Critical Approaches

After Reading This Chapter, You Should …

- Understand the distinctions between a critical approach & other approaches we have thus far considered.
- Appreciate the centrality of "power" to the critical approach and be able to describe how power is represented through the modes and means of production and through organizational discourse.
- Be familiar with the critical concepts of "ideology," "hegemony," "emancipation," and "resistance" and be able to describe how these concepts fit together for critical theorists.
- Be able to describe how feminist approaches to organizational communication and the theory of concertive control represent important concepts to critical scholars.
- Understand deconstruction as a critical method and how critical activism requires particular "modes of being" in the world.

We have gone down a long road in the last four chapters in learning about various approaches to the study of organizational communication. We began with classical approaches that conceptualize organizations as machines and emphasize rationality and efficiency. We next considered human relations and human resources approaches, which, respectively, emphasize the needs of employees and the contributions those employees could make to organizational functioning. We then looked at two relatively contemporary approaches to organizational communication, conceptualizing organizations first as systems and then as cultures. As we traveled along this road, we highlighted the differences among these approaches. Indeed, these approaches to organizational study are quite distinct. However, common threads underlie all of them.

The first of these underlying threads involves the "political" frame of reference used to understand the organization. Burrell and Morgan (1979) distinguish among unitary, pluralist, and radical frames of reference. In the unitary frame of reference, emphasis is placed on common organizational goals. Conflict is seen as rare and negative, and power is the natural prerogative of management. In the pluralist frame of reference, the organization consists of many groups with divergent interests. Conflict is seen positively, as "an inherent and ineradicable characteristic of organizational affairs" (Morgan, 1997: 202). Finally, in the radical frame of reference, the organization is viewed "as a battleground where rival forces (e.g., management and unions) strive for the achievement

of largely incompatible ends" (Morgan, 1997: 202). Conflict and power are seen as reflections of larger class struggles in society.

The approaches to organizational communication we have considered so far have utilized unitary or pluralist frames of reference. For example, classical approaches clearly adopt a unitary frame of reference. This is true to a lesser extent of human relations and human resources approaches. Systems and cultural approaches tend to take pluralist approaches by considering the management of divergent subgroup interests. None of the approaches we have looked at so far, however, have used the radical frame of reference to understand organizational communication processes. A second underlying thread involves the role of the theorist in approaching organizational life. For classical, human relations, and human resources approaches, the role of the theorist is typically one of finding effective techniques for organizing. For systems and cultural scholars, the role of the theorist is to understand or explain organizational communication phenomena. Of course, this understanding/explanation can take very different forms, depending on the approach. The systems theorist aims for an objective explanation of causal relationships, whereas the cultural theorist attempts to gain a subjective understanding of the organization from the viewpoint of an insider. Both of these theorists, though, would balk at stepping in and attempting to change the organization in their role as theorist. As Bernstein (1976) notes, "while the theorist may be passionately interested in the fate and quality of social and political life, he must bracket this practical interest in his pursuit of theory" (p. 173).

The approaches we consider in this chapter take a turn away from these commonalities. Specifically, critical approaches adopt a radical frame of reference by considering organizations as sites of domination. Furthermore, these approaches see theory as a force that can emancipate individuals from these dominating organizational forces or consider how employees resist organizational dominance. Thus, the theorist takes an activist role in instigating and encouraging organizational transformation. We first look at historical and contemporary framing assumptions that are used by most critical theorists. Next, we consider two specific approaches to critical theory—concertive control and feminist theory—that have been widely used in the field of organizational communication. We then survey the analytical techniques often used by critical scholars.

Critical Approaches

Although the roots of critical scholarship can be traced to a variety of influential thinkers, including Georg Hegel and Max Weber (see Miller, 2005, for review), some of the most important roots of critical theory in organizational communication can be found in the work of Karl Marx. Marx, a German intellectual who lived in the nineteenth century, examined the relationship between owners and workers in a capitalist society and theorized that there was an inherent imbalance in this relationship and that eventually workers would rise up in revolt against the capitalist system. Marx believed that "critique" would lead to revolution because it would reveal fundamental truths about the human social condition. He noted that "what we have to accomplish at this time is all the clearer: relentless criticism of all existing conditions, relentless in the sense that the criticism is not afraid of its findings and just as little afraid of the conflict with the powers that be" (Marx, 1967: 212).

Marx's political influence has been, of course, widespread. Theoretically, his thoughts have also shaped the work of theorists taking a "critical" approach to social research. Perhaps the most widely known of these are researchers from the Frankfurt school of critical theory. Scholars aligned with the Frankfurt school (including Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and Jurgen Habermas, among others) pursued social and political critiques that would lead to "the development of normative alternatives which might enable humans to transcend their unhappy situation through critical thought and action" (Huspek, 1997: 266).

It would be impossible to provide a thorough review of the various strands of critical theory (see Alvesson & Deetz, 1996; Morrow, 1994; Mumby, 2000). At the risk of oversimplifying, however, critical theorists tend to agree on the following: First, critical theorists believe that certain societal structures and processes lead to fundamental imbalances of power. Second, these imbalances of power lead to alienation and oppression for certain social classes and groups. Third, the role of the critical theorist is to explore and uncover these imbalances and bring them to the attention of the oppressed group. Emancipation is then possible, either through direct political action, individual resistance, or awareness of the oppressed individuals.

In the next few sections of this chapter, we will "unpack" this explanation of critical theory by considering several key concepts. First, we look at power and how power can be seen as residing in the social structures and processes that make up organizational life. Second, we look at the impact of these power relationships by considering the related concepts of ideology and hegemony. Third, we examine the concept of emancipation within critical theories of organizational communication. Finally, we consider ways in which processes of resistance often work against the dominance of the powerful in the workplace.

The Pervasiveness of Power

No concept is as important as power for the critical theorist. As Mumby (2001: 585) argues, critical theorists see power as "a defining, ubiquitous feature of organizational life". The concept of power is typically equated with the related constructs of control and domination (Pierce & Dougherty, 2002), and these ideas are central to all critical theories. In exploring the concept of power, it is useful to examine three approaches to the topic outlined by Conrad and Ryan (1985). The traditional approach considers power to be a relatively stable entity that people or groups possess. Researchers adopting a traditional approach ask questions about the factors that lead to organizational power and the impact of power on outcomes such as job satisfaction and performance. These scholars often equate power with control over resources or with hierarchical status in the organization (Hardy & Clegg, 1996). The symbological approach (see also Mumby, 2001, for related discussion of the interpretive approach) views power as a product of communicative interactions and relationships. Researchers taking this approach are interested in how communication constitutes understandings of power through socially constructed organizational relationships (Mumby, 2001: 594). In reference to the approaches we have thus far discussed in this textbook, the traditional approach to power would be adopted by classical and human relations theorists, whereas the symbological approach would be adopted by cultural theorists.

