

Critical Management Education Beyond the Siege

David Boje and Khadija Al-Arkoubi

New Mexico State University

Chapter draft dated February 11, 2008

Accepted for publication in Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development (Sage). Editors: Steve Armstrong & Cynthia Fukami

“... the absence of any serious discussion of pedagogy in cultural studies and in the debates about higher education has narrowed significantly the possibilities for redefining the role of educators as public intellectuals and of students as critical citizens capable of governing rather than simply being governed.” [Giroux, 1997: 259]

Abstract

Management education has been dominated by managerialism and its underlying assumptions (rationality, efficiency, performativity, control, objectivity, etc). Although some management scholars have denounced management orthodoxies and have provided illuminating critiques of business curricula and their ingrained pedagogies, their efforts have yet to achieve the promised emancipatory journey for educators, students, and citizens. *Critical management education* (CME) is at impasse, unable to liberate management teaching from the siege of managerialist capitalism, and the corporatization and deskilling of the university. While we recognize the many challenges facing CME, we outline and explain its tenets and offer some ideas on how they can be translated into practice.

Introduction

Critical Management Education (CME) arose in the 1990s (Perriton and Reynolds, 2004) to counter the managerialist orientation in business schools. Managerialism is an ideology of performativity (work until you drop), efficiency (people defined as expendable resources), and commitment to short term, bottom line decision criteria. CME questions these ethical assumptions, and seeks to liberate management education to be more inclusive of a variety of stakeholder voices and a myriad of issues, including the environment, labor, community, multiculturalism, racial/ethnic diversity, and social concerns.

CME rebels against the positivist, dogmatic management education models and is well grounded in the social and moral roles of education. Although it has been influenced by a

number of academic disciplines including Critical Theory (CT), critical theory (ct lowercase),¹ Critical Pedagogy (CP) and Critical Management Studies (CMS), it is still searching for its soul.

CT can be defined as the theories and methods of the Frankfurt School between 1923 and end of World War II. ‘ct’ (lowercase) typically refers to subsequent critical theories, theorists, and methods originated since the 1970s. CP stands for the branch of education known as Critical Pedagogy, initiated by Paulo Freire in the 1960s. CMS (Critical Management Studies) is a branch of scholarship that is informed by CT, ct, and most recently by CP. CMS has led to writers and teachers developing texts and materials for Critical Management Education (CME).

In this chapter, we first offer an historical overview on CME drawing from its philosophical grounds reflected in the Frankfurt School Critical Theory (known as CT) (*Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, 1932-1939), and later work, in contemporary ‘critical theory’ ‘ct’. Second, we propose closer alliance of CT, ct, and critical pedagogy, ‘CP’. Third, we explore the meaning of *critical*, in CT, ct and CP, and *critical thinking* approaches that are prominent in managerialism. Fourth, we explicate tenets of CME such as, ethics of answerability, commitment to emancipation/ transformation, diffusion of power in the classroom, promotion of multiculturalism, and the belief in multidisciplinary approaches. Finally, we identify some challenges of CME and offer suggestions on how these may be faced.

FOUNDATIONS OF CRITICAL MANAGEMENT EDUCATION (CME)

Critical Theory (CT): The Frankfurt School

CT designates the philosophy, theory, and practice of the directors and associates of the Frankfurt School Institute for Social Research. Boje (2007b) asserts that there were three phases: The inception, the aestheticization of critical theory, and the search for enlightenment.

Phase 1 of CT: The Inception

In the First Phase of CT, Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno and Max Horkheimer were directors of the Frankfurt School Institute for Social Research. Besides Adorno and Horkheimer, Walter Benjamin, Erich Fromm, Henry Gossmann, Arkadij Gurland, Otto Kirchheimer, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse, Franz Newmann, Friedrich Pollock, and successor Jürgen Habermas are recognized as the main figures of CT. The Frankfurt School was founded in

¹ CT ct is a well-known distinction in Critical Management studies to designate important transitions in the Frankfurt school (CT) from more recent work in ct.

Frankfurt in 1923, but it was Horkheimer's directorship after 1931, that gave it prominence. Horkheimer and Adorno focused on an empirical and historically ground interdisciplinary research program to overcome the inadequacies of Hegelian, Marxist, and Kantian theories. Horkheimer's (1974) *Critique of Instrumental Reason* (a collection of his writing from mid-forties to 1967) asserted that business goals once achieved become instrumental means to new goals, and that this progression is without ethical moorings. Reason without spiritual (transcendentally reflexive) substance becomes the curse of science made into technology instrumentally deployed by business and public administration. Horkheimer (1974), for a time thought that CT would, after Nazism's defeat, begin a new day of "authentically human history" brought about by "reforms or revolution." Yet new forms of dictatorship emerged.

Adorno and Horkheimer are particularly critical of Immanuel Kant's (1781) "*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*" (*Critique of Pure Reason*). There was hope that the Enlightenment could be salvaged in critical interdisciplinary projects. Horkheimer's (1933) essay '*Materialismus und Moral*' (*Materialism and Morality*), is the first CT materialist critique of Kantian ethics. Horkheimer (1933/1993: 25) points out how the Kantian doctrine of the categorical imperative anticipates the end of morality, and helps it along by making a "distinction between interest and duty." Adorno (1963/2000) talks about it as the distinction between Kant's ethics of conviction, and an ethics of responsibility. Boje (2007b) argues that industrial revolution gave way to the post-industrial revolution of late modern capitalism, Kant's writings on Moral Philosophy have been transformed to achieve currency in a field known as 'Business Ethics' in the Academy of Management, and Public Administration Ethics, in the Academy of Public Administration. Horkheimer's (1933/1993: 25) critique is the basis for an ethics of responsibility. Horkheimer's challenge is how can any "society of isolated individuals" acting with ethics of conviction bring about meaningful change in the social order (Horkheimer, 1933/1993: 25)? At the close of the first phase of CT, it was business as usual for the capitalist and Marxist-inspired states: exploitation reined. Horkheimer's and Adorno's (June 1947) introduction could well be describing our contemporary situation. Public opinion has become a commodity, which is manipulated to keep attention away from devaluation and oppression by language manipulations.

Phase 2 of CT: The Aestheticization of Critical Theory

The Second Phase of CT (1947-1970) began with Horkheimer and Adorno's (1944) *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. It is regarded as a turning point in CT implying the aesthetic critique

of the Culture Industry. The Nazi fascism of World War II left them disillusioned about the prospects for any positive program of empirical interdisciplinary study. Clearly, their goal of ultimate emancipation from fascism lies elsewhere than scientific Enlightenment. They turned to more Weberian and Nietzschean skepticism to contend with the dark reality of post World War II. In particular, Phase 2 work indicates a distrust of state and corporate control over the culture industry. Adorno (1963/2000: 170) ends his series of 1963 lectures by declaring, “There is no ethics [...] in the administered world.” Adorno says he owes Nietzsche “the greatest debt” for his skepticism (p. 172).

The second phase was characterized by the critique of the mass culture that is in reality embedded in an elitist hierarchical society where privileged people prevail culturally and socially. Both Adorno and Horkheimer were working with an ‘inner circle’ composed of Marcuse, Lowenthal, Fromm and Benjamin. This circle initiated some of the most critical analyses of ideology ever produced (Kellner, 1990). Having the intention to promote transition toward socialism, scholars under this circle denigrated capitalist ideologies in research and theory. They attacked mass culture such as, literature, music, magazines, films, TV, radio, etc. and other artifacts of the culture industry. They also fostered the necessity of developing the sociology of mass culture and were persuaded that cultural phenomena are the translation and reflection of the whole socio-economic structure. In fact, according to Adorno and Horkheimer, a theory of culture should involve the processes of production, reproduction, distribution, exchange and consumption (Held, 1980).

Phase 3 of CT: The Search for Enlightenment

The third Phase of CT (1970- 1980s) is characterized by the leadership of Jürgen Habermas. We would argue that Habermas has turned the clock back to redeem the First Phase of CT. Habermas seeks the Enlightenment ideal, an emancipatory potential attainable by neo-Kantian moral philosophy applied to social science. This can be seen in Habermas’ communicative ethics. More recently Habermas picks up on Luhmann, as well as Parsons in a turn that can only be described, as structural functionalist system theory. The result is that whereas Horkheimer and Adorno (as well as Fromm and Marcuse) were moving away from formal, absolutist, universalistic ethics to one that Bakhtin (1990, 1993) calls an ethics of answerability, Habermas is headed to the other direction. He fearlessly criticized positivism and

its contribution to the 'technocratization' of the social consciousness. He turned his back to the methodology of the exact sciences and based his work on hermeneutics (interpretive methodology of human sciences). He believed that critical theory of society is capable of ensuring order, reason, truth and justice. Following Kant's position, Habermas pointed out that moral obligation requires that we always give up our selfish interests when they clash with universal ones (Ingram, 1987). However, his discourse on ethics has shifted away from Kant's categorical imperative into moral argumentation. The latter suggests that the sine qua non condition for a norm to be valid is its satisfaction of every one's interests. Therefore, unlike Kant, who promoted a monological and solitary consciousness, Habermas concentrated on collective moral consciousness characterized by perspective-taking and inclusion of the community interests (Habermas, 1991).

In sum, CT stands for the three phases of theory and research of the Frankfurt School founders and associates. Each phase has its characteristics and pioneers. While there are disagreements, all converge in the pursuit of social justice and a critique of managerialist approaches to capitalism.

Contemporary Critical Theory (ct)

It is important to develop the current directions in 'ct' that were ignored by the Frankfurt School CT. Critical theory (ct) has given credentials to the feminist movement and is characterized by women's contributions. In fact, one of the major problems with CT is its lack of female scholarship. For example, Adorno, Horkheimer, and key male associates including Walter Benjamin, Henry Gossmann, Arkadij Gurland, Eric Fromm (often excluded by CT historians), Otto Kirchheimer, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse, Franz Newmann, and Freidrich Pollock, and successor Habermas dominated CT. With little ct there has been more female authorship. However, several feminists have contributed not usually cited in 'ct' reviews: Susan Bordo, Judith Butler, Hélène Cixous, Donna Haraway, Lucé Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva (see Boje, 2007b for a review).

Over the decades there has been an increase in feminist ct scholarship, beginning with Calás, Smircich, Fulop (1999) and Townley (1993, 1994). The critical theory (ct) has resulted in the movement of 'Critical Management Studies' (CMS) that focuses more superficially on gender as well as ethnic and racial diversity, postcolonialism, and multiculturalism. A complete

review is beyond the scope of this chapter, since the literature is so prolific that we can barely scratch the surface.

The ‘ct’ writing began its inroad into management studies in the 1970s with focus on new-Marxism, hegemony, and labor process (Benson, 1977; Braverman, 1974; Gramsci, 1971; Wood & Kelley, 1978), expanded in the 1980s, broke loose in the 1990s with the growing application of Foucault’s work, and the 2000s taking more focus on narrative, discourse, and rediscovering CT ethics (see the list below for more information on the scholars who contributed to ct in the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s). This emphasis shows the proliferation and the growing impact of ‘ct’ on all disciplines, including management education.

Table 1: Development of ‘ct’ in recent decades²

Decades	Key Areas	Pioneers
<u>1980s</u> :	Critique of capitalism; managerial bias in accounting; doing critical management research methods	Clegg (1981, 1989); Clegg & Dunkerley (1980); Ferguson (1984); Jermier (1985); Knights & Willmott, (1986a, b, 1988, 1989); Knights, Willmott & Collinson (1985); Littler (1982, 1984); McCarthy (1981); Steffy & Grimes (1986); Shor (1980), Thompson (1989); Tinker (1985); Willmott & Knights (1989).
<u>1990s</u>	Managerialism in TQM; critical storytelling; Critical Human Relations	Adler (1990); Adler, Forbes, & Willmott (2006); Alvesson (1990); Boje (1995); Boje & Dennehy (1993); Boje & Winsor (1993); Calás (1993, 1994); Calás & Smircich (1991, 1993, 1999); Collins (1995); Deetz (1992); Forester (1993); Fulop & Linstead (1999); Hardy & Clegg (1996); Hassard, Holliday, & Willmott, (1998, 1999); Jermier (1998); Jermier, Nord, & Knights (1994); Parker (1999); Thompson (1990); Townley (1993, 1994); Willmott (1993, 1998)
<u>2000s</u>	Racial and ethnic diversity; spectacles of capitalism	Boje (2000; 2001a-c; 2002, 2004, 2006, 2007a-f); Boje & Al Arkoubi, 2005); Boje & Cai, (2004, 2005); Boje, Enríquez, González, & Macías (2005); Boje, Luhman, & Baack (1999); Boje & Rosile, (2003); Delbridge (2006); Edwards & Collinson (2002); Hassard, Hogan & Rowlinson (2001); Hassard, Kelemen, & Forrester (2000); Knights & Willmott (2000, 2007) ; Knights, Noble; Levy & Egan (2003); Mills, Mills, Forshaw & Bratton (2006); Mills, Simmons, & Mills (2005); Parker (2002); Prasad (2003); Thompson & McHugh (2002); Thompson & Newsome (2004); Thompson & Smith (2001); Tinker (2002); Vurdubikis, & Willmott (2001); Willmott (2003, 2005).

² The references in Table One can be found at http://business.nmsu.edu/~dboje/655/CMS_guide.htm. We apologize for leaving anyone’s work out. See also Academy of Management CMS interest group <http://group.aomonline.org/cms/Resources/Bibliography/cmsbib.htm>

In sum, what is occurring now is some resurgence of interest in difference in early phases of CT, and implications of ct scholarship in gender, diversity, and multiculturalism. In addition, there is now interdisciplinary work to develop a more Critical Pedagogy (CP). We explore these conditions next.

CRITICAL MANAGEMENT EDUCATION (CME) AND ALLIANCE OF CT, ct AND CRITICAL PEDEGOGY (CP)

We would like to acknowledge and encourage the growing intertwinement of CMS with CP. From the 1970s through the early 1990s, CMS and CP have remained separate disciplines, with a paucity of cross-citation. All roads of CP lead to Paulo Freire (1972).

CP is grounded in the struggle for social justice, democracy, and the most humane precepts of life. Paulo Freire, the father of CP, regarded education as a way to transform and liberate the human kind. He fought against oppression and sought to develop students who are capable of taking actions and changing their own realities. At the heart of the Freirean philosophy is the courage to alter one's own identities in a sharp contradiction with the dominating, oppressing and widely held assumptions. Therefore, students are always exhorted to develop subject positions and act as critical analysts and change agents.

In terms of Critical Management Pedagogy (CMP) we will limit our review to commentaries on critical theory reforms in management education and the university. CMS has just begun to develop its own teaching texts, and pedagogy materials. In fact, since the 1990s, critical theorists (i.e. Alvesson & Deetz, 2004; Alvesson and Willmott, 1992; 1996; Boje, 1994; 1996; Ehrensall, 2001; Fenwick, 2001, 2005; Humphries & Dyer, 2005; Grey, 2004; French and Grey, 1996; Grey and Mitev 1995; Humphries & Dyer, 2005; Monaghan, 2001; Parker & Jary, 1995; Reed, 2002; Reynold, 1999; Summers, Boje, Dennehy, & Rosile, 1997; Thompson, 2005; Willmott, 1997) started to demystify the role of educational institutions, especially business schools, as agents of regulation and control of organizations and people. They denounced the utilitarian and technical trend in knowledge transfer and the focus on a purely positivistic worldview. They also deplored the prevailing wave of celebrating capitalism; shareholders profit maximization and enforcement of managers' hegemony in the educational act. For them, schools

should be deemed the sites of critical learning, and social, political and cultural emancipation. Schools are supposed to prepare critical citizens, who can voice their opinions with courage, and otherwise challenge the embedded assumptions of instrumental society.

The CMS movement is heavily influenced by Freire's (1972) CP, which according to Perriton and Reynolds (2004: 108) still deserves further attention:

“Critical pedagogy [...] is a minority and marginalized activity within management education that deserves to be more widely recognized and adopted. Although there has been a proliferation of literature on management learning, especially in terms of techniques of teaching, the efforts of critical pedagogues in ME have rarely been articulated and consequently we suspect their practice probably occurs in a fragmented and ad hoc manner”

As with CMS, CP took off in the 1970s with work by Stanley Aronowitz (1973, 1977; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985), developed in the 1980s, and the 1990s, Henry Giroux (1991); bell hooks (1994), Peter McLaren (1995), and Maxine Greene (1996). Unlike CT, there is more early reference by CP to critical feminist work by Hannah Arendt (1963). In the main, ct will cite some of the same CT scholars, such as Habermas (1972) and Marcuse (1966), and in ct work by Braverman (1974). There seems less CP focus on work by Horkheimer, Adorno, or Fromm.

