to life beyond the ivory tower only to recidivate into yet another university. We must certainly measure, diagnose, analyze, and ethnograph this recidivism process. Why are universities so addictive? We try to rehabilitate so they will go into the real world and lead productive lives. Yet, they keep coming back for more disciplinary life education. They can not get enough academic discipline. Detention causes recidivism. Those leaving the university



have more chance than before of going back to its halls. Professors and graduate students are former inmates of the university machine. Do they return for learning, for correcting deficit careers, or to sip the addiction of university life disciplines?

#### V. The Ritual of the University Panopticon.

The Panopticism of the Graduation Ceremony. Weaving their way down the corridor defined by rows of smiling, cheering, and unruly students, assigned to sections by their major, passes the faculty, walking two by two, wearing the uniform of the university: black robes with caps and capes to indicate the university where they got their training in university life. The spectacle of this procession is the panoptic machine made visible for only a few moments. Along the corridor at my university, dividing the procession of faculty from the students, are parallel chains of ten students, segmented with administrators, wearing the colors of their cadres: the volunteer corp of the "Belles" and the "Crimsons." Trustees wearing uniforms of service lead the procession up this panoptic corridor. It is the festival of the departing graduates, the scapegoats that are being chased away into the cold, harsh, cruel world. Programs and student newspapers provided their names, recount their deeds to the spectators and to the participants. Seasoned veterans can guess the occupational grouping of students by their dress; empirical and ethnographic eyes know the color codes of vestments. Students respond to the ceremonial game by comically displaying some uniqueness in their hat decorations and the fraternity letters that adorn their gowns: insignias of their gang memberships and comic affirmations of their individuality and their indocility. The chancellor carries a mighty weapon to lead the procession to its public graduation. It is a sea of black heroization; it is the dark panoptic machine in full

display; it is the spectacle of the university of the dark ages come back to the future. The veil of technical subtlety has been rolled back during the procession to see the enactment of the execution spectacle; a meticulously designed administrative machine of the panoptic cage with its central corridor defining the entire path into cells and rows of students on either side, sitting in chains of folding chairs, completely visible to the raised platform of the presiding Deans and Chancellors and Chief Administrative officers. The registrar approaches the platform to hand out the sentences of the institution. The gaze is present; the students can not see one another too well, but are under constant surveillance by the warders hand in hand chain along the corridor. The journey of a few moments, sometimes a few hours, reveals the massive enclosure, the carefully articulate segmentation of disciplines, the capillaries of the mighty mechanism; its elements dressed out for all to see. At the close of the ceremony, the university sets loose swarms of dangerously docile graduates on the unsuspecting public. Parents and employees can always readmit them for more education.

## VI. Conclusions.

The university practices both a technology and a psychology of discipline. The university orders time and space rhythms into a grand machine. The cogs reconfigure only slightly with the signals of the bells, initiating the movements through time and space. The instruments of discipline are the gaze, endless recording, and subtle penal mechanisms distributed in a network of devices throughout the productive corridor of the university machine. The penal mechanisms

have been sanitized, rationalized, and civilized from their barbaric and feudal university roots. Nevertheless, the penal councils and judgements utilize examinations, normalization, gratification-punishment, panoptical mechanisms, and a supportive host of auxiliary disciplinary penal mechanisms to form the capillary subsystem of the university machine. Not just students are disciplined, the most disciplined of all are the professors. They are subjected through powerful isolation, regulation, transformation through rank and tenure, coopted in cycles of reform, and participate in recidivism. There are precious few academic freedoms within the university cage.

What are the results of the university panopticon? Foucault gives us a framework for answering this question. We shall adopt his analysis of the Carceral Archipelago Network to summarize the results not for the prison, but for the university.

1. People are disciplined for norm and rule violations. Anomalies are not tolerated. Surveillance and penal mechanisms are networked to form a continuous gaze and hierarchical differentiation to judge and correct students and professors. The surveillance is discreet, the coercion vague, the divisions seem minor, and the penalties are mild, but the total effect is severe. Punish the slightest indiscipline, gaze at the slightest irregularity in conduct, and maintain a **framework** and technology for reporting, monitoring, ranking, and normalizing. In the history of the ancient university, we find the sovereign Chancellors discoursing directly with the deviant Galileo and Aristotle. Now the discipline takes a more circuitous route.

2. The University machine recruits, fabricates and consumes its own delinquents. The university inculcates docility and by these same mechanisms fabricates non-conformity. Yet, the university takes care not to waste anything. The inassimilable persons are processed through the university machine. "It is unwilling to waste even what it has decided to disqualify" (p. 301). Delinquents are a continuous birth and death object of panopticism. Tenureship is born at the center of a system of insistent surveillance and cumulative disciplinary coercion. Someone once said "universities are places we send rebels to keep them off the streets, fighting for rank monies of no great account anyway." However, I think "rebels" have been systematically marginalized within the educational systems by the disciplinary machine.

3. The university teaches that the power to punish and discipline is natural and legitimate. In the feudal times, corporal punishment was a primary mechanism; the physical torture of the body has been gentlemanized and transformed into the scientific and technical and more anonymous tortures of the machine. Universities lower the threshold of tolerance to penalty mechanisms. The university is a legal entity for registering justice to its students and professors. It is also an extra-legal register of disciplinary mechanisms that have legal sanction. The university punishes and yields verdicts, gazes through an imitative police work, disciplines in imitation of the law, objectifies and normalizes in imitation of science, ritualizes and solemnifies in imitation of the church, and cures in imitation of medicine. The university is relatively free of all excess and violence. (I say 'relatively' with due caution. Some may wish to point out the rise in date rape and sexual harassment.) The gradations of continuous and pervasive apparatus of discipline are less the violent form of corporal punishment, and more the taken-for-granted

forms. There is nothing in disciplinary existence, except the graduation ceremony and the Ph.D. exam to recall the sovereign power of feudal universities. The disciplinary mechanisms are sanctioned by scientific rationality. Technology makes discipline seem less arbitrary, less the spectacle, and teaches the graduates of its training to practice the mechanisms in the institutions that will employ them. A more precise conclusion is that the institutions of societies thrive on the consumption of university output: business, government, and non-profit ventures need docile practitioners of the disciplinary sciences.

4. The Normalization of the Power to Judge. Judges assess, diagnose, classify the normal and abnormal, recommend rehabilitation, use many experts, decide the good of the subject's development. The judge has access to systems of inspection, insertion, distribution, surveillance, and observation to perform and normalization function. Universities produce leaders who can operate the technologies of discipline. We call it social science and use it to discipline society.

5. The body of the human has been captured in the perpetual gaze, the knowledge accumulation, and the panoptic cage. The society is obsessed with methods to fix, decide, record, examine and ultimately objectify behavior. After the age of "inquisitorial" justice with its torture confessions, we entered the age of enlightened "examination" for justice and the use of scientific instrumentation to make people docile and compliant through the examination process. The society is obsessed with examinations to qualify everything. They learn the technology in the university and transport it to every niche in our social fabric. There is a

seemingly uncritical usage of scientific analysis that is being applied to human domination. Handwriting experts are making placement decisions based on secret examinations of handwriting samples that subjects do not know they have donated. Personality inventories decide placements. GMATs decide entrance. Auxiliaries of bureaucrats and technocrats are accumulating an amazingly complete file and encompassing a mass of information on all aspects of the body human. The human being has been caged, not by the 'Rube Goldberg' machine, but by the hard drives of the computer, so many bubbles of binary memory. Memory, the collective human capacity, is being roboticized.

6. Universities meet any force to reform them with great inertia. The university can be defined as a relay network of discipline mechanisms and surveillance systems. Foucault sees only two ways the panoptic cage loses its grip on the body of the human.

First, the surveillance hierarchy will lose its usefulness when the utility for its continued operation makes the apparatus an ineffective way to make the workforce docile. Computers are everywhere; with their information processing power, one executive can sit at his panoptic terminal and review, in spreadsheet form, the time and motion of a vast population of employees. The computer is replacing the panoptic tower as the ideal and perfect cage for human discipline. Like the panoptic tower, the human does not know what information is being seen, who is seeing it, and when the computer monitor is being turned on. The gaze is asymmetric. (Some of us are not eager to link our PCs to the network).

Second, as expert disciplines in science, psychology, psychiatry, educational psychology, engineering, sociology, accounting, management information systems, and the like, assume more of a direct supervision and judging role over the normalization process, there will be less need for an extensive network of direct hierarchical supervision. Although hierarchies in American corporations are quickly becoming flatter, and workers are more trained to supervise themselves, expert technicians control the panoptic mechanisms of discipline. The hierarchical pyramid thereby loses much of its utility. As the standardized tests proliferate and you can sit at a terminal and analyze everyone's pattern, the psychologist is the expert who offers the promise, if not the fact of controlling a vast array of panoptic mechanisms.

Foucault paints the disciplinary capillary, in a manner whose implications are profound for an 'Academy of Management.' For at the center of the postmodern panopticon, there is no dominant boss, no sovereign monarch, no theory X administrator, not is there a dominant coalition, or a council of elders, or a board of directors. There is not a board of strategists distributing elements throughout the enterprise, at every level and region, linking the array of panoptic mechanisms to normalize behavior of all the humans. But there is a mechanism for calling out the strategist to enact small acts of cunning, petty cruelty, and calculated technologies, and even ignore insidious leniencies. In universities, the mechanism is us, with our internalized gaze and docile practices. The strategist, therefore, is not one person, nor a board of strategists.

