M@n@gement

■ François GRIMA   2011
Between authenticity and conformism: ideological tension as a lever for change in Business School
M@n@gement, 14(5), 311-350.

Between authenticity and conformism: ideological tension as a lever for change in Business School

François GRIMA

IRG-UPEC & RMS
Grimaf2000@yahoo.com

Abstract:
The present article aims to explore how strategies to manage the ideological tension experienced by Critical Management Scholars (CMSars) in Business Schools can lead to changes in the way the School is run. We firstly attempt to identify the nature of such changes and, secondly, the factors which facilitate or impede them. We use the theoretical framework of tempered radicals in a survey involving semi-directive interviews with 17 CMSars from French Business Schools. Our study identifies two positions, the oppositional and the activist, which are adopted by CMSars in their relationship with their Business School. The first position leads the CMSars to more or less distressing marginalisation, with little impact apart from a few individual cases. In the second scenario, the CMSars acquire relative autonomy, which enables them to wield a degree of influence in the way their School is run both at individual and collective level. Our findings indicate that the oppositional position is based on the defensive use of a limited number of resources. On the other hand, the activist position is underpinned by a complex attempt at persuasion, which brings into play relational, academic and institutional resources, without which the task is much more difficult.

Keywords:
Critical Management Scholars, tempered radicals

INTRODUCTION

While there is growing interest in the critical analysis of organisations in the literature (Huault & Golsorkhi, 2006; Adler et al, 2008; Dehler, 2009; Dany, 2009a), little research has been done on critical management scholars themselves (shortened in the rest of the text to CMSars) (Perriton and Reynolds, 2004). Despite the increasing institutional interest in critical work (Cunliffe et al, 2002), there is a relative lack of research on the outcomes of the ideological tension experienced by CMSars in their Business Schools, other than an account of the way they defend their identity (Smircich, 1986).

This situation may be partially explained by the difficulty in defining a

CMSar (Cunliffe & Linstead, 2009). The wide range of critical perspectives (Marxism, postmodernism, feminism…) and the nature and range of criteria included in the definition (justice, ethics, absence of performance design, denaturalisation, reflexivity) generate a good deal of debate (Alvesson &Willmott, 1996; Fournier & Grey, 2000; Czarniawska, 2001; Willmott, 2008). Noting that this diversity (Cooke, 2008; Adler, 2008; Cunliffe, 2008; Voronov, 2008) is a source of enrichment (Speaking Out on Critical Management Studies, 2008), and based on an acknowledgment of its maturity (Clegg et al, 2006; Walsh & Weber, 2002; Parker, 2002), we adopted a flexible approach (Stookey, 2008; Adler et al, 2008) in our definition.

Thus, we combined three criteria in our definition of a CMSar. Firstly, they fight against managerial abuse by challenging the hypotheses that attribute superior competencies to managers (Townley, 1993). Secondly, they include the impact of managerial choices on society in their work, which leads them to criticise environmental irresponsibility and the patriarchal structure of organisations (Watson, 2007; Speaking out on Critical Management Studies, 2008). Thirdly, they attempt to expose the power struggles within organisations and to transform them by putting forward new frameworks for managerial thinking (Fournier and Grey, 2000; Watson, 2004; Dany, 2009a).

Positioned in Business Schools, in other words, institutions whