RESISTANCE TO THE ONE DIMENSIONAL STUDENT: A PROPOSAL FOR AN ACTIVIST PEDAGOGY IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION.

Jason S. LeCoure
Sobey School of Business, Saint Mary's University

This paper examines the possibility of a theoretically defensible activist pedagogy by using the works of Foucault and Marcuse. Critical Realism is proposed as a pedagogical methodology that has the possibility of providing an emancipatory framework which the concerned teacher can use in designing curricula.

"This class, this intelligentsia has been called the new working class. I believe this term is at best premature. They are - and this we should not forget - today the pet beneficiaries of the established system. But they are also at the very source of the glaring contradictions between the liberating capacity of science and its repressive and enslaving use. To activate the repressed and manipulated contradiction, to make it operate as a catalyst of change, that is one of the main tasks of the opposition today. It remains and must remain a political task." - (Marcuse, 1968)

In recent years a great deal has been written on the political and social changes which have occurred in universities and colleges across North America. Primarily this writing has dealt with the rise of post modernism and the advocate faculty which has embraced it after the decline of traditional and Mediterranean Marxism. The charge usually levelled in these works is that the faculty has become rabidly political and is working to convert/subvert the students in their care through indoctrinating them in an anti-capitalist, anti-liberal, anti-Zionist, and perhaps most importantly to the movement's critics - anti-American political worldview. The other common criticism is the rise of the critical studies of race, gender, and sexuality and the power these faculties hold through the use of diversity courses and political correctness. This trend has been identified as a "hostile takeover" of the traditional classical liberal university by politicized evangelical radicals (Kimball, 1990).

The "critics" of this movement continue to this day and recently received great attention by the general public through the media coverage given to the Ward Churchill saga (Johnson, 2005). David Horrowitz's www.frontpagemag.com acts as a self appointed watch-dog and inquisitor of Academic faculty members throughout the united states, in a so-called bid to "protect" Academic Freedom -which mainly consists of denigrating "liberal" academics in the United States (e.g. Felkner, 2005). The Students for Academic Freedom movement led by Harrowitz has been called "Neo-McCarthyism" for the way it attempts to "out" radical activist professors. The organizations website even has a "how-to" kit for what to do if a professor brings up a politicized subject or theory (http://www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org/). In the post 9-11 world, the charge which has been laid most often is that certain professors are pro-Muslim, anti-Israeli and bring this political viewpoint into the classroom where they "intimidate" students who do not

share their views. This criticism of the University from mainstream and conservative critics is hardly a new phenomenon, previous incarnations have included attacks on the Marxism of university faculty, and the trend of political correctness in the late 80's and early 90s.

The purpose of this paper is not to bring attention to the current resistance - to the perhaps fait-accompli takeover of the liberal arts university - by conservative journalists and critics. Rather it is to highlight the fact that in the business and management schools this movement has been largely held at bay by the ideology of the business school as a servant to the corporate and managerialist paradigm – a position that has long been advocated by traditional management researchers (Koontz, 1980). In a review of several of the key texts which have criticized the post-modern and post-marxist takeover of places of higher learning business schools have the – in this author's mind – dubious distinction of not meriting mention (Bromwich, 1992; D'Souza, 1992; Gross & Levitt, 1998; Hollander, 2002; Kimball, 1990; Kors & Silverglate, 1999). The fundamental purpose of this paper is threefold: 1) to discuss why the critical theorists have not had the impact on business schools that they seem to have had on other humanities schools, 2) What justification do academics have for resistance, and if one exists, in what direction should this resistance be implemented, and 3) What pedagogical approach would allow concerned critical academics to agitate for social change.

I attempt to accomplish this with a discussion of the 1962 Management conference at the University of California and the ensuing "Symantic Jungle", and the attempted inroad of critical scholarship in the "paradigm wars". Alongside this will be interwoven an examination of Herbert Marcuse's justification of political agency as a responsibility of faculty members and discuss both his ideas for pedagogy and emancipation. In an effort to suggest a practical implementation, Critical Realism (Bhaskar, 1978) will be proposed a s a pedagogical tool which has the possibility to embrace Marcuse's requirements for emancipation in education while at the same time providing an analytical framework in which can encompass a wide variety of research methodologies.