Outside the Academy, the panoptic machine wakes up the strategist when the market and

enterprise readings demand punitive mechanisms to "do their thing." One is reminded of the workings of the New York Stock Exchange, where, when the averages dip or rise too far beyond the programmed norms, the computers whiz and putter and they do their own trading. As if this image of the panoptic machine evolved to an Orwellian dimension is not scary enough, Foucault ends his history of the prison with this pronouncement:

In this central and centralized humanity, the effect and instrument of complex power relations, bodies and forces subjected by multiple mechanisms of 'incarceration', objects for discourses that are in themselves elements for this strategy, we must hear the distant roar of battle (p. 308).

I hear the distant roar of science and technology battling to make mankind more docile.



## VII. References

- Annarelli, James Jon  
1987 Academic Freedom and Catholic Higher Education. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Beale, Howard K.  
1936 Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools. Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part XII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Boje, David M.  
1991a "Organizations as storytelling networks: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm," Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol 36: 106-126  
1991b "Consulting and change in the storytelling organization," Journal of Management Education, Second issue, August: 279-294.  
1992 "A postmodern analysis of Disney leader narratives." Invited paper presented to the New England Symposia for Narrative Studies in the Social Sciences (IV) by Harvard Medical School Department of Psychiatry, Sloan School of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Boston University, Saturday, May 9, 1992 at MIT.
- Boje, David M. and Robert F. Dennehy  
1992 America's Revolution Against Exploitation: The Story of Postmodern Management. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishers.
- Boyne, R.  
1990 Foucault and Derrida. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Brown, Julie R.  
1991 "Speaking as a Curio... Intellectuals, fragments, and others in "our" discipline and beyond." Presentation at the Alta Conference in Alta, Utah (August).
- Burrell, Gibson  
1988 "Modernism, Post Modernism and Organizational Analysis 2: The contribution of Michel Foucault." Organization Studies 9/2: 221-235.
- Califano, Joseph A. Jr.  
1970 The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Cantelon, John E.  
1969 College Education and the Campus Revolution. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

- Clegg, Stewart  
1989a "Radical revisions: Power, discipline and organizations." Organization Studies, Vol. 10 (1): 97-115.
- 1989b Frameworks of Power. London: Sage.
- Fayol, Henri  
1949 General and Industrial Management. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd.
- Foucault, Michel  
1977 Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hetrick, William P. and David M. Boje  
1992 "Organization and the body: Post-Fordist dimensions." Journal of Organizational Change Management, Vol. 5 (1): 48-57.
- Hofstadter, Richard  
1955 Academic Freedom in the Age of the College. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hofstadter, Richard and Walter P. Metzger  
1955 The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kibre, Pearl  
1962 Scholarly Privileges in the Middle Ages: The rights, privileges, and immunities of scholars and universities at Bologna, Padua, Paris, and Oxford. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. & Wagner Thielens, Jr.  
1958 The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- MacIver, Robert M.  
1955 Academic Freedom in Our Time. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Marti, Berthe M.  
1966 The Spanish College at Bologna in the Fourteenth Century. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mayer, J.P.  
1956 Max Weber and German Politics. London: Faber and Faber.
- Mechanic, David  
1962 "Sources of power of lower participants in complex organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 7, no. 3 (December): 349-64.

- McLaughlin, Mary Martin  
1952 "Intellectual Freedom and Its Limitations in the University of Paris in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centures," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Columbia University).
- McGucken, William J. S.J.  
1932 the Jesuits and Education: The Society's Teaching Principles and Practice, Especially in Secondary Education in the United States. New York: Bruce Publishing Company.
- Metzger, Walter P.  
1955 Academic Freedom in the Age of the University. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Porter, Lyman W. and Lawrence W. McKibbin  
1988 Management Education and Development: Drift or Thrust into the 21st Century? New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schwickerath, S.J.  
1904 Jesuit Education: Its History and Principles viewed in the light of Modern Educational Problems. 2nd Ed. St. Louis, MO.: B. Herder (Becktold Printing).
- Shumway, David R.  
1989 Michel Foucault. Boston: Twayne Publishers (Division of G.K. Hall & Co.).
- Simon, Herbert A.  
1957 Administrative Behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations, Second edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Summers, Robert E.  
1954 Freedom and Loyalty In Our Colleges. New York: H.W. Wilson Company.
- Urwick, Lyndall  
1945 The Elements of Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Footnotes:

1. Similarly, the fact that some total institutions, to use Goffman's term, have these physical constraints does not invalidate the application of the concept to other organizations, such as boarding schools, nunneries, and campus universities which do not.