The third approach to power—the radical-critical approach—is most germane to the theorists considered in this chapter. In this approach, the theorist is concerned with the

"deep structures" that produce and reproduce relationships in organizational life. Furthermore, these theorists contend that there are inherent contradictions between the "surface structure" and the "deep structure" of power that must be explored. The role of the radical-critical theorist, then, is to explore the ways in which economic, social, and communicative relationships produce and maintain organizational power relationships. What, precisely, are the structures that serve to shape power relationships in the organization? Morgan (1997) explored fourteen sources of power within the organizational setting, as presented below:

Sources of Power in Organizations

The following are among the most important sources of power:

- Formal authority
- Control of scarce resources
- Use of organizational structure, rules, and regulations
- Control of decision processes
- Control of knowledge and information
- Control of boundaries
- Ability to cope with uncertainty
- Control of technology
- Interpersonal alliances, networks, and control of "informal organization"
- Control of counter organizations
- Symbolism and the management of meaning
- Gender and the management of gender relationships
- Structural factors that define the stage of action
- The power one already has

These sources of power provide organizational members with a variety of means for enhancing their interests and resolving or perpetuating organizational conflict.

Used by permission of Sage Publications, Inc., from Morgan, G., Images of Organization (1986): 159.

The above presents just a sampling of the sources of power in the organization; others could probably be added. As Hardy and Clegg (1996) note, "All resource lists are infinite, however, since different phenomena become resources in different contexts" (p. 626).

This table is instructive, though, in pointing out the wide range of power sources that can be drawn on in the organization. Some of these sources of power are relatively overt and tend to be the focus of traditional theorists. These include, for example, formal authority, control of scarce resources, and control of knowledge and information. Other sources of power, however, are less obvious to the casual observer; these covert and unobtrusive forms of power in organizations tend to be the focus of critical theorists. We will now consider two sources of power in more detail. The first of these—control of modes and means of production—is associated most clearly with the Marxist tradition of critical theory. The second—control of organizational discourse—highlights concerns most typically associated with critical theorists in the communication discipline.

Control of Modes and Means of Production

Classic Marxist theory examines the ways in which capitalist owners have control over the modes and means of production in the workplace (see Clegg & Dunkerley, 1980). The modes and means of production constitute the substructure of society—its economic and production base. The term modes of production refer to the economic conditions that underlie the production process. For example, Marx argues that the capitalist mode of production is based on owners expropriating surplus labor from workers. However, owners and workers in a capitalist system are not necessarily aware of this process. As Deetz and Mumby (1990) explain:

> To Marx, the surplus value of labor was hidden from both workers and capitalists. The capitalist would understand the realization of profit as coming from the investment in the plant and equipment, with the amount of profit determined by market conditions rather than by unpaid labor. The worker being paid a wage would not be in a position to determine the portion of the value of the product that was a result of his or her labor and hence could not recognize unpaid labor (p. 20).

These hidden imbalances, then, create conflict between workers and owners. According to Marxist theory, the continuing existence of this conflict (the thesis in the material dialectic model of Hegel and Marx) would lead to the revolt of the working class (antithesis) and a transformation of the economic system (synthesis).

The term means of production refers to actual work processes—how products are made and services rendered. According to Deetz and Mumby (1990), "In Marx's view, industrialization brought with it dehumanization and alienation from work and work products … the division of labor, the treatment of labor as a commodity, and the separation of the individual from his or her product produced a fragmented, lost person, estranged from his or her own production activities" (p. 20). This controlling aspect of means of production has been further elaborated by Braverman (1974), who argues that as the workplace becomes more technologically sophisticated, workers become "deskilled" and alienated from their work. For example, assembly-line production leads to highly specialized, fragmented, and monotonous jobs. Retail and service jobs often involve repeating the same simple tasks over and over again. Office work often has similar characteristics, as computer software programs often break down jobs and take autonomy and freedom away from individuals. Telemarketers are provided specialized scripts they must follow, and data-entry workers can have their jobs broken down to the individual keystroke.

But what is the outcome of this monotonous and fragmented work? Surber (1998: 77) explains: "Anyone who has worked for an hourly wage at some repetitive and mechanical task will realize not only how one's own physical activity can come to appear alien but also how easily she or he can be replaced by another person willing to do the same work". In short, when owners and managers have control over workplace processes and technologies (the means of production), critical theorists believe the result will be an alienated and oppressed workforce. Alienation can occur through the repetitive and boring jobs created by technology; oppression can occur as workers are replaced or limited in advancement by robotics or other technical achievements. Furthermore, the mechanization of the workplace allows management to constantly monitor the behavior of workers. Think, for instance, of how many times you hear the phrase "this call may be monitored for quality-control purposes" when calling an organization for sales or service help. This kind of surveillance is one more example of how management maintains its domination over employees (see D'Urso, 2006, in Chapter 2's "Spotlight on Scholarship").

Control of Organizational Discourse

Critical scholars in the communication field argue that power relationships are produced and reproduced through organizational discourse (Mumby, 1988, 1993). Like cultural researchers, these scholars believe that organizational reality is socially constructed through communicative interaction.

However, critical researchers go further, suggesting that the reality created through discourse is the site of domination. Mumby (1989), for instance, plays off Geertz's (1973) definition of culture as "webs of significance". Mumby (1989) comments:

> If we extend Geertz's own web metaphor a little further it might be suggested how power relations are fundamentally structured into all social relations. After all, a spider's web is not simply an intricately constructed and beautiful product of nature; it is itself a site of struggle. The very existence of the web structures and instantiates a particular kind of power relationship between the spider and its prey (p. 292).

There are a number of ways in which organizational discourse can be seen as creating and recreating power structures in the workplace. For example, the use in our culture of particular phrases to describe work can be seen as reinforcing dominant power structures. Clair (1996) examined the ways in which the phrase "real job" (as in "when are you going to get a real job?") serves a political function within the organization by implying that the kind of jobs held by college students (e.g., waiting tables, retail clerking) are not as important as other types of employment. Thus, this phrase—and the meanings that surround it—serves to define power relationships in the workplace.

Mumby (1987, 1993) extends this view by looking at how organizational narratives (i.e., stories) can function in power-laden ways in the organization. Mumby (1987) argues that "narratives provide members with accounts of organizing. Such accounts potentially legitimate dominant forms of organizational reality and lead to discursive closure in the sense of restricting the interpretations and meanings that can be attached to organizational activity" (p. 113). Thus, the stories people tell make sense of the organization in a way that often supports the dominant organizational coalition. Mumby (1987), for example, analyzes a famous, oft-told IBM story in which a lowly security worker refuses to let the company president into a restricted area without the proper identification.

Mumby argues that although this story is held up as showing the strength of the "little people," it also serves to strengthen the dominant coalition by highlighting the importance of bureaucratic rules and regulations.

Tompkins and Cheney (1985) make a related point, arguing that decision premises serve as a source of unobtrusive control in organizational life. Like narratives, the options available to a decision-maker serve to restrict choice and provide an interpretation for organizational activity. For example, if decisions are always made with the bottom line as the criterion for a quality decision, any decision made will serve to support the dominant coalition in the organization.

Finally, Zoller (2003) argues that entire industries can be influenced by the discursive constructions found in regulatory materials. She considers the discourse of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), arguing that OSHA standards act to establish control by defining occupational injury and illness in particular ways—ways that support the power of management. For example, Zoller notes that the terms "cumulative stress disorder" and "repetitive strain injuries" are being replaced in OSHA standards by the term "upper extremity musculoskeletal disorder" because the latter term does not imply that the workplace caused the physical problem. Similarly, the term "accident" is used to describe an injury because it does not suggest any culpability on the part of management.

Ideology and Hegemony

In the last section, we explored how the economic structure of the workplace and organizational discourse can serve as instruments of domination and control. Later in this chapter, we will explore some other sources of power, such as identification with the organization and control over gender relationships. But what are the outcomes of these control structures and processes? Critical theorists argue that these processes of control will lead to a shaping of ideology and to hegemony. Let's define these concepts and talk about how they fit into the models of critical theorists.

Ideology refers to "the taken-for-granted assumptions about reality that influence perceptions of situations and events" (Deetz & Kersten, 1983: 162). This definition has

several important facets. First, ideology refers to more than a set of attitudes or beliefs. Rather, ideology "structures our thoughts and controls our interpretations of reality" (Eisenberg & Goodall, 1997: 153). As Therborn (1980: 18) argues, ideology shapes our understanding about what exists, what is good, and what is possible. Second, ideology involves assumptions that are rarely questioned or scrutinized. Deetz and Kersten (1983) provide an example of this in considering our ideological beliefs about organizational structure. As they note, "most people assume that organizational hierarchy is a necessary and useful arrangement. When a person encounters superior-subordinate situations, he or she views them as normal, acceptable, and unproblematic" (p. 162). Third, by shaping our view of the world, an ideology can also influence our behaviors. As Bernstein (1976) observes, "The power of ideologies is related to the way in which they are used to justify and legitimize actions" (p. 108).

For critical theorists, though, ideology is not a neutral concept but is intimately tied to systems of power and domination (Mumby, 1989). This leads us to the concept of hegemony, originally developed by Gramsci (1971). Hegemony refers to a process in which a dominant group leads another group to accept subordination as the norm (Hall, 1985). It is "manufactured consent" (Habermas, 1971) in which employees willingly adopt and reinforce hierarchical power structures. As Mumby (2001: 587) argues, "Hegemony does not refer to simple domination, but rather involves attempts by various groups to articulate meaning systems that are actively taken up by other groups". Hegemonic control is typically accomplished by shaping ideology in such a way that the controlled group accepts and actively participates in the control process. For example, most organizational members accept the legitimacy of rules and may actively participate in formulating them. However, these rules serve as a source of managerial control over organizational members. This is an example of hegemonic control, in which the subjugated group becomes complicit in the control process.

A study of the "Japanese model" of team participation in a U.S. automobile plant provides a telling illustration of hegemony in today's organizations (Graham, 1995). Graham first presents the arguments often presented for team-based management, which is that workers will benefit from increased control on the floor and will be more

satisfied with cooperative workplace relationships. She then argues that worker selection, orientation, and participative processes within these systems often serve as hegemonic devices to control workers. And because the Japanese model often undermines existing union systems and future unionization efforts, workers in these "participative" systems may ultimately have little voice in the workplace. More on this issue will be considered when we discuss "concertive control" later in this chapter.

For the critical theorist, then, social structures and processes allow the dominant class to shape organizational ideology. The result of this ideological monopoly is a hegemonic relationship in which one group is controlled by another through coercion, acceptance, or even active participation. What is to be done about these social imbalances? For critical theorists, the next step is emancipation of the oppressed group. For participants in these organizational structures, the next step might be activities of resistance. These two concepts are discussed next.

Emancipation

The ultimate goal of the critical model is emancipation, or "the liberation of people from unnecessarily restrictive traditions, ideologies, assumptions, power relations, identity formations, and so forth, that inhibit or distort opportunities for autonomy, clarification of genuine needs and wants, and thus greater and lasting satisfaction" (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992: 435). Although some critical theorists in the Marxist tradition advocate overt political action and "bloody revolution" (see Burrell & Morgan, 1979), most see emancipation as a process of emerging awareness and communicative action on the part of the oppressed.

Case in Point: Power of the Pretty

As this chapter points out, there are many sources of power in organizations: formal authority, technology, decision-making, gender, to name just a few. One factor that is rarely mentioned in discussions of organizational power is attractiveness, but appearance clearly has an effect on organizational outcomes. As Dahlia Lithwick (2010) has recently pointed out, the way a person looks influences a wide range of life events: "College students tell surveyors they'd rather have a spouse who is an embezzler, drug user, or a shoplifter than one who is obese. The less attractive you are in America, the more likely you are to receive a longer prison sentence, a lower damage award, a lower salary, and poorer performance reviews" (Lithwick, 2010: 20). Indeed, recent alleged cases of "beauty bias" include Hooters firing servers for being too heavy and Abercrombie & Fitch examining photos of sales associates to check for issues such as weight gain and acne (Lithwick, 2010).