Herbert Marcuse – One Dimensional Man

Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979) was an influential figure in critical sociology for much of the previous century. He was one of the first to describe the all encompassing hegemony of the modern capitalist project (Marcuse, 1991) and how the positive aspects of the enlightenment and liberal thought had been co-opted by the dominant regime. Rather than these ideas being libratory, he discussed how they had been wielded by advanced industrial society to create a new form of oppressive, yet invisible, tyranny. "The rights and liberties which were such vital factors in the origins and earlier stages of industrial society yield to a higher stage of this society: they are losing their traditional rationale and content…Once institutionalized, these rights and liberties shared the fate of the society of which they had become an integral part. The achievement cancels the premises." (Marcuse, 1991, pg 1). In particular relevance to academics engaged with the study of business Marcuse points out that the discussion of alternatives takes place within the status quo (Marcuse, 1991). Alternatives from outside the capitalist framework can be, and have been, included within this framework thus drastically reducing the range of emancipatory options available "With respect to the institutionalized forms of life, science (pure as well as applied) would thus have a stabilizing, static, conservative function. Even its most

revolutionary achievements would only be construction and destruction in line with a specific experience and organization of reality." (Marcuse, 1991, pg 165). This is a similar proposition to that stated by Michel Foucault, that all acts of resistance, no matter how radical, will become an incorporated part of the dominant system (Foucault & Kritzman, 1988a). Where they differ is that Marcuse firmly believed that essential change could be made to the system while Foucault had no belief in the idea of historical progress (ibid).

It seems that business schools (and their client corporations) have been rather successful at illustrating Marcuse's analysis. Consider the recent impacts of the tech bubble burst and the collapse of Enron. While critical scholars were quick to point out that both are inherent to capitalism, the conversation was muted by the deluge of outpourings by mainstream academics, journalists, professional bodies and other interested associations that shifted the conversation away from large scale structural critique to weaknesses in particular areas within the overarching capitalistic structures.

What this internal self-examination has facilitated has been a strident within-paradigm critique that comfortably ignores the difficult questions of social organization and focuses instead on the improving the environmental and ethical efficiency of corporations and businesspeople. Examples of this within paradigm critique include stakeholder rights, triple bottom line accounting, and the incessant call for the establishment of concretized business ethics courses at universities and colleges. As a result, many traditional leftist academics have engaged in this debate from the perspective of improving their interest groups place within the existing social framework (worker's rights, race, gender, environment) in what has been described as the defeat of the left (Hassard, Hogan, & Rowlinson, 2001). They have given up the inevitability of revolution and instead have chosen the ironic and disinterested stance of post modernism that actually seeks to alter current management practices through critique by instilling a perceived benefit for progressive management practices (eg. Balakrishnan, Duvall, & Primeaux, ; Clegg, 1992). This trend of limiting of choice of critique (Hassard et al., 2001) echoes a relevant warning from Marcuse "The range of choice open to the individual is not the decisive factor in determining the degree of human freedom, but *what* can be chosen and what is chosen by the individual." (Marcuse, 1991, pg 7).

What we shall attempt next is to examine why, in the case of business education, this closure of alternatives has had the resilience that we have not seen in other schools of the university. This closure exists despite several influential works which have endeavoured to expand the dialog so that alternative views would have an effective space in which to enable change (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Clegg & Dunkerley, 1980). Management theory developed as a school in reflex to the institutional and social changes brought about by mass industrialization and coalesced in the post-war period. The process of managing and the reforms of business took place prior to the awakening of academics that this was a "science" that could be studied and academic thought had little impact on the processes as they developed. As such, the study of management began as taking the world as is and focused on determining which practices were most efficient (Koontz, 1961).

This view was concretized during the 1962 conference at the University of California in which the goal was made to unify the management paradigm and determine the "proper" way in which

the science of management could be advanced (Koontz & University of California Berkeley. Graduate School of Business Administration., 1964) and played a large role in the future development of thought in management theory (Wren, 1994). In North America then, the study of management from its organized inception as a discipline was driven primarily to be interested in functional expertise which could (or rather ought) be used to form predictive theory for the application of practicing managers (Koontz, 1961). The success of behavioural, systems, and management scientists during the second world war (Rose, 1975) led to a tacit support of this approach by government and other funding agencies during the cold war period (Robin, 2001). As a result, management academics have been burdened by both powerful peer-group and structural forces which limit the appropriate areas of inquiry. An examination of the top 20 business journals (Starbuck, 2002) reveals that in North America, this approach has remained the dominant regime and continues to limit the research and academic pursuits of scholars engaged in the study of management, partially through the tenure and performance requirements inherent in a career in academia. Under this monolithic discourse there "…emerges a pattern of *one-dimensional thought and behavior* in which ideas, aspirations, and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe." (Marcuse, 1991, pg 12). Even areas of research that appear to be a concern with worker's interests often have managerial goals in heart (Nord, 1977). In this paradigm the social position of each person is governed by "…objective qualities and laws" that appear as "calculable manifestations" of demographic and cultural determents rather than as symptoms of oppression (Marcuse, 1991, pg 168).