The focus in CP is on taking back the classroom from predatory capitalism. Accordingly, Aronowitz and Giroux (1991: 76) have regarded schools as “places where a sense of identity, worth, and possibility is organized through the interaction among teachers, students, and texts”. At the heart of this process lies the andragogy (the theory of adult learning as developed by Malcolm Knowles) to be embraced. The latter should reinforce the perception of schools as “democratic public spheres’ where administrators, students and teachers play the role of ‘public intellectuals’ who continuously challenge the existing assumptions in an attempt to expand ‘civic courage’, and permanently transform public life (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1991).

While unfolding our story of CT, ct, and CP, one cannot ignore Ghoshal's outcry against teaching bad management theories and their moral implications on management practice: “our theories and ideas have done much to strengthen the management practices that we are all now so loudly condemning” (Ghoshal, 2005: 75). More than that, Ghoshal suggests that “by propagating ideologically inspired amoral theories, business schools have actively freed their students from any sense of moral responsibility’ (p. 76). One hears echoes of Horkheimer and Adorno. Therefore, there are problematic issues in management education that one cannot deny. These include for instance, encountering students who are deprived from sense of ethics and do

not recognize their roles in their communities or societies, the commodification of management education and the engagement of management academics in the game of sustaining educational models that promote management orthodoxies. Certainly one can point to corporatization of the university, with presidents and deans, demanding salaries like those of corporate CEOs, and turning the university into McUniversity, as common ground of CP and ct.

Does “educational theory and practice stand at an impasse” as Giroux (1997: 71) claims? How can we liberate education from the siege (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985) that many want purposefully or aimlessly to sustain?

Our story is still unraveling and we think its time to raise questions for both ct and CP. First, we share with you our understanding of critical management education (CME) focusing mainly on its tenets and underlying assumptions. Second, we explore its content and andragogy, and finally we identify some of the challenges of CMS and CP, and offer some suggestions on how these may be faced.

WHAT IS CRITICALITY?

When exploring the concept “critical thinking” versus CT, ct, or CP, one must first be clear about the sense of the word “critical”.

In conventional managerialism, critical may be viewed as arming students with problem solving skills and training them to look for unconventional, even creative remedies to crises and difficulties they face in the business environment. In CMS or CP, on the other hand, being critical means students (and faculty) recognizing their agency as citizens, their complicity in systems of production and commodification in a world where 95% of the population of the world is below common poverty line designations for advanced corporate nations.

In this next section we adapt and extend Mingers (2000) specification of four dimensions of the meaning of critical, i.e. a skepticism towards rhetoric, tradition, power, and objectivity. Besides these aspects we like to add two more elements: being critical towards oneself (reflexivity) and towards the reality where education takes place (see Figure 1). While some students may attain all these dimensions, their level of general criticality may vary according to the educational system they went through, their worldview, degree of maturation, dominant intellectual/epistemological paradigm and accumulated ontological experiences in life.




Figure 1. Six dimensions of being critical

Rhetoric: The critique of rhetoric or critical thinking is the simplest level that reflects the ability to assess others' arguments, opinions, and use of the language in a logical, abstract as well as reflective ways. This aspect is what business schools and management departments run after and try to promote in their educational systems. Although we recognize critical thinking as defined by Mingers (2000) as fundamental, we feel compelled to add the term discourse with small 'd' and big 'D' (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000). Small 'd' discourse is talk and text in social contexts and practice. Big 'D' discourse is focused on broader cultural and historically-situated language systems.

The term discourse has been vastly controvertible (Grant, Keenoy, and Oswick, 1998; Fairhurst, 2007). Whether it is a talk or a text, for us, discourse involves several ways of expression (speech, myth, story, essay, conversation, dialogue, account, metaphors, tropes, etc) that require careful attention to be understood, analyzed, reflected upon, deconstructed and reconstructed. We don't include at this level of criticality Discourse with big 'D' which is a general system of thought developed in a particular historical time (Foucault, 1980) or 'critical Discourse' as in the work of Fairclough. We are somewhat suspicious of big 'D' and little 'd' as a duality, one we think that managerialism can continue to exploit, keeping 'critical thinking' confined to problem

solving, while the source of problems are in the material conditions, and the logics of the political economy. It is the interaction between micro-discourse and macro-Discourse and the necessity for students to be able to engage in a critical (de)construction of knowledge and reality that we consider as essential for criticality.

Tradition: Skepticism toward tradition or conventional wisdom infers challenging our deep assumptions and taken for granted attitudes and views about traditions and customs whether they are embedded in organizations or are well rooted in societies concerning gender, race, ethnicity, and how the Other (e.g. individuals belonging to a minority) is treated. Often, it is easier in critical thinking to adhere to these common and majority held managerial or market forces values rather than critiquing or even opposing them because they are very much promoted by powerful groups and supported by the weight of the tradition. Does CMS dare to deconstruct them as a way of initiating change and overcoming the inertia of the status quo, right in the classroom, as is done routinely in CP?

Power: In critical thinking, one is supposed to be skeptical of the one dominant view and seek a more Bakhtinian polyphony (multiple voices), and difference in meanings and perspectives (polysemy). In CP and CMS, de-power consists of teaching students that there is no one ‘correct’ answer, otherwise ‘they will never dare to question the ‘validity of their teachers’ (Mingers, 2000: 226). And if they don’t feel the courage to challenge teachers’ authority and opinions in the academic setting, they will be deprived in the future from the power to think differently in their organizations or societies. More than that, they will easily accept oppression of their free will, ideas, individuality, and personal voice, etc. The result of critical thinking is submission to authority, to people in leadership, to teachers, etc. Conversely, learning to deal in a dialogic way with other perspectives is extremely critical and necessary for any growth process: “We must share each other’s excess in order to overcome our mutual lack” (Bakhtin, 1990: xxvi). Boje (2001a) called for a restitution that overcomes the cast of dualities, hierarchical thinking, and hegemonic reasoning. He emphasized the need to hear from marginal voices (rebellious people, employees in the lowest ranks of the hierarchy, minorities, etc.).

Objectivity: The final aspect of critical thinking according to Mingers (2000) is being skeptical of knowledge and objectivity. By contrast in CMS and CP, it is about recognizing that there is no value free knowledge and that the construction of knowledge and the processing of information are always subjective and subject to power structures and interest groups in particular context (Foucault, 1980; Freire, 1970). Which knowledge gets to be promoted and propagated and which one gets to be marginalized or even silenced depends heavily on political agendas. In the process of learning, Weick (2007: 6) suggests that we should focus on dropping our tools to gain wisdom. In critical thinking metaphor, story and trope are just tools for efficiency and performativity. He states: “learning to drop one’s tools to gain lightness, agility, and wisdom tend to be forgotten in an era where leaders and followers alike are preoccupied with knowledge management reengineering (Boje, 2006), acquisitions and acquisitiveness. Nevertheless, human potential is realized as much by what we drop, as what we acquire”.

Reflexivity: Being critical towards oneself entails first a capacity to develop an awareness of oneself at individual, relational and collective levels. Second, it requires an understanding of our present/actual self and the possible one (the one to which we aspire). One’s level of reflexivity can heavily contribute to our transition toward the possible self and will always play a key role in our growth and transformation. Critical theory work by Ricoeur (1992) looks at how narrative identity is one of sameness being dialectic with selfhood. Identity stories (or narratives) solicit our obligation to take action, to recognize our connection of selfhood on a moral plane to others. In sameness identity there is a distancing, a standing back from the other, and the kinds of apathetic world we live in is the result. Without reflexivity, learning about selfhood in the world of others will be hindered. If one refuses or does not know how to be critical towards oneself, they will be unable to develop awareness about others. Critical thinking without reflexivity on one’s selfhood, one’s complicity, and solicitude to act when one encounters a story of other being negatively affected our shared life on the planet. For Ricoeur (1992: 218-219), as with Adorno and Horkheimer, Kant’s “follow your maxim”, falls short, in the individualist world.

Reality: Critical thinking is not about context, especially not about one’s citizenship in the world. CP is focused upon being skeptical toward the reality where education takes place. This means being fully aware of one’s citizenship and one’s role as a critical citizen. In CMS,

questioning the structural factors influencing the general educational context becomes very relevant. These factors may include among others, historical, cultural, economic, social, and political facts that seem to be excluded in critical thinking. Critical thinking is too focused in small reality, what we call small 'r.' Small 'r' refers to students' own personal context as producers, consumers, and individuals complicit in global capitalism. The micro-little 'r' needs to be tightly related to the other Reality (with the big R) and reflect the different ways in which people are oppressed globally.

It is worth noting that all these six aspects of criticality are interwoven and they interact with each other in a strong way. From a CP or CMS perspective, we believe students need to develop a sufficient courage and skills to be active members in the act of constructing Reality (with a big 'R') by recognizing the complicity of small 'r.' No one of them can be seen in isolation of the others. Criticality is a whole that is beyond any dichotomies or dual thinking of CT and ct, big D and little d, and big R and little r. It is in the-in-between that the actions of solicitude and answerability take place, recognizing complicity of the selfhood in more dialectic relationship to the narratives of sameness. Nonetheless, one may develop different levels of competency related to each aspect of criticality. It is up to critical management and CP educators to develop teaching methods and content that help students acquire and improve their competency level pertaining to criticality dimensions.

Now that we have clarified our underlying assumptions regarding criticality, we shall elucidate what we consider as tenets of CME.

TENETS OF CRITICAL MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

We offer five tenets of critical management education based upon the first three sections of our chapter (see figure 2 below). These are: ethics of answerability, commitment to emancipation, promotion of multiculturalism, challenge of dichotomies and boundaries, and de-centered power. Each one of them is explained below. All of them are in line with the meaning of criticality exposed above and they have a common philosophical ground with CP and CMS.




Figure 2. Tenets of Critical Management Education

Ethics of Answerability

Answerability is Bakhtin’s term that implies responsibility and accountability of the individual toward self and the other. It is a whole philosophy of life and of the act that “can only be a moral philosophy” (Bakhtin, 1993:56). It is about authoring our answers through acts that reinforce ethics, question injustice, oppression, commodification of the society, and design new projects that create the potential for legitimizing and gratifying the deepest needs and desires of human beings. Answerability requires critical moral beings who has skillfully learned how to position themselves vis-à-vis immorality, how to courageously craft their ideas and actions to serve others in their societies. It is the greatest gift an educator may have because it is based on bravery, self-sacrifice and a permanent willingness to improve our social environment. It is very sad to notice though that the prevailing model of education does not encourage educators to be answerable or promote a culture of answerability in their institutions. Boje (2006) states that “The problem with this line of ethical theory and practice is that it ignores the teachings of ‘ethic of answerability’ to get involved and change the status quo, that its impossible to lead the good moral life within a society or global capitalism that leads the bad moral life. For practical business purposes, contemporary Business Ethics and Public Administration Ethics endorse a *Supposed Right to Lie* and a *Right to Exploit*.”

Educators who do not only transfer knowledge but also values seem to be complicit in disseminating amoral ideological beliefs (Ghoshal, 2005). They are fulfilling their roles as

employees of business or management schools and act “in a spirit of managerialism” (Watson, 1999: 3). Managerialism is founded on a technical view of organizations and regards management as a politically neutral/technical activity. Therefore, management education within this paradigm is “the acquisition of techniques regardless of the context of their application” (Grey and Mitev, 1995: 74). Managers get the privilege to impose their worldview, enforce their control and come up with technical solutions to problems that are deeply grounded in issues related to power, race, class, gender, unfairness, human dignity, etc.

Cheit (1985:50) reviewed more than 200 articles on MBA programs and codified all the critiques. His findings fall into four categories: programs emphasize the wrong model, ignore important work, fail to meet society’s needs, and foster undesirable attitudes. A program’s content is oftentimes more concentrated on control, efficiency and greater effectiveness that meet the demands of the accreditation requirements and fall under the wrong model of management education (Porter and McKibbin, 1988). The latter is heavily reliant on economics and quantitative methodologies that are far, most of the time, from handling complexity, uncertainty, uniqueness and value/power clashes (Schon, 1983). Conversely, managers need to be exposed as students and learners to ethical issues. They need to gain awareness about how their potential position, power, values, understandings of the world affect others’ lives. In a similar vein, management academics have to be wholly conscientious of their impact on their students’ ethical growth and answerability development.

Pfeffer (1997; 2005) called business academics to be solicitous towards the values they teach and warned them against turning universities into knowledge factories that are producing limited technical competencies without consideration of ethics that serve the society as whole. In CME, the responsibility of academics and scholars to educate should be regarded primarily as a moral imperative that is well embedded in the praxis of ethics.

Commitment to Emancipation and Transformation

There is a strong belief in CME that learning and teaching should challenge the existing reality rather than sustain it (Grey and Mitev, 1995) and that historically the focal principle of CME has been the praxis (Fenwick, 2005; Freire, 1973). Commitment to this combination of

reflexivity and social collective actions lies at the heart of individual and societal transformation: “Indeed in the tradition of critical pedagogy, learning is a process through which personal and group consciousness are transfigured to unveil a world of oppression, through praxis, a dialectic of critical reflection and practical action, learners commit to its reform” (Grey and Mitev, 1995: 32). Unfortunately, in the dominant model of management education, functional analyses that address practical organizational problems are the ones that are more accepted while analyses that challenge the structural order (political, ethical, social, cultural, etc.) and question the philosophical underpinnings of organizations and management are deemed to be dangerous and are therefore avoided (Kellie 2004; Pfeffer, 1997).

Nevertheless, historically, the original vision of Joseph Wharton when he endowed the business school at University of Pennsylvania was to ingrain management in the social fabric of people’s life and seek their general well-being (Grey, 2004). This noble aim cannot be achieved without emancipating ourselves and our students from the rigidity of fixation, without challenging our believed truths, and without ‘dropping our tools.’ Weick (2007: 15) eloquently stated that “Your students are likely to remain among the sane if they learn to drop their tools, and you maintain your own lightness as you teach excellence”. Teaching excellence is teaching against rigidity, conformism and taken for granted assumptions. This may occur through creating a relaxed free atmosphere where students can feel liberated from all kinds of fear (academic/ideological, political, social, psychological, etc). Without this freedom (that we should initiate) in our academic institutions, it is less likely that our students become effective social agents in their communities. In the words of Palmer (1998: 19-20): “Institutions reform slowly, and as long as we wait, depending on "them" to do the job for us—forgetting that institutions are also "us"—we merely postpone reform and continue the slow slide into cynicism that characterizes too many teaching careers.” Learning is the domain of discovery, risk, surprise, puzzle, creation, unlimited territories, change and transformation. If we fail to liberate our students’ potential and open the doors large in front of their growth, then they will remain imprisoned in their own fears and will be probably incapable of becoming critical citizens.

Promotion of Multiculturalism

Palmer (1998) pointed out that teaching requires a deep understanding of the inner sources of both the intent and the act. It is also about being cognizant of our identity as a teacher and deepest self as a human being. Thus, one of the ethea of CME is to recognize differences and celebrate them to bring about depth and richness. This tenet is about creating a sense of relatedness, relationality and connectedness with the others that are different than us in a way or another. It is about believing that our being in this world depends on them and our actions are never completed and successful without them, their help and their appreciation. Embracing CME entails a full belief in your authentic identity without faking or looking down to others' identities. Yet, management teaching and learning reality is pretty shocking. In the US, the politics of identity are ongoing. Complaints of discrimination related to race, gender, ethnicity, religious background, color, political membership, ideological convictions, cultural origin, etc. are quite numerous while there is a majority that intentionally or unconsciously enjoys privileges. Attending to multicultural issues in the US is still marginal and a far reached objective.

Far from the US and in the rest of the world, business schools following the American model and adopting English as the language of teaching have mushroomed celebrating the American educational model and the American cultural hegemony. On the other hand, the local identities, the social, cultural, economic and political concerns in these societies have been overlooked and/or marginalized at the expense of promoting a corporate identity that is aligned with the giant American corporations' identities. It is very sad to notice that management students in several corners of the world are being molded according to the American model and that the number one priority in American education is to make the US number 1 in the market place. An alternative proposed by Giroux (1993: 20) is:

“to educate students to live in a multicultural world, face the challenge of reconciling difference and community, and addressing what it means to have a voice in shaping one's future is part of a broader task of deepening and extending the imperatives of democracy and human rights on both a national and global level”.

Promoting multiculturalism is all about initiating and consolidating multicultural literacy based on a dialogic classroom where students discursively and reflexively negotiate their identities (Hesford, 1999).

Challenge of Dichotomies and Boundaries

A central assumption to CME, as we regard it, is the perception of the student and the teacher as whole human beings who cannot be deprived from their wholeness. Fostering the belief in fragmentation, scattering, and dichotomy within the individual during the teaching and learning process is confining the relationship of both teachers and students to the world, and negating the strong interaction between the basic and the most fundamental components of the human fabric: the heart, the mind, and the spirit. Palmer (1998:4) has eloquently expressed this point:

“Reduce teaching to intellect and it becomes a cold abstraction; reduce it to emotions and it becomes narcissistic; reduce it to the spiritual and it loses its anchor to the world. Intellect, emotion, and spirit depend on each other for wholeness. They are interwoven in the human self and in education at its best, and we need to interweave them in our pedagogical discourse as well.”

The dominant education model emphasizes the cerebral activity, rationality and logical thinking. Many teachers are cautious to let emotions interfere in the learning act because they are perceived as weakness while any discussion involving spirituality and/or religion is deemed to be unacceptable. Moreover, the “either or” axiom is fully embraced and enacted by both teachers and students. Getting over this dualistic thinking is what CME needs to achieve.

Another key assumption that we want to instigate in CME is the engagement in multidisciplinary learning/teaching and the defeat of educational boundaries and all kinds of narrow/discipline-centric thinking. This should be based on the encouragement of interdisciplinary inquiry and the perception of management education as well grounded in the other disciplines and the integration of business schools within the other institutions in the Academy. There are three boundaries that we need to cross according to Costigan (2003: 14): (1) boundaries of common sense and constructivist educational orientation, (2) boundaries of artificially construed subject disciplines, (3) boundaries between schools of education and schools of arts and sciences (we can add here business schools). The main advantage of crossing the boundaries is allowing ourselves and our students to see the world from different lenses, and uncover/explore the hidden perspectives that are never present or clear within one discipline, school, or paradigm.

Dialogism and De-centered Power

One of the focal tenets of CME is the belief in an egalitarian liberatory learning agenda and process where values of equality, participation, and collaboration are shared and celebrated. Dialogism is a Bakhtinian concept that involves sharing power in the classroom and allowing all the voices to be heard. It is a way to transform social interactions in the classroom and sensitize students about relations in their larger environment (Ira and Freire, 1987). Thus, students in CME are not passive submissive learners who fear the autocratic teacher, but they are at the heart of the learning process. They co-create knowledge along with the teacher. The dynamics created to help them share their perspectives, express their opinions and interpretations of the world are central to the CME community because these dynamics promote difference and respect and support their way of acting on reality.

In a dialogic community, both the teacher and the student preserve their uniqueness and sense of self, but they both have the courage to listen and accept opinions that may be opposite to their cherished beliefs. Central to these principles of self-awareness, motivation to learn and having a stand in the world is the distinction of Knowles (1990) between pedagogy and andragogy. The former implies the education of children while the latter refers to adult education.

The dialogic classroom is the terrain where shared inquiry based on mutual respect is fostered. Mutual respect means seeking connectedness, and relatedness, without merging. It is listening to people in their wholeness without violating their space or having any intention of control or domination. Our perception of mutual respect is well reflected by Josselson's (1996: 93) in the following way:

“This ‘moving with’ (as opposed to ‘getting ahead of’ or ‘gaining control of’) others has not been encouraged. It is clear that we have come to the edge of our capacity as a species to wield power over one another or to solve problems with force and domination. Either we live interdependently or we all vanish. Our survival necessitates seeing what connects us, looking at what occupies the space between us”

This way both parties can transcend their own boundaries and self-limitations.

THE CHALLENGES FOR CME

How can critical management academics legitimize CME in their institutions and overcome some of the ethical dilemmas they might themselves be subject to? We organize an

answer around five challenges for CME: teaching and working in the Margins, the “I” and the “Other” in the classroom, the content of management education, and curricula development, and bridging the gap between theory and practice. We chose these themes, because we believe they are central to repositioning CME in today’s world.

Teaching and Working in the Margins

Perriton and Reynolds (2004:73) have pointed out that critical management educators (CMEs) find themselves a minority in their academic institutions where the managerialist functionalist worldview is strongly embraced and perceived as aligned with the global trend of management in the world: “We might already have acknowledged the painful truth that, just outside the margins of the articles we write that so proudly outline our ‘critical’ approaches, we are embedded in an educational system that both profits from and promotes the managerialist agenda we like to believe we are combating”. Thus CMEs find themselves isolated, sometimes harshly criticized by their colleagues who belong to the overriding paradigm. Besides, their courses are not a part of a whole curriculum based on the same perspective. Therefore, in the middle of their struggle against the dominant system, their voices do not get fully listened to and their influence on their academic and business environment turns to be partial.

While CMEs believe in their moral responsibility and their role in acting on reality, they live unfortunately in the margins and feel continuously compelled to engage in power negotiations. Their professional identities are torn between ensuring an academic comfort in the institutions where they work and being change agents in their classrooms, communities and societies. A major consequence of this situation is the position CMEs adopt vis-à-vis their students and the learning/teaching process.

The “I” and the “Other” in the Classroom

CMEs believe in their role in engaging their students in critical learning where the dialectics between critical reflection and action should unfold opening doors to the praxis to shake the structural order and engage in reform. This strong stance may be based on the assumption of an ideological supremacy that can be very hard to be accepted by some students. In the words of Fenwick (2005: 33): “How can an educator ethically justify such radical intervention in others’ beliefs, identities, and values? Furthermore, what views can be tolerated? How can a posture of

critique be adopted that is not also somewhat despotic, intolerant of intolerance, and therefore controlling?”

Indeed, we can not ignore the clashes that may occur between the critical teacher and students whose identities have been manipulated throughout their educational experiences and different socialization processes. Students might find themselves in an existentialist state characterized by loss and confusion. They might sympathise with the liberatory discourse at the same time that they accumulate feelings of fear of failure of their future emancipatory endeavours (Alvesson and Willmott, 1996). The dynamics of the interactions between the “I” (teacher) and the “Other” (students) in the classroom becomes the story of different subjectivities and torn identities trying to create meanings and define potential prospective actions with some chances of success.

Several authors (Fenwick, 2005; Grey, 1996; Reynolds, 1999), for instance, have warned against the ‘blind’ adoption of critical pedagogy (CP) where CMEs continue to ‘impose’ their discourse and rationalize it regardless of students’ resistance. In this case, it is the dark side of CP that will emerge and threaten both teachers and students. The former, will suffer from the negative corollaries of adopting a doctrinarian standpoint and imposing it instead of working with students and appreciating the benefits of a progressive dialogic relationship. Students on the other hand, may develop a discomfort with both the content and the pedagogy (Currie, and Knights, 2003), they may doubt their right and worthiness to challenge their teachers (Reynolds, 1999) and may wonder how they would fit in the global market when they graduate.

Having recognized these risks, it is useful now to reiterate the necessity of being permanently aware of avoiding them through developing

“the willingness to see one’s own world from other perspectives, the willingness to engage with them, the willingness to work things through in a positive spirit, the willingness to risk critique not just from within, but also beyond one’s own intellectual and professional world, the willingness to go on giving relentlessly of oneself, and the willingness to go on undercutting one’s own social and professional identity as one takes on the conflicting perspectives of one’s own frameworks” (Barnett, 1997: 169).

This basic challenge of identity is also related to the perceived roles of students and teachers. To keep away from any sort of domination, imposition or coercion in the learning process we should avoid talking about teaching and replace it with the concept of ‘dialogic inquiry’ where both CMEs and students learn collaboratively and take turns to voice their concerns, opinions, positions, emotions, and stories. In the words of Michel Novak: “We are always living out a

story. “There is no way to live a storyless [...] life” (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1991: 128) yet, it is fundamental to be able to unveil it, reflect on it, learn from it and develop a stance vis-à-vis the world.

The Content of Management Education and Curricula Development

It is very sad to notice that the management curricula around the world are all standardized and follow the Anglo-American model and seem to be Western ethnocentric. It is also bizarre as Currie and Knights (2003) noted that cultural otherness is not given some intellectual space in most typical MBA programs. One of the key challenges for CMEs is how to act on the content of management education to make it as diverse as possible and reflective of the concerns, specificities, cultural values, heritage and contextual characteristics of the learners.

Although, CMEs are not always involved in the development of management education curricula another challenge for them is to go beyond the disciplinary boundaries and expose students to a myriad of knowledge domains. This will provide according to Giroux (1997) a space for critical discourse and will set up the foundation for students to learn how to discuss issues in a problematic way. Moreover, the different paradigmatic perspectives explored will serve as a source for insights and an opportunity to recognize difference and appreciate how conflicting positions and understandings play a crucial role in creating shared meanings (Bartunek, Gordon and Weathersby, 1983).

Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice

One of the key issues that many critical theorists have raised including Alvesson and Wilmott (1996), and Fenwick (2005) is the tension that CMEs may create among students between theory and practice. While the theoretical discourse tries heavily to challenge the technician/managerialist trend, the reality of organizations promotes profitability, competitiveness, performativity, etc. Also, other educators in the same institution foster managerial theories and activities that are celebrating the capitalistic system and students feel this fragmentation just by going from one course to the other. Another problem phrased by Watson (1999: 8) is that critical academics may “talk about these ideas in language which few people understand” with the result that the ideas have “no chance of being implemented”.

Several suggestions have been offered to close this gap between theory and practice. Some of them include the creation of strong links between the academy and the workplace (Boud and Solomon, 2002); emphasizing students experiences (Fenwick, 2005); adopting critical action learning where students conduct field projects in volunteering organizations and engage in reflexive conversations about them in their classes (Alvesson and Willmott, 1996; Cunliffe, 2002; Fenwick, 2003; 2005; Foley, 2001); undertaking organizational ethnographies to research organizational members in their everyday practice and getting closer to their lived experiences (Samra-Fredericks, 2003); interpreting and negotiating in class the narratives collected and deciding about what may work and can be integrated in organizations and what may not. Indeed, conducting ethnographies and appreciating the use of stories have been suggested by multiple academics (i.e. Boje, 2006; Fineman and Gabriel, 1994; Willmott, 1994) who insisted on the need to care about emotions and feelings, and derive insightful meanings from experiences that would inform future actions.

The challenges of CME are tightly related to the main components of education in general. These are: the teacher, the student, the content and the process. These should never be seen as compartmentalized. It is the deep understanding of how these components interact in a complex academic setting in a complex world that will provide every critical academic with the agency to contribute to transformation.

CONCLUSION

CME is the story of a group of approaches that are beginning to pay dialogic attention to one another. There is agreement that managerialism must be challenged with a variety of ethical voices. There is disagreement over the particular approach to ethics. For example, Habermas (phase 3 CT, which is a reincarnation of phase 1 Kantian ethics) turns back to the unfinished projects of Enlightenment, in such areas as a communicative rationality. The varieties of contemporary ‘ct’ perspectives have put a stronger focus on feminism, diversity, multiculturalism, and postmodern approaches which question the underlying universal ethics of Enlightenment projects.

We have suggested that CME can benefit from a closer relationship to CP. The issue facing CME is how to translate ‘critical’ into management education. What CME can learn from

CP is to develop the student's understanding on how their lives (and roles) are complicit in the fabric of socioeconomic life.

Each of the CT and ct disciplines has its storylines, characters, concerns, context, and a history of ideological struggles. The multi-story is still unfolding and sincerely searching for new and better avenues that would help academics, students, professionals, managers, institutions, communities, political actors, etc. to transcend their interests, constricted calculations, fixed ideologies, narrow terrains, and so forth to embrace the essence of human life in its wholeness and hold up front the human dignity in the world.

The field of CME has inherited strong philosophical principles and ethea from both critical theory movements 'CT' and 'ct', critical pedagogy and critical management studies. It can still benefit from an interactive and closer relationship between all of them while being open to a multidisciplinary inquiry that considers the major historical, political, social, economic, and cultural developments in the world.

While there is a frenetic search for a sustainable economic development in many corners of the world, there should be a parallel search for alternatives to efficiency, competition, performativity, consumption, and exploitation. Privileging a new political, economic, social and cultural system based on justice, human wellbeing, and respect of human dignity entails a new educational order that challenges the well embedded assumptions and goes beyond the quick fixes. CME is a good alternative when it is fully embraced and supported. It is true that it won't radically change the practice of management overnight, but it will at least contribute to the critical education of new generation of managers and citizens.

In a complex, McDonaldized world, several challenges of CME that relate to the subject (teacher and student), content and the process of teaching and learning remain undefeated. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that a strong belief in the tenets of CME as outlined above will open doors to a different practice of education. This practice will radically refute the mere commodification of educational products in a serious attempt to get out of the box of managerialism and overcome the blind followership of the current world socio-economic order. A powerful commitment to the ethics of answerability, emancipation, multidisciplinary exploration of issues, diffusion of power, social justice and challenge of dualistic dichotomic thinking will certainly take CME beyond the siege of managerialism and will encourage every critical management educator to start the first step of the thousand mile journey.

We have major concerns about the encroachment of managerialism into university education. In the United States, the corporatization of the university is a movement, which is gaining ground. University presidents are acting as if they are CEOs; academic freedom of students and faculty has lost ground to hierarchical administered curriculum and governance. In Australia (and elsewhere) government is defining and administering the research agenda of universities. University ranking systems in the UK follow a managerialist ideology. In these times there is greater need than ever before for critical management education.

References

- Adler, P. S. (1990). Marx, machines and skill. *Technology and Culture*, 31(4), 780-812.
- Adler, P. S.; Forbes, L. C; Willmott, H. (2006). *Critical management studies: Premises, practices, problems and prospects*. Unpublished draft for annals of the Academy of Management, Nov 2.
- Adorno, T. W. & Horkheimer, M. (1944). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. John Cumming (Verso, London & New York, 1979).
- Adorno, Theodor W. (1963/2000). *Problems of Moral Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 1st published in German, 1996; 2000 English version. Based upon 17 lectures (7 May 1963 through 25 July 1963).
- Alvesson, M. (1994). Critical theory and consumer marketing. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 10(3), 291-313.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing critical management research*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M. & Karreman, D. (2000). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations*, 53 (9), 1125-1149.
- Alvesson, Willmott, H. (1992). Critical theory and management studies: An introduction. In M. Alvesson & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Critical management studies* (pp. 1-20). London: Sage Publications
- Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (1996). *Making sense of management: A critical introduction*. London: Sage
- Aronowitz, S. (1973). *False promises*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Aronowitz, S. (1977). Mass culture and the eclipse of reason. The implications for pedagogy. *College English*, April, pp. 768-774.
- Aronowitz, S. & H. Giroux (1985). *Education under siege*. Westport, CN: Greenwood, Bergin-Garvey.
- Aronowitz, S. & H. Giroux (1991). *Postmodern education: Politics, culture and social criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays* (ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, trans. Vadim Liapunov). Austin: Texas UP
- Bakhtin M. M. (1993). *Toward a Philosophy of the Act* by trans. and notes by Vadim Liapunov, ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Austin: Texas University Press
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: A critical business*. Bristol, PA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Bartunek, J.M., Gordon, J.R. & Weathersby, R.P. (1983). Developing 'complicated' understanding in administrators. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 273-284.
- Benson, J. K., (1977). Organizations: A dialectical view. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 1-21.
- Boje, D. M. & R. Dennehy. (1993). *Managing in the postmodern world: America's revolution against exploitation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing.
- Boje, D.M. (1994). Organizational storytelling. The struggles of pre-modern, modern and postmodern organisational learning discourses. *Management Learning*, 25 (3), 433-461
- Boje, D. M. (1995). Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as 'Tamara-land'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (4), 997-1035.
- Boje, D.M. (1996). Management education as a panoptic cage, in R. French and C. Grey (eds) *Rethinking management education*, (pp. 76-93). London: Sage
- Boje, D. M. (2000). Nike corporate writing of academic, business, and cultural Practices. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 4(3), 507-516.
- Boje, D. M. (2001a). *Narrative Methods for Organizational and Communication Research*. London: Sage.
- Boje, D.M. (2001b). Carnavalesque resistance to global spectacle: A critical postmodern theory of public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 23(3), 431-458.

- Boje, D. M. (2001c). Las Vegas Spectacles: Organization Power over the Body. *Management*, 4(3), 201-207. Special issue on Deconstructing Las Vegas at <http://www.dmsp.dauphine.fr/management/PapersMgmt/43Boje2.html>
- Boje, D. M. (2002). *Critical Dramaturgical Analysis of Enron Antenarratives and Metatheatre*. Plenary keynote presentation to 5th International Conference on Organizational Discourse: From Micro-Utterances to Macro-Inferences, Wed 24th - Friday 26th July (London).
- Boje, D. M. (2004). *Grotesque Method*. Published in Proceedings (edited by Henri Savall, Marc Bonnet & Michel Peron) of First International Conference (Lyon, France); Co-sponsored Conference, Research methods Division, Academy of Management: Crossing Frontiers in Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods. Vol. II pp. 1085-1114.
- Boje, D. M. (2006). The Dark Side of Knowledge Reengineering Meets Narrative/Story. *Organization Journal*, Book Review, *Knowledge Management and Narratives: Organizational Effectiveness through Storytelling*, edited by Georg Schreyögg and Jochen Koch. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag GmbH & Co.
- Boje, D. M. (2007a). *Storytelling Organization*. London: Sage (in press).
- Boje, D. M. (ed.). (2007b). Contributions of CT Ethics for Business & Public Administration, In *Critical Theory Ethics for Business and Public Administration*. NC: Information Age Press (in press).
- Boje, D. M. (2007c). Story Ethics. In Boje (ed) In *Critical Theory Ethics for Business and Public Administration*. NC: Information Age Press (in press).
- Boje, D. M. (2007d). Dialogism in management research. In Richard Thorpe, Luiz Mountinho and Graeme Hutchinson (Eds), *Sage Dictionary of Management Research*, forthcoming.
- Boje, D. M. (2007e). Exploitation. Entry to appear in S. Clegg and J. Bailey (Eds) *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*. London: Sage.
- Boje, D. M. (2007f.) Chapter 17: Globalization Antenarratives. Albert Mills, Jeannie C. Helms-Mills & Carolyn Forshaw (Eds). *Organizational Behavior in a Global Context*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Boje, D. M. & Al Arkoubi , K. (2005). Third Cybernetic Revolution: Beyond Open to Dialogic System Theories. *Tamara Journal*, 4 (4), 139-151.

- Boje, D. M. & Cai, Y. (2004). McDonald's: Grotesque Method and the Metamorphosis of the three Spheres: McDonald's, McDonaldland, and McDonaldization. *Metamorphosis Journal*, 3 (1): 15-33.
- Boje, D. M. & Cai, Y. (2005). A Laclau & Mouffe Discursive Critique of McJob. For Nico Carpentier (ed), *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Boje, D. M. Enríquez, E. González, M. T. & Macías, E. (2005). Architectonics of McDonald's Cohabitation with Wal-Mart: An Exploratory study of Ethnocentricity. *Critical Perspectives on International Business Journal*, 1 (4), 241-262.
- Boje, D. M., Luhman, J. & Baack, D. (1999). Hegemonic Tales of the Field: A Telling Research Encounter between Storytelling Organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8(4), 340-360.
- Boje, D. M. & Rosile, G. A. (2003a). Life Imitates Art: Enron's Epic and Tragic Narration. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17 (1), 85-125.
- Boje, D. M., Rosile, G.A., Durant, R.A. & Luhman, J.T. (2004). Enron Spectacles: A Critical Dramaturgical Analysis. Special Issue on Theatre and Organizations edited by Georg Schreyögg and Heather Höpfl, *Organization Studies*, 25(5),751-774.
- Boje, D. M., & Winsor, R. (1993). The resurrection of Taylorism: Total quality management's hidden agenda. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 6(4), 57-70.
- Boud, D. and Solomon, N. (eds) (2002). *Workbased learning: A New higher education?* Buckingham: Society for research into higher education and Open University Press.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Calás, M. B. (1993). Deconstructing charismatic leadership: Re-reading Weber from the darker side. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 305-328.
- Calás, M. B. (1994). Minerva's Owl?: Introduction to a thematic section on globalization. *Organization*, 1, 243-248.
- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1991). Voicing seduction to silence leadership. *Organization Studies*, 12, 567-602.
- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1993). Dangerous liaisons: The "feminine-in-management" meets "globalization." *Business Horizons*, 36(2), 71-81.
- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 649-671.

- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (2006). From the woman's point of view ten years later: Towards a feminist organization studies. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed.): 284-346. London: Sage.
- Cheit, E.F. (1985) Business schools and their critics. *California Management Review*, 27/3, 43-62.
- Clegg, S. (1981). Organization and control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(4), 545-562.
- Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of power*. London: Sage.
- Clegg, S., & Dunkerley, D. (1980). *Organization, class and control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Collins, D. (1995). A socio-political theory of workplace democracy: Class conflict, constituent reactions and organizational outcomes at a gain sharing facility. *Organization Science*, 6(6), 628-644.
- Costigan, A. (2003). Educational foundations: Building the case for communication. In D. Kaufman, D.M. Mauss, and T.A. Osborn. *Beyond the boundaries: A Transdisciplinary approach to learning and teaching* (pp. 13-33). London: Praeger/Greenwood
- Cunliffe, AL. (2002). Reflexive dialogical practice in management learning. *Management Learning*, 33(1), 35-61
- Currie, G. & Knights, D. (2003). Reflecting on a critical Pedagogy in MBA Education. *Management Learning*, 34(1), 27-49
- Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in the age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dehler, G.E., Welsh, M.A. & Lewis, MW. (2001). Critical Pedagogy in the 'New Paradigm'. *Management Learning*, 32(4), 493-511
- Delbridge, R. (2006). Extended review: The vitality of labour process analysis. *Organization Studies*, 27(8), 1209-1219.
- Edwards, P., & Collinson, M. (2002). Empowerment and managerial labor strategies. *Work and Occupations*, 29, 271-290.
- Ehrensals, K. N. (2001). Training capitalism's foot soldiers: The hidden curriculum of undergraduate business education. In E. Margolis (ed.), *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education* (pp. 97-113). NY/London: Routledge.

- Fairhurst, GT. (2007). *Discursive leadership in conversation with leadership psychology*. London: Sage Publications
- Fenwick, T. (2001). Ethical dilemmas of transformative pedagogy in critical management education. Stream 20 Activism and teaching, Critical Management Studies Conference. Unpublished document.
- Fenwick, T. (2003). Emancipatory potential of action learning: A Critical analysis. *Journal of Organizational Change management*, 16(6), 619 - 632
- Fenwick, T. (2005). Ethical Dilemmas of critical management education within classrooms and beyond. *Management Learning*, 36(1), 31-48
- Ferguson, K. E. (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Folet, G. (2001). *Strategic learning: Understanding and facilitating organizational change*. Sydney: Centre for Popular Education
- Forester, J. (1993). *Critical theory: Public policy and planning practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. Brighton: Harvester Press
- Fournier, V. (2006). Breaking from the weight of the eternal present: teaching organizational difference. *Management Learning*, 37 (3), 295-311
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Seabury Press.
- French, R. & Grey, C. (1996). *Rethinking management education*. London: Sage Publications
- Fulop, L., & Linstead, S. (Eds.). (1999). *Management: A critical text*. London: Macmillan.
- Giroux, H.A. (1997). *Pedagogy and politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press
- Giroux, H.A. (1993). *Living dangerously: Multiculturalism and the politics of difference*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Trans. Q. Hoare, & G. Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Greene, M. (1996). In search of a critical pedagogy. In P. Leistyna, A. Woodrum, & S. A. Sherblom (Eds.) *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy* (pp. 13-30). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

- Grey, C. (2004). Reinventing business schools: The contribution of critical management Education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3(2), 178-186.
- Grey, C. & Mitev. N. (1995). Management education: A Polemic. *Management Learning*, 26, 73-90
- Grant, D., Keenoy, T & Oswick, C. (1998). Organizational discourse: Of diversity, dichotomy and multi-disciplinary. In D. Grant, T. Keenoy, & C. Oswick (Eds.), *Discourse and organization* (pp.1-13). London: Sage
- Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and Human Interests*, trans. J. J. Shapiro. London: Heinemann.
- Habermas, J. (1991). *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge: MIT. Press
- Hardy, C., & Clegg, S. R. (1996). *Some dare call it power: Handbook of organization studies*. London: Sage.
- Hassard, J., Hogan, J., & Rowlinson, M. (2001). From labor process theory to critical management studies. *Administrative Theory & Practice*, 23(3), 339-362.
- Hassard, J., Holliday, R., & Willmott, H. (1998). *Body and organization: Toward the organization without organs*. London: Sage.
- Hassard, J., Kelemen, M., & Forrester, P. (2000). BPR and TQM: Convergence or divergence. In H. Willmott & D. Knights (Eds.), *The Re-engineering Revolution*. Routledge: London.
- Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press
- Hesford, WS. (1999). *Framing identities: Autobiography and the politics of pedagogy*. Minneapolis, US: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress' Education as the Practice of Freedom*. NY/London: Routledge.
- Horkheimer, M. (1933/1993). *Materialism and Moraility*. Translated by G. Frederick Hunter, Matthew S. Kramer, and John Torpey, with introduction by G. F. Hunter. London/Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press
- Horkheimer, M. (1974). *Critique of Instrumental Reason*. Translated by Mathew J. O'Connell et al. NY: The Seabury Press (A continuum Book). First published in German in 1967
- Horkheimer, M. (1947). *Eclipse of Reason*. NY: The Seabury Press.

- Humphries, M. T. & Dyer, S. (2005). Introducing critical theory to the management classroom: An exercise building on Jermier's 'Life of Mike.' *Journal of Management Education*, 29(1), 169-195.
- Ira, & Freire, P. (1987). What is "the dialogic method" of Teaching? *Journal of education*, 169 (3), 11-31
- Ingram, D. (1987). *Habermas and the Dialectic of Reason*. Yale: Yale University Press
- Jermier, J. (1985). When the sleeper awakens: A short story extending themes in radical organization theory. *Journal of Management*, 11(2), 67-80.
- Jermier, J. (1998). Introduction: Critical perspectives on organizational control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(2), 235–256.
- Jermier, J., Nord, W., & Knights, D. (Eds.). (1994). *Resistance and power in the workplace*. London: Routledge.
- Josselson, R. (1996). *The space between us: Exploring the dimensions of human relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kant, I. (1781/1900). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Introduction by translator, J. M. D. Meiklejohn and special introduction by Brandt V. B. Dixon. NY: The Colonial Press. First edition 1781; revised edition, 1900.
- Kant, I. (1785/1993). *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals: On A Supposed Right to Lie because of Philanthropic Concerns*. Translated by James W. Ellington. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company. 1785 in German, 1993, 3rd edition, English
- Kellner, D. (1990). Critical theory and ideology critique. In R. Roblin (Ed.), *The Aesthetics of the critical theorists: Studies on Benjamin, Adorno, Markuse and Habermas*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press
- Kllie, J. (2004). Management education and management development: Widening participation or narrowing agenda? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 28 (8/9), 676-688
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (1986a). *Managing the labour process*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (1986b). *Gender and the labour process*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (1988). *New technology and the labour process*. New York: Macmillan.

- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (1989). *Labour process theory*. New York: Macmillan.
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (2000). *The re-engineering revolution? Critical studies of corporate change*. London: Sage
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (1999). *Management lives: Power and identity in contemporary organizations*, London : Sage
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (2007). *Introducing organizational behavior and management*. London: Thomson Learning.
- Knights, D., Noble, F., Vurdubakis, T., & Willmott, H. C. (2001). Chasing shadows: Control, virtuality and the production of trust. *Organization Studies*, 22(2), 311-336.
- Knights, D., Willmott, H., & Collinson, D. (Eds.). (1985). *Job redesign: Critical perspectives on the labour process*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.
- Knowles, M. (1990). *Adult learning*. (4th Ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Levy, D. L., & Egan, D. (2003). A neo-Gramscian approach to corporate political strategy: Conflict and accommodation in the climate change negotiations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(4), 803-830.
- Littler, C. (1982). *The development of the labour processes in capitalist societies*. London: Heinemann.
- Littler, C. (1984). Soviet-type societies and the labour process. In K. Thompson (Eds.), *Work, employment and unemployment* (pp: 87-96). Milton Keynes: Open University.
- Marcuse, H. (1966). *Ethics and Revolution*. *Ethics and Society: Original Essays on Contemporary Moral Problems*, edited by R. T. de George (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1966).
- Marcuse, H. (1972). *Counterrevolution and Revolt*. London: Allen Lane.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. 1. The Process of Capitalist Production. Trans. S. Moore and E. Averling. F. Engels (ed.). NY: International Publishers. First published 1867, English 1967.
- McCarthy, T. (1981). *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Mills, A. J., Jean, C., Mills, H., Forshaw, C., & Bratton, J. (2006). *Organizational behavior in a global context*. Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.

- Mills, A. J., Simmons T., Jean C., & Mills, H. (2005). *Reading organization theory: A critical approach to the study of organizational behaviour and structure* (3rd ed.). Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.
- Mingers, J. (2000). What is it to be critical? Teaching a critical approach to management undergraduates. *Management Learning*, 31(2), 219-237.
- Monaghan, C. H. (2001). Silence, voice, and resistance in management education. Stream 20: Activism and Teaching, paper presentation at Critical Management Studies conference # 3, unpublished.
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parker, M. (1999). Capitalism, subjectivity and ethics: Debating labour process analysis. *Organization Studies*, 20(1), 25-45.
- Parker, M. (2002). *Against Management*. Oxford: Polity.
- Parker, M., & Jary, D. (1995). The McUniversity: Organization, management and academic subjectivity. *Organization*, 2(2), 319-338.
- Perriton, L. & Reynolds, M. (2004). Critical Management Education: From pedagogy of possibility to pedagogy of refusal. *Management Learning*, 35(1), 61-77
- Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New directions for organization theory: Problems and prospects*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pfeffer, J. (2005). Why do bad management theories persist? A comment on Ghoshal. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(1), 96-100.
- Plato. (406BCE). *The Phaedrus*. (Jowett, B. Trans 1999). Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.
- Porter, L.W. & McKibbin, L.E. [1988] *Management education and development: Drift or thrust into the 21st century?* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Prasad, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Postcolonial theory and organisational analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reed, D. (2002). Management education in an age of globalization: The need for critical perspectives. In C. Wankel & DeFillippi (Eds.), *Rethinking Management Education for the 21st Century*. Greenwich, Conn: Information Age Publishing.
- Reynolds, M. (1999). Grasping the nettle: possibilities and pitfalls of critical management pedagogy. *British Journal of Management* 9, 171-84

- Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as Another*. Trans. by Kathleen Blamey. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Samra-Fredericks, D. (2003). A proposal for developing a critical pedagogy in management from researching organizational members' everyday practice. *Management Learning*, 34 (3), 291-312
- Schon, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Shor, I. (1980). *Critical Teaching and Everyday life*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering Education; Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Steffy, B. D. & Grimes, A. J. (1986). A Critical Theory of Organization Science. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(2), 322-336.
- Summers, D., Boje, D., Dennehy, R., & Rosile, G. (1997). Deconstructing the organizational behavior text. *Journal of Management Education*, 21(3), 343-360.
- Thompson, P. (1989). *The nature of work* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan.
- Thompson, P. (1990). Crawling from the wreckage: The labour process and the politics of production. In D. Knights & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Labour process theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Thompson, P. (2005). Brands, boundaries and bandwagons: A critical reflection on critical management studies. In C. Grey & H. C. Willmott (Eds.), *Critical management studies: A reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, P., & McHugh, D. (2002). *Work organizations* (3rd ed.). London: Palgrave.
- Thompson, P., & Newsome, K. (2004). Labour process theory, work and the employment relation. In B. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theory and the employment relationship* (pp: 133-162). Champagne, IL: Industrial Relations Research Association.
- Thompson, P., & Smith, C. (2001). Follow the redbrick road: A reflection on pathways in and out of the labour process debate. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 30(4), 40-67.
- Tinker, T. (1985). *Paper prophets: A social critique of accounting*. New York: Praeger.
- Tinker, T. (2002). Specters of Marx and Braverman in the twilight of postmodernist labour Process research work. *Employment & Society*, 16(2), 251-281.

- Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, power/knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(3), 518-545.
- Townley, B. (1994). *Reframing human resource management*. London: Sage.
- Watson, T.J. (1999). Beyond Managism: negotiated narratives and critical management education in practice. Paper presented in the First International Conference on Critical Management Studies, University of Manchester, July 14-16, 1999
- Weick, K. (2007). Drop your tools: On reconfiguring management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 31(1), 5-16
- Willmott, H. (1993). Strength is Ignorance; Slavery is Freedom: Managing Culture in Modern Organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4), 515-553.
- Willmott, H. (1997). Critical management learning. In J. Burgoyne & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Management learning: Integrating perspectives in theory and practice* (pp. 161-176). London: Sage.
- Willmott, H. (1998). Re-cognising the other: Reflections on a new sensibility in social and organizational studies. In R. Chia (Eds.), *In the realm of organization: Essays for Robert Cooper*. London: Routledge.
- Willmott, H. (2003). Organization theory as a critical science? Forms of analysis and 'new organizational forms'. In H. Tsoukas & C. Knudsen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organization theory* (pp: 88-112). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willmott, H. (2005). Theorizing contemporary control: Some poststructuralist responses to some critical realist questions. *Organization*, 12(5), 747-780.
- Willmott, H., & Knights, D. (1989). Power and subjectivity at work: From degradation to subjugation in social relations. *Sociology Review*, 23(4), 535-558.
- Wood, S., & Kelly, J. (1978). Toward a critical management science. *Journal of Management Studies*, 15, 1-24