Legal scholar Deborah Rhode believes that such discrimination should be illegal. In her book The Beauty Bias, Rhode makes the case that employment bias toward attractive men and women is widespread and should be banned like discrimination based on sex, age, ethnicity, disability, and religion. Perhaps she is right. But as we examine this argument, we also need to consider the notion of hegemony introduced in this chapter. Clearly, the existence of huge industries supporting cosmetic surgery and beauty treatments suggests that many, if not most, Americans are complicit in valuing beauty more than other characteristics. Or as Lithwick summarizes, "Appearance bias is a massive societal problem with tangible economic costs that most of us—perhaps especially women—perpetuate each time we buy a diet pill…. The law won't stop us from discriminating against the overweight, the aging, and the imperfect, so long as it's the quality we all hate most in ourselves" (Lithwick, 2010: 20).

Habermas (1971) has compared the role of the critical theorist in the emancipation process to the role of the psychoanalyst. A psychoanalyst's job is to help a client break down resistances and gain a deep level of self-understanding. As Bernstein (1976) notes, "The success of therapy ultimately depends not on the analyst's understanding of the patient, but on the extent to which the patient by his own self-reflection can appropriate this analytic understanding and dissolve his own resistances" (p. 201). By analogy, the role of the critical theorist is to reveal the social structures and processes that have led to ideological hegemony. When alienated people are able to consider their condition critically, emancipation will be possible. For organizational communication theorists, then, it is important to find ways that people can participate in free and open communication about power and control in the organizations where they work. In discussing such structures, Deetz (2005: 99) argues that "minimally, forums would be available for discussion and decision making, and no individual or group would be excluded arbitrarily from the opportunity to participate".

The possibility for emancipation is further emphasized in Giddens's (1979) notion of a dialectic of control. Giddens argues that "relations of autonomy and dependence (power relations) are never fixed; that is, subordinates can always exercise some degree of

control over the conditions of hegemonic reproduction" (Stohl & Sotirin, 1990: 65). Consider, for example, Mumby's idea that power relationships are produced and reproduced through the stories that organizational members tell. The current stories in an organization might be serving to support managerial interests in the workplace. However, if workers become aware of this process, they can create their own narratives that can shift the balance of power in the organization.

Resistance

Within critical communication research, the dialectic of control is most clearly illustrated in work on resistance in the workplace. We have talked extensively about how power and control are exercised in organizational settings—the concept of resistance considers how workers can exert counterpressure on this exercise of power and control. Mumby (2005: 21) notes that scholarship in organizational communication has been moving in this direction for a number of years: "While early critical studies focused almost exclusively on organizational processes of control and domination, more recently the pendulum has swung more toward a focus or perhaps even a celebration of—possibilities for employee resistance". However, Mumby argues that these ideas shouldn't be seen in an "either/or" way and are better conceptualized as intimately linked in organizational communication processes. He illustrates this with a Malaysian proverb: "When the great lord passes, the wise peasant bows deeply and silently farts" (Mumby, 2005: 20). Domination (the bow) and resistance (the silent fart) are intimately linked in processes of organizational communication.

Resistance is sometimes seen in collective and organized processes such as unionization, strikes, boycotts, and large-scale social movements. For example, protestors at the World Trade Organization meeting held in Seattle in 1999 are often credited with stopping a multilateral economic agreement that protestors believed was contrary to the interests of workers (Ganesh, Zoller & Cheney, 2005). But organizational communication scholars are more often interested in resistance undertaken by the individual. For example, Murphy (1998) considered ways in which flight attendants would go along with the rules of the airline in public (e.g., serving pilots beverages before

takeoff to avoid dehydration) but communicate their resistance to the rules through the "hidden transcripts" (Scott, 1990) of backstage and ironic forms of communication (e.g., joking with pilots about their "hydration" needs). Bell and Forbes (1994) documented how office workers sometimes decorate their cubicles with cartoons that signal resistance (e.g., cartoons reading "I Have PMS and a Handgun … Any Questions?" or "When I Woke Up This Morning I Had One Nerve Left, Damned If You Ain't Got On It!"). Research from communication scholars' points to the complexity of resistance processes that have sprung from changing organizational forms and evolving technologies. Drawing on theories of gender and resistance, Ashcraft (2005) describes the changing job of commercial airline pilots. Traditionally, the job of an airline captain was one with unquestioned power and control. However, in recent years, there have been industry-wide efforts toward a model of cockpit resource management (CRM) that "endeavors to institutionalize a shift in crew roles, from captain as infallible 'god' to empowering manager and from crew as compliant minions to active, even questioning partners" (Ashcraft, 2005: 77). However, many pilots have resisted this change in their workplace through a process of redefinition. Specifically, the pilots structure these organizational changes as a program they have generously agreed to go along with, maintaining their perceived power and enhancing their perceived sensitivity. Thus, the pilots maintain symbolic power even when sharing control in the cockpit.

Another example of how the contemporary workplace shapes resistance practices is offered by Gossett and Kilker (2006). These researchers considered the new phenomenon of "counter institutional websites" in a study of RadioShackSucks.biz. On this website, many members of the Radio Shack community (employees, past employees, customers) shared their dissatisfaction with Radio Shack management and policies, vented frustrations, and suggested actions that could be used as more active-resistance strategies. For example, posters to the website facetiously suggested things that should "not" be done after quitting a job at the company: "I have decided NOT to remove every price tab in the store on MY last day … nor will I break off the key in the cage padlock" (Gossett & Kilker, 2006: 77). Thus, Internet technology provided a forum for widespread and anonymous organizational resistance.

Employee resistance is not a straightforward and unproblematic process, however. A study of English policemen and women working toward gender equality (Dick, 2008) suggests that this struggle is often a very pragmatic process that involves both acts of resistance and complicity in organizational systems of power. Furthermore, Contu (2008) points out that employees involved in organizational resistance often pay a steep price in their personal and emotional lives.

Two Critical Approaches in Communication

The underlying assumptions of critical approaches provide a view that is both sobering and hopeful. The view is sobering because it highlights the many ways that individuals can be controlled and dominated in organizational settings. The view is hopeful because its ultimate aim is the emancipation of oppressed groups through critical reflection and action and because avenues of resistance are revealed that provide insight into the tension inherent in workplace domination processes. This co-existence of critique and hope also permeates several specific critical approaches that have been used extensively in organizational communication. In this section, we consider two of these approaches: concertive control theory and feminist theories.

A Theory of Concertive Control

In Chapter 3, we noted the increasing prevalence of team-based structures within today's organizations. Following human resources principles, these team-based structures are intended to distribute participation and accountability throughout the organization and facilitate a more "democratic" organizational form. But do teambased organizational structures actually fulfill these democratic ideals? This is the question addressed by an important theory in organizational communication—the theory of concertive control (see Miller, 2005, for a review of the theory). This theory, which originated with the work of James Barker, George Cheney, and Phil Tompkins, attempts to explain how power relationships can be transformed in an era of team-based and

"alternative form" organizations. Three concepts are particularly important to an understanding of this theory: control, identification, and discipline.

Spotlight on Scholarship

Critical approaches to organizational communication point to the power of ideology—deep-seated beliefs about the world and how it should work. For the last fifty years or so, ideological assumptions about men and women in the workplace and the relationship between the public sphere of work and the private sphere of home have been particularly important. A recent study by Sarah J. Tracy and Kendra Dyanne Rivera point to ways in which scripts about men's and women's roles at home and at work have both shifted and remained relatively impervious to change in recent years.

Tracy and Rivera (2010) interviewed thirteen male executives about the relationship between work and home and the roles of men and women in these life spheres. The voices of male executives have rarely been heard in this type of research but are undoubtedly important. As Tracy and Rivera argue, "Because male executive gatekeepers play a pivotal role in shaping organizational policy, culture, and practice, it is important to hear what they have to say" (2010: 4). The men interviewed, aged 30–49, were all married and had children. Seven of them had wives who did not work for pay outside of the home. The researchers analyzed transcripts of the interviews, looking at both what these men said about work and home and how they said it.

This research revealed a number of fascinating findings regarding the ideology of work and home life among male executives. When asked about their abstract attitudes regarding gender equity, respondents noted that work-home balance was an issue for both men and women and that home life should take precedence over work concerns. However, these abstract attitudes were not reflected when these men talked about their own lives and families. Indeed, Tracy and Rivera note that "when we asked participants about their own practices as well as their specific hopes for their children's futures, a different story emerged" (2010: 15).

This alternate story is one in which women have a "choice" about working (ignoring the many women who need an income to support themselves and their families) and in which navigating the challenges of work and home is the responsibility of the woman (not her spouse or the organization). These male executives looked at their own home lives and used these personal experiences as templates for organizational policy. For example, Nathaniel looked at his own family life with a stay-at-home wife and preschooler and stated that it was unreasonable to expect "the working person to be home by a given time … because of the dynamics of the day-today working environment" (Tracy & Rivera, 2010: 18). Furthermore, these male executives looked to the future with a similar vision for work and home life—they saw specific career options for their sons, but "when speaking of their daughters, interviewees often focused on their daughter's family life" (Tracy & Rivera, 2010: 21).

Tracy and Rivera (2010) came away from their study somewhat discouraged about this enduring ideology about the roles of men and women in the workplace. After all, the beliefs of organizational leaders can have a strong impact on the organizational culture and on specific policies. However, they also express some hope for the future. The men they interviewed were interested in the topic and willing to engage the issue. Furthermore, in considering the manner in which ideas were communicated, Tracy and Rivera found that respondents often had increased rates of pauses and verbal fillers such as "ums" and "ahs" when talking about the complex relationship between work and home. The researchers believe "that the number of disfluencies and talk repairs in the data are not just signs of embarrassment or political correctness but also signify that executives' viewpoints on these issues are in a state of flux" (Tracy & Rivera, 2010: 31). Thus, although the ideology of sexism was still apparent in these executives' talk, there were also "flickers of transformation" (Tracy & Rivera, 2010: 3).

Tracy, S. J. & Rivera, K. D. (2010). Endorsing equity and applauding stay-at-home moms: How male voices on worklife reveal aversive sexism and flickers of transformation. Management Communication Quarterly, 24, 3–43.

Control

Concertive control theorists (Barker, 1993, 1999; Barker & Cheney, 1994) begin with organizational strategies of control originally enumerated by Edwards (1981). Edwards identified three broad strategies for exerting control in the modern organization. Simple control involves the direct and authoritarian exertion of control in the workplace. Technological control involves control exerted through technological workplace processes

such as assembly lines or computer programs. Bureaucratic control is based on the power of hierarchical structure and the rational-legal rules (Weber, 1968) that emanate from the bureaucratic structure. These three forms of control have long exemplified typical forms of power in organizations. However, some theorists propose that in team-based organizations, a new form of control has emerged—concertive control. Daniels, Spiker, and Papa (1997: 196) define concertive control systems as those in which

> the locus of control in an organization shifts from management to workers, who collaborate to create rules and norms that govern their behavior. The role of top management in this process is to provide a value-based corporate vision that "team members use to infer parameters and premises (norms and rules) that guide their day-today action" (Barker, 1993: 413).

Identification

The second key concept for understanding concertive control systems is identification. Identification refers to "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to [a collective], where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the [collective] in which he or she is a member" (Mael & Ashforth, 1992: 104). Thus, when an individual identifies with an organization or a work group, that individual takes on the concerns of the organization or group and accepts those concerns as his or her own. Organizational identification represents "the point at which the individual and the collective merge … the point of transcendence for the natural differences between individual identity and collective identity" (Barker, 1999: 128). Thus, within a concertive control system, an individual identifies with the values of the organization or work group and hence will act in accordance with those values even in the absence of simple, technological, or bureaucratic control.

Discipline

A final concept important for understanding the theory of concertive control is discipline. Barker and Cheney (1994) draw on the work of Foucault (1976) in seeing discipline as embedded within the "discursive formations" of a social group. That is, through communicative interaction, work groups develop techniques to reward and punish behavior that conforms with or deviates from the values identified as important by the work group. These disciplinary techniques might include direct criticism, the use

of silence, social pressure, or a host of other interaction strategies. What is important to note is that although the values being upheld may emanate from management, the discipline is meted out by the work group. Thus, a concertive control system is established in which workers identify with organizational values and then discipline behavior in accordance with those norms. These various aspects of a concertive control system come together in an organization analyzed by Barker (1993; Barker & Cheney, 1994). This organization was moving from a traditional hierarchical model to a team-based organizational system. Barker describes how team members came to identify with values developed by management (e.g., quality, on-time shipment, team responsibility) and then disciplined team members who were not behaving in accordance with those values. Indeed, Barker notes that, ironically, the discipline enacted by the teams was often more powerful, more difficult to resist, and less obvious than similar discipline enacted in a bureaucratic control system. Consider, for example, the comments of "Danny" describing how his team dealt with problems of punctuality:

> Well we had some disciplinary thing, you know. We had a few certain people who didn't show up on time and made a habit of coming in late. So the team got together and kinda set some guidelines and we told them, you know, "If you come in late the third time and you don't wanna do anything to correct it, you're gone". That was a team decision that this was a guideline that we were gonna follow (Barker, 1993: 426).