Does this then mean that no true radical critique is taking place? Not at all, indeed there are many fine scholars working in management who have proposed a wide array of techniques used to examine the world. The problem is more that we as academics in management research are directly engaged with the examination of the machinery which defines the times we live in. As of today, critical management theory has either lost, or never had the ability to drastically transform the way the business school pursues its agenda. The existing frames of resistance such as activism and protest no longer serve their desired ends: "But such modes of protest and transcendence are no longer contradictory to the status quo and no longer negative. They are rather the ceremonial part of practical behaviourism, its harmless negation, and are quickly digested by the status quo as part of its healthy diet" (Marcuse, 1991, pg 14) . At this stage in business schools, critical management scholars are tolerated, and as such, this toleration leads to an empty echo chamber in which one can make much noise to no effect on the dominant paradigm. Through toleration the critic can be brought into the dialogue but rendered powerless: "Your tolerance is deceptive. In reserving for me a special niche of meaning and significance, you grant me exemption from sanity and reason, but in my view, the madhouse is somewhere else." (Marcuse, 1991, pg 192). In order for alternative paradigms to be effective they must be privileged in the dialog and not simply tolerated as experiments in utopian idealism (Marcuse, 1969).

The business school is a key player in the training and recreation of the technicians of capitalism and the system at large. In such a situation the educational system acts as a subsidy for corporate interests (Toffler, 1980). Consider the trend in business education that closely ties corporate interest (and sponsorship) to the business school. In the rush to provide the technical skills demanded by business interests through the client centered model these same universities have

developed a monolithic functionalist pedagogy that prepares students to succeed as unquestioning, docile, highly paid servants (Langbert, 2003). The major challenge to concerned critics of the dominant paradigm in management theory is to form a basis for resistance that maintains the goal of emancipation but is intellectually defensible in light of the end of certainty brought about by post-modernism and post-structuralism. Academics play an active role and have an obligation to be agents of resistance and change and must take accountability for the success or failures these efforts: "In a society that often looks toward intellectuals to set the critical thinking agenda and to spur social change, organizational scholars, especially those who identify themselves as critical or radical theorists, need to examine their role in the academy and their responsibility as agents of social transformation." (Mir & Mir, 2002).

Michel Foucault – The Technologies of the Self

One possible source for such a defence is the late work of Michel Foucault as he explored the concept of The Technologies of the Self in a series of lectures and seminars given prior to his demise (Foucault, Martin, Gutman, & Hutton, 1988b). The purpose of the technologies of the self were to examine the history of how an individual acts upon themselves to effect some change on themselves and the interaction between oneself and others (Brewis, 2004; Foucault, 1988). He did this through the analysis of the techniques used by ancient philosophies of self-improvement in Greece, Roman stoicism, and the early Catholic traditions. Of particular importance for this discussion is the concept that none of the ethical practices discussed were thought, at the time, to be universally applicable to all and were utilized by only a small portion of the population (Foucault et al., 1988a). This is a sharp contrast to the traditional Marxist belief in the inevitability of a working class revolution which would represent the end point and purpose of material progress (Marx & Engels, 1986). In the technologies of the self the choice of ethical practice was voluntary and "Morality was a matter of individual choice." (Foucault et al., 1988a, p.245). The technologies of the self provide an interesting counterpart to Foucault's works on the other technologies by suggesting that individuals can overcome the burden of the dominant framework of disciplinary power and achieve their own goals and desires through a function of "self-discipline and self-knowledge" of their own design (McKinlay & Starkey, 1997).

Foucault argues that in the modern era, philosophy has focused almost exclusively on the maxim "know thyself" while forgetting that at the time the maxim was coined it was also fundamentally associated with (and subordinated to) taking care of ones-self (Foucault, 1988). This echoes the belief of Marcuse who stated that in the modern one-dimensional philosophies theory no longer implied an "ought" but rather limited itself to an examination of what "is" (Marcuse, 1991). The practices of the Technologies of the Self are directed toward the concept of taking care of one's self as opposed to adopting morality imposed or reinforced by political and social systems. This is a practical system of ethical concern wherein one's ethics are always in reference to the particular culture of the group who come together with shared modes of thinking (McKinlay et al., 1997). It should be realized that it is not the practice itself that is good or bad but rather the direction to which it is put which determines the ethical value (Markula, 2003). Foucault is unwilling to give us specific direction on what types of activities would be best pursued by the inhabitants of post-modernity and it has been pointed out, any technology can be dominating or liberating depend upon its use and purpose (Burkitt, 2002). Thus if we are willing to work with

the technologies of the self it allows the concerned pedagogue to find a space for creation of resistance that recognizes that "Mass production and mass distribution claim the *entire* individual, and industrial psychology has long since ceased to be confined to the factory." (Marcuse, 1991, pg 10) and that fundamental change from within the status-quo is impossible.

Now that the rationale behind the need and possibility for an effective pedagogical space for critical scholars has been examined, we now turn to examining what type of educational approach can effectively allow critical management research to privileged. Mir & Mir (2002) proposed a framework that outlined what questions critical scholars in management studies ought to be asking. This framework outlined several approaches that welcomed both experiential research and structural research. A slightly adapted version appears in Figure 1 below and I propose that the framework represents a possible practical approach to teaching that has the potential to awaken scepticism to the status-quo in students and facilitate "critical thinking" in both senses of the word.

Figure 1:

Proposed requirements for an alternative pedagogical approach
Adapted from (Mir et al., 2002).

Experiential	Structural
•What is it like to work for organizations? •What is the spectrum of experience faced by the various constituencies who work for organizations? •What are the mechanisms by which one type of work is more highly valued than another? •Who gets the "better" kind of work and Why?	•How do different organizations relate to one another? •How are different economies different from each other? •Is there a way in which we can evaluate a economy or system and determine if it is better or worse than another?
•What effects do organizations have on the lives of people? •Who benefits from organizational "performance"? •Who is adversely affected? •How do those disadvantaged by organizational practices respond? •How are their responses theorized?	•Which regulatory institutions form the supporting frameworks for organizations? •How have they transformed the relationships between organizations and various elements of society? •What are the linkages between these institutions and organizations?

Critical Realism

One of the most interesting alternatives to postmodernism that have arisen in recent years is that of Critical Realism. This modern incarnation of realism is a descendant of both the early realist programmes and the Marxist tradition. Critical realism strives to understand the world of through general concepts while taking the particular into account (Layder, 1990). Critical Realism has been proposed by its advocates as the successor (Lopez & Potter, 2001) to what has been described as the nihilistic complacency of the theoretical cul de sac that is the post-modern movement (Bulavka & Buzgalin, 2004). One of the key strengths of the critical realist paradigm is its recognition that every analysis is laden with ideology, methodology and epistemology, all of which are "tools" used in the seeking of a truth, be it the functionalist's universal or the post modernists particular. Even the basic assumption of critical theory of reducing human suffering (Jay, 1973) has an impact on the approach used. What we are left with are "maps of maps" and "ways of knowing about ways of knowing about the world" (Scollon, 2003). This realization is of consequence to both the empirical and constructivist programmes.

Critical Realism is also strengthened by recognition of the dualistic nature of reality. Fundamental to the approach is the idea is that the world can not be explained by purely constructivist nor structuralist approaches. It recognizes that the person does indeed enter a pre-existing reality largely governed by existing social structures (or cultures) that have a large impact on individual agency. As an example Bhaskar wrote "People do not marry to reproduce the nuclear family or work to reproduce the capitalist economy. Yet it is nevertheless the unintended consequence (and inexorable result) of, as it is also a necessary condition for, their activity." (1978, pg 44.). However, it also recognizes that individual (or groups) can have an impact on the existing social structure (Bhaskar, 1978). It grasps the uncomfortable position between determinism and agency and proposes methodological approaches which attempt to examine a phenomenon from a position that recognizes both viewpoints in its analytical dualism (Carter, 2000). As such, unlike postmodernism the critical realist approach can be used to advocate social transformation from a position of strength and reason as opposed to a position of irony and play.