In summary, the theory of concertive control argues that power is embedded in a system of identification and discipline. Workers identify with the values and norms of management and then use these values as a basis for making workplace decisions and for disciplining other members of the work team. For example, Papa, Auwal, and Singhal (1995) considered the Grameen Bank Cooperative in Bangladesh and found that fieldworkers highly identified with the bank's goal of uplifting the poor and thus disciplined each other to keep loan recoveries up. As Papa et al. (1995: 209) recount, these workers "do not receive pressure from upper management if their loan recovery rate falls below 99% but they place incredible pressure on one another". Thus, even in a workplace designed with democratic and participatory ideals (or with the culture of a "family" or "team"—see Casey, 1999), the ideology of management is upheld through the everyday practices of organization members.

Feminist Theories of Organizational Communication

One of the first researchers to approach the issue of gender in the organizational setting was Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977) in her book Men and Women of the Corporation. Kanter explores a variety of gender-related issues, ranging from tokenism (the promotion of a few women into highly visible positions) to the role of the "executive secretary" and the "corporate wife". Her analysis makes it clear that gender issues permeate organizational life. In recent years, an increasing number of organizational communication scholars have adopted feminist theory as a backdrop for their work (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004; Buzzanell, 1994; Mumby, 1996).

Many feminist scholars have noted that organizations—in their traditional and bureaucratic forms—are inherently patriarchal (see, e.g., Ferguson, 1984). They further note that women have distinct ways of viewing the world and creating meaning through interaction. For example, Buzzanell (1994) argues that traditional views of organizational communication highlight the importance of individualism, causeand-effect thinking, and autonomy. In such a bureaucratic workplace, the most valued commodities are the stereotypical male characteristics of logic, aggressiveness, and competitiveness. In contrast, stereotypical female characteristics—such as emotion, empathy, intuition, connectedness, and cooperation—are likely to be downplayed in organizational life. Feminist scholars also argue that the concepts used to understand organizational life (such as rationality and hierarchy) tend to be male-biased (see, e.g., Mumby & Putnam, 1992) and that the very structure of language is patriarchal (see, e.g., Penelope, 1990). In short, feminist scholars believe that women in organizations can become marginalized in organizational life because of the dynamics of gender relationships within patriarchal organizational structures.

It should be noted, though, that not all see feminist work in the organizational communication field as situated within critical theory. Indeed, Ashcraft (2005) argues that it is better to look for the roots of the feminist organizational communication studies within the larger feminist movement, as this movement emphasizes activism. As Ashcraft (2005: 145) argues, feminist work within organizational communication "reflects an entrenched commitment to do more than talk within the walls of an ivory

tower; it embodies the desire for tangible forms of justice that enhance the lives of real people". Even within this focus on activism and emancipation, however, there are a variety of views regarding what should be done (see Buzzanell, 1994; Mumby, 1996). For example, liberal feminists believe that remedies for female subordination should come from within the system and that women should work to gain their fair share of control in institutions currently run by men. Other feminists balk at this approach, arguing that it only serves to support the patriarchal nature of society. Radical feminists believe that emancipation for women can occur only through the destruction of male-dominated institutions or through the total separation of women from these institutions. Other feminists argue for more symbolic courses of action. Standpoint feminists work to enhance the opportunity for a variety of marginalized voices to be heard within societal dialogue, and postmodern feminists attempt to "deconstruct" maledominated meaning systems in order to highlight women's perspectives. Recently, Ashcraft (2000) has argued for a hybrid form of feminism that she calls pluralist feminism. Ashcraft's research suggests that even in "feminist" organizations, there are pragmatic contingencies that constrain an idealistic view of feminism. In developing pluralist feminism, scholars could become "responsive to the needs of organizations that seek social change yet cannot fully embrace antibureaucratic, countercapitalist ideals and practices" (Ashcraft, 2000: 381).

Feminist scholarship within organizational communication research is expanding rapidly. Some researchers consider specific practices that illustrate the gendered nature of organizations, and some consider the ways in which the social fabric of life in the workplace can influence the professional and personal identities of women. Others consider the ways in which gender intersects with race and class in organizational life (Parker, 2003). Still others investigate whether there are communicative differences between traditional bureaucratic organizations and womancontrolled and nonhierarchical organizations. We will briefly consider three studies to provide a sampling of feminist scholarship in organizational communication.

The "Framing" of Sexual Harassment

One early investigation in the feminist tradition (Clair, 1993b) examined the narratives of women talking about sexual harassment in the workplace. Clair examined the "framing devices" women used in the telling of these harassment stories. For example, a woman could frame her story as "simple misunderstanding" or she could trivialize the event. The framing devices examined and their definitions are presented in table below.

Framing Devices on Sexual Harassment Narratives

Framing Device	Explanation
Accepting dominant interests	Sexual harassment accepted or justified as a less important problem than other managerial concerns
Simple misunderstanding	Sexual harassment accepted or justified as "mere flirting"
Reification	Sexual harassment accepted or justified as "the way things are"
Trivialization	Sexual harassment accepted or justified as "a harmless joke"
Denotative hesitancy	Sexually harassing encounter not defined by the term sexual harassment
Holism	Because of component interdependence, a system is more than the sum of its parts.
Public/private expression—public/private domain	Sexual harassment described as part of private—rather than public—life or described using private forms of expression (e.g., embarrassment, fear)

Based on Clair, R. P. (1993b).
The use of framing devices to sequester organizational narratives: Hegemony and harassment.
Communication Monographs, 60, 113–136.

Clair argues that certain framing devices serve to accentuate or confront the hegemonic experience of women in organizations:

> How these personal narrations of organizational life are framed contribute to or challenge the dominant ideology of organizational life. Certain framing techniques either reinforce or challenge the dominant ideology. Specifically, the subjugated group, in this case female targets of sexual harassment, framed their stories in such a way that sexual harassment incidents were generally sequestered or kept out of the mainstream of organizational communication (1993b: 131).

Thus, through the examination of women's stories, Clair uncovered an important hegemonic aspect of relationships between men and women in the workplace. In the very ways that women talk about harassment, they often normalize it and suppress further discussion of harassment as an oppressive feature of the workplace.

Case in Point: Using the F Word

In recent years, the word feminist has fallen into disrepute. As Anna Quindlen (2003) states in a column entitled "Still Needing the F Word," people see the word feminist as inappropriate, offensive, or simply off-putting. In part, this reputation can be attributed to commentators who see feminists as activists for an unwanted agenda ("femi-nazis"). However, this current disregard for feminism also stems from the belief that we are now in an era in which all the battles have been won. As Quindlen states, "Conventional wisdom has it that we've moved on to a postfeminist era, which is meant to suggest that the issues have been settled, the inequities addressed, and all is right with the world" (p.74).

However, recent research suggests that feminists have not progressed as far as they would like (e.g., pay inequity remains a major problem, and women still struggle against sexual harassment in the workplace) and may even have taken a few steps backward. For example, Quindlen argues that although women in the past felt pressured to be the perfect housewife and mother, women today strive to be models of perfection in the workplace while maintaining the same old pressures at home. In The Second Shift (1993), Arlie Hochschild argues that women still do the majority of domestic work even while taking on enhanced responsibility at work. In other words, says Quindlen, "Women have won the right to do as much as men do. They just haven't won the right to do as little as men do" (p. 74).

Discourse at a Woman-Owned Business

Many feminist scholars argue that life can be different in an organization that exemplifies feminist values such as cooperation, emotion, and support. Paige Edley (2000) examined this assumption in her study of a woman-owned interior design firm that employed mainly women (the only men were part-time delivery and warehouse workers). Edley's long-term participant observation study of this organization resulted in an interesting picture of life in a woman-owned business. One of her major findings, for example, was that although everyone in the organization "talked the talk" of a cooperative and flexible workplace (e.g., one in which family concerns were taken seriously), the owner of the business often did not "walk that talk". Instead, the owner often publicly derided those who took off too much time for family concerns or kept those individuals from key work assignments.

Second, although Edley found that communication in this organization was often marked by emotion and conflict, such interaction was often labeled as simply the way women talk. Edley (2000: 293) reports that "conversations were filled with references to women as cranky and moody and blaming nonverbal expressions of anger on PMS [premenstrual syndrome]". By blaming their anger and emotional outbursts on "the way women are," workers in this organization could downplay the importance of conflict in the organization.

Thus, Edley found that, in many ways, the women in this organization played into the sexual stereotypes of women. Through their discourse, they constructed an idealized organization of support and flexibility that, in many ways, didn't really exist. Through their discourse, they also submerged conflict, blaming emotional communication on PMS or the stereotypical emotionality of women. This sounds, in many ways, like a very negative construction of women within this woman's organization. However, Edley argues that there were rewards for the women, as they saw themselves as working in an ideal workplace in which they could speak and act as women.

Disciplined Bodies

Finally, recent work by Angela Trethewey (1999, 2000; Trethewey, Scott & LeGreco, 2006) has examined how the organizational context—as well as society and culture in general—serves to discipline women in terms of bodily display. For example, she reviews research that has considered the ideal body for white, middle-class women. These bodies have a particular size and shape that must be maintained through diet and exercise regimes. These bodies must pay careful attention to nonverbal movement—walking, sitting, and gesturing in particular ways. And these bodies must be displayed with makeup and clothing that exhibit the appropriate level of femininity.

Trethewey then argues that women are faced with a conundrum in the workplace: Although a "professional body" is strong and competent, such a body might contradict the nurturing and soft body of traditional femininity. How are women to manage this dilemma? Trethewey's interviews with a wide range of professional women provided several answers to this question. First, women clearly saw a "professional body" as a fit body that symbolized discipline and endurance. Second, women believed they needed to control their nonverbal displays in a way that communicated strength—but that was nonthreatening. For example, one of Trethewey's respondents said, "We still need to have that firm handshake, but don't overdo it" (Trethewey, 2000: 119). Finally, women talked about the need to control and discipline the female body's tendency to "leak out through unruly clothing, menstrual bleeding, pregnancy, or emotional displays" (Trethewey, 2000: 20). Such a leaking body calls attention to the feminine and private nature of a woman's body in a public context that values control.

Research Methodology in The Critical Approach

So far in this chapter, we have considered a wide range of scholarship that has investigated power, discipline, control, and resistance in organizational settings. Clearly, there are challenges in learning about these issues, as many of the processes considered are "below the surface" and may not be easily accessed through typical organization research. How, then, do critical scholars do their work in organizational communication? In the most general sense, the research methodology employed by critical theorists is "ideology critique" (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996). That is, through their scholarship, critical theorists attempt to show "how specific interests fail to be realized owing partly to the inability of people to understand or act on those interests" (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996: 198). The specific data and analytical techniques that contribute to this critique can vary substantially across different research efforts. Quantitative data can contribute to such critiques by showing how resources are distributed in organizations and how individuals perceive their lives within organizations. More often, critical theorists use interpretive research techniques similar to those used by cultural scholars (see Chapter 5; see also Taylor & Trujillo, 2001). As Eisenberg and Goodall (1997) explain, "a critical theorist … gathers interpretive cultural data about language, motives, and actions, and makes judgments about the power relationships that exist in the organization" (p. 168).

One research technique unique to critical theorists—and to postmodern critical theorists, in particular—is known as deconstruction (Derrida, 1976; see also Linstead, 1993). Deconstruction involves "taking apart" a text in order to reveal social and political meanings. Specifically, Derrida argues that in any text, certain meanings and interpretations are "privileged," while others are "marginalized". For example, an employee handbook might privilege male interpretations by referring to a manager as "he" or a rational approach to organizing may be privileged through the decision-making processes prescribed by an organization. The process of deconstruction, then, involves "dismantling the apparent fixed meaning of a text" (Mumby & Putnam, 1992: 468). Table 6.3 considers several examples of how organizational communication discourse

has been "deconstructed" by scholars attempting to provide alternative meanings to those that are typically privileged.

It is worth emphasizing, however, that critical scholars do more than "take apart" organizations for study. Indeed, a central tenet of critical scholars is to strive to improve the lives of organizational constituents through social activism and education. Thus, Deetz (2005) argues that the most important aspect of undertaking a critical approach in organizational communication is to live a life characterized by critical modes of being. Specifically, Deetz believes that critical scholars should be "filled with care" in their empathetic approach to others, "filled with thought" in their consideration of the social and political ramifications of organizational experience, and "filled with good humor" in appreciating the irony and contradictions that are always a part of organizational life.

Examples of Privileged and Alternative Meanings

Study	Discourse	Privileged Meaning	Alternative Meaning Revealed Through Deconstruction
Clair (1996)	"A Real Job"	Paid jobs (typically white-collar) through established organizations are the only ones that "count".	Other jobs should also be honored, such as volunteer work, temporary work, blue-collar work, and care giving to children, elderly, or disabled people.
Clair (1993a)	"Keep a Record"	Women who are sexually harassed should carefully document all details of the harassment incident.	Women must keep a record because—in a bureaucratic organization—her account will not be believed if the man has a different story.
Mumby & Putnam (1992)	"Bounded Rationality"	Decision-makers in an organization attempt to be rational but are limited by cognitive and organizational factors.	Perhaps rationality should not be the goal of organizational life, and we should honor emotion instead.
Zoller (2003)	"AccidentProneness" and "Compliance"	When something goes wrong with safety in the workplace, it is because the worker is clumsy or didn't properly follow the rules.	These phrases divert attention from work processes that might be inherently dangerous.

Summary

At the beginning of this chapter, we noted two threads that underlie classical, human relations, human resources, systems, and cultural approaches to organizational communication: (1) Organizations consist of unitary or pluralist systems of control, and (2) the organizational theorist's job is to understand and explain. The critical approaches we considered in this chapter have questioned these basic assumptions. Specifically, critical theorists take a radical frame of reference and believe that the theorist's job is to change organizations through the emancipation of oppressed social groups. We examined important concepts such as power, ideology, hegemony, and resistance and considered two bodies of work within organizational communication—concertive control theory and feminist theory—to illustrate how a critical lens can be placed on organizational communication processes. We concluded our discussion by briefly considering research methods used by critical theorists. The critical theorist's general goal of ideology critique can be achieved through a variety of research techniques, especially interpretive research and deconstruction, and should be constantly tempered through critical modes of being.

Discussion Questions

1. Many abstract concepts are important to critical work in organizational communication. How do these concepts fit together? For example, how is ideology related to hegemony? How is power related to discourse? How is emancipation related to resistance?
2. Think about how the terminology used in an organization or the stories told in an organization contribute to power imbalances. What are ways of fighting against these imbalances?
3. If you are a woman, do the studies of feminist organizing described in this chapter ring true for you? Do you have other stories about the challenges of being a woman in a patriarchal organization? If you are a man, are these studies revealing to you? Do you think men suffer from similar constraints in the workplace?

CASE STUDY

Talking Turkey

Brandon and Gabriella Houston were both home from college for Thanksgiving weekend. Brandon, a senior, attended a state university about ninety miles from home. Gabriella, a sophomore, attended a small college in a neighboring state. Both were home for the first time during the school year and were spending some time catching up. As they lounged in the living room watching football, the smell of roast turkey wafted through the house, and assorted relatives milled around munching on celery sticks and green olives.

Brandon and Gabriella's parents contributed the lion's share of their children's college expenses, footing the bill for tuition and the majority of room and board. However, both Brandon and Gabriella had to pitch in a small portion of the housing tab and cover any incidental expenses they might incur. Thus, both held part-time jobs while going to school. Brandon worked twenty hours per week at the Baxter Company, a small manufacturing firm that assembled corrugated boxes. It was boring but dependable work and paid slightly better than minimum wage. Gabriella worked for Personal Greetings, a small company that specialized in personalized party greetings, including singing telegrams and "strip-o-grams". Gabriella worked eight to ten jobs per week (each job lasted about an hour) and earned $25 per job plus tips. Brandon was mortified when he heard what Gabriella was doing to earn her college money. "Gabs, I can't believe you're taking off your clothes for money! Does Mom know what you're doing?"

"Well, not exactly, but I don't think she'd mind. Mom and Dad are pretty liberal about these things, and I don't actually take off all my clothes. It's really pretty innocent—just some entertainment for people who like to have a good time. Unlike you, brother dear. Besides," Gabriella added, "I make great money. I usually pull in over $400 a week for about ten hours' work. Can you say the same?"

"The money isn't the point. And neither is being liberal or conservative, for that matter. The point is that you're being exploited. You may be making

$400 a week, but you can bet that Personal Greetings is making a lot more than that. And they're making it off your body. How can you be a woman in this day and age and allow people to do this to you—isn't this the very thing that feminists have been fighting against for years?"

"Well, maybe the feminists are wrong about this," Gabriella replied. "It seems to me that everyone is benefiting from this situation. I make great money and can support myself while I get an education and move on to something else in my life. The company is highly successful and can keep paying people like me a good wage. And the customers are getting a service that they're eager to pay for. Who loses? If you want to see someone being exploited, you should just look at yourself, Brandon".

"What do you mean? I'm doing good honest work. I may not be paid a lot, but at least I'm keeping my clothes on!"

"Yeah, I'm stripped of my clothes, and you're just stripped of your dignity," Gabriella retorted while Brandon stared back in disbelief. "The Baxter Company is making money hand over fist, and they've got you working for minimum wage. They set your hours, they give you boring work to do, they control when you can take a break, and who you can talk to on the job. And you just shuffle along and pick up your paycheck and feel good because you're doing 'honest work.' Maybe your kind of job is the American way, but I'd rather wiggle my butt for a living and have a lot of free time to study and have some fun!"

Gabriella and Brandon's mother stood at the doorway. "I think dinner's ready, kids. We've got turkey, cornbread dressing, cranberry sauce, green bean casserole, corn, & three kinds of pie. I don't think anyone will go hungry today!" Brandon led the way past his mother into the dining room. As he left, he turned back for one last parting shot. "Sounds great, Mom, and I'll take an extra portion of dressing. Given Gaby's current line of work, I don't think she'll be wanting any".

CASE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

1. How would you evaluate the argument between Brandon and Gabriella? Are either or both of them being exploited? If so, how?
2. How does this discussion illustrate the concepts of power, ideology, and hegemony?