The major keys tenants of critical realism can be summarized for the purposes of this paper in a few brief statements. The world exists independent of human knowledge. Knowledge is fallible and theory laden. The world is differentiated and stratified and not amenable to conflationist or reductionist approaches. Knowledge production does not occur as a wholly linear process. Objects are "real" in the sense that they have causal power whether natural or social. Social phenomenons are concept dependant. Science is a social practice. Social science must be critical (Sayer, 1992). The last point is the most interesting for the purposes of this paper: social science must be critical. The reason for this is that only through a critical analysis can you represent the multiple relationships been the causal object and the interconnected subjects. There must be a critique and falsification of the "common sense" or dominant dialog. Previous attempts to justify a critical stance failed to recognize that: "*The relationship between causal powers or mechanisms and their effects is therefore not fixed, but contingent;...*" (Archer, 1989,pg. 107). In other words, while the causal power of tendencies may be real, the lack of the exercise of this power does not mean the theory is wrong.

As can be seen from the preceding discussion, Critical Realism has the capacity to address both the structural and experiential components of the curricula proposed in Figure 1. As such, it is in this author's judgement, a prospective pedagogical approach that should be seriously considered by concerned business and management academics. It is vital that we not only be able to critique the status-quo but also be able to present a framework by which progress towards emancipation is possible.

The Critical Realist project is an epistemological project not a theory driven project. The goal is to determine which theories have the most explanatory power. This is in contrast to the post-modern model in which all utterances are equal and the functionalist model which is concerned most with internal validity and prediction. Since by using the critical realist epistemology one can weigh and judge theories based upon their explanatory power the pedagogue now has a way in which to teach to their students – and have an intellectual position in which to defend their claims. In Critical realism one is more interested in "…discovering generatively causal mechanisms as opposed to correlationally causal 'events'." (Sayer, 1992, pg 67).

Concluding Discussion

In the beginning of this paper we described the outcry of conservative critics and scholars of the left-ward march of institutions of higher education. It was noted that for the most part business schools have been immune to the scathing indictments found in the key works of this genre. Despite several important works which have argued for a more critical approach to the examination of business and management, the functionalist pro-capitalist dialog has continued to remain dominant. A very brief historical examination was presented to show some of the structural and norming processes inherent in the business school environment in an effort to explain why academics in business schools have not been as effective as their peers in other programs in reshaping the content of their course work and research. Using the work of Herbert Marcuse, primarily his essay One Dimensional Man (1991), a discussion ensued on the mechanisms by which this regime was all-encompassing and coercive by limiting the available choices for dialog through creating a weak and impotent space for critical researchers through toleration. Subsequently a need for a capacity for critical scholars and professors to resist (due to the defeat of the left and the loss of Marxist certainty) the status-quo was identified.

Ironically, the late works of Michel Foucault were used to identify the justification and possibility for resistance through the creation of personal ethical self-care. After showing the possibility of resistance the discussion turned to what an effective critical pedagogy could look like. Critical Realism has been proposed as an approach which recognizes both the structural determinants of society while recognizing the impact agency can have on said structure. By using a Critical Realist approach a professor can help students achieve an understanding of the powerful institutional, governmental and social oppressive components of advanced industrial capitalism. Through the inclusive methodological nature of Critical Realism a wide variety of theoretical lenses can be used to examine contemporary society as it pertains to the study of business management while avoiding the uncertainty and impenetrability of post-modern driven theory.

More work is needed to be done on what a Critical Realist business curriculum would look like in practice. Such a curriculum however would answer the Marcusian call to privilege critical or leftist approaches over the dominant functionalist paradigm by exposing the limitations and assumptions inherent in this approach and more importantly, it is able to identify and promote possible solutions. If all critical scholars in business schools can do is continue to snipe from the post-modern paradigm without showing paths to a possible reprieve from oppression we will continue to be the "pet beneficiaries" (Marcuse, 1968) of modern industrial life. A more strident approach to critical management is necessary if we are also to work for a better world.

References

Balakrishnan, U., Duvall, T., & Primeaux, P. Rewriting the bases of capitalism: Reflexive modernity and ecological sustainability as the foundations of a new normative framework. Journal of Business Ethics, 47(4): 299.

Bhaskar, R. 1978. A realist theory of science. Hassocks, Sussex

Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Harvester Press ;

Humanities Press.

Brewis, J. 2004. Refusing to be `me'. In R. Thomas & A. J. Mills & J. Helms Mills (Eds.), Identity Politics at Work. Resisting Gender, Gendering Resistance: 23-39. London: Routledge.

Bromwich, D. 1992. Politics by other means : higher education and group thinking. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bulavka, L. A. & Buzgalin, A. V. 2004. The Dialectics of Dialogue Versus the Metaphysics of Postmodernism., Russian Studies in Philosophy, Vol. 43: 62-82: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Burkitt, I. 2002. Technologies of the Self: Habitus and Capacities., Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, Vol. 32: 219: Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. 1979. Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis : elements of the sociology of corporate life. London: Heinemann.

Carter, B. 2000. Realism and racism : concepts of race in sociological research. London ; New York: Routledge.

Clegg, S. & Dunkerley, D. 1980. Organization, class and control. London ; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Clegg, S. R. 1992. Postmodern management? Journal of Organizational Change Management, 5(2): 31.

D'Souza, D. 1992. Illiberal education : the politics of race and sex on campus (1st Vintage Books ed.). New York: Vintage Books.

Felkner, B.; Re-Education in Rhode Island; http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=17862.

Foucault, M. 1988. Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin & H. Gutman & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), Technologies of the self : a seminar with Michel Foucault: 166 p. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Foucault, M. & Kritzman, L. D. 1988a. Politics, philosophy, culture : interviews and other writings, 1977-1984. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M., Martin, L. H., Gutman, H., & Hutton, P. H. 1988b. Technologies of the self : a seminar with Michel Foucault. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Gross, P. R. & Levitt, N. 1998. Higher superstition : the academic left and its quarrels with science (Johns Hopkins Paperbacks ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hassard, J., Hogan, J., & Rowlinson, M. 2001. From Labour Process Theory to Critical Management Studies, Administrative Theory & Praxis, Vol. 23: 339-362: University of Nebraska at Omaha, School of Public Administration.

Hollander, P. 2002. Discontents : postmodern and postcommunist. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Jay, M. 1973. The dialectical imagination; a history of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950 ([1st ed.). Boston,: Little.

Johnson, K. 2005. University Changes Its Focus In Investigation of Professor, New York Times, Late Edition ed.: 9. New York.

Kimball, R. 1990. Tenured radicals : how politics has corrupted our higher education (1st ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Koontz, H. 1961. The management theory jungle. Academy of Management Journal (pre-1986), 4(000003): 174.

Koontz, H. & University of California Berkeley. Graduate School of Business Administration. 1964. Toward a unified theory of management; a symposium held at the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles, November 8 and 9, 1962. New York,: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Koontz, H. 1980. The Management Theory Jungle Revisited. Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review, 5(2): 175.

Kors, A. C. & Silverglate, H. A. 1999. The shadow university : the betrayal of liberty on America's campuses (1st ed.). New York: HarperPerennial.

Langbert, M. 2003. PC and the Fast-Food Model for Teaching., Academic Questions, Vol. 16: 70-78: Transaction Publishers.

Layder, D. 1990. The realist image in social science. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lopez, J. & Potter, G. 2001. After Postmodernism: An introduction to critical realism. New York: The Athlone Press.

Marcuse, H. 1968. Liberation from the Affluent Society. In D. G. Cooper (Ed.), The dialectics of liberation; edited: 207 p. Harmondsworth,: Penguin.

Marcuse, H. 1969. Repressive Tolerance. Boston,: Beacon Press.

Marcuse, H. 1991. One-dimensional man : studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society. Boston: Beacon Press.

Markula, P. 2003. The Technologies of the Self: Sport, Feminism, and Foucault., Sociology of Sport Journal, Vol. 20: 87-107: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. 1986. The Communist Manifesto. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.

McKinlay, A. & Starkey, K. 1997. Afterword: Deconstructing Organization - Discipline and Desire. In A. McKinlay & K. Starkey (Eds.), Foucault, management and organization theory : from panopticon to technologies of self: p. 230-241. London ; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mir, R. & Mir, A. 2002. The organizational imagination: From paradigm wars to Praxis. Organizational Research Methods, 5(1): 105.

Nord, W. R. 1977. Job Satisfaction Reconsidered. American Psychologist, 32(12).

Robin, R. T. 2001. The making of the Cold War enemy : culture and politics in the military-intellectual complex. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Rose, M. 1975. Industrial behaviour : theoretical development since Taylor. London: Allen Lane.

Sayer, R. A. 1992. Method in social science : a realist approach (2nd ed.). London ; New York: Routledge.

Scollon, R. 2003. The Dialogist in a Positivist World: Theory in the Social Sciences and the Humanities at the End of the Twentieth Century., Social Semiotics, Vol. 13: 71-88: Carfax Publishing Company.

Starbuck, W.; Journals Ranked by Citations per Article; http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~wstarbuc/cites.htm.

Toffler, A. 1980. The third wave (1st ed.). New York: Morrow.

Wren, D. A. 1994. The evolution of management thought (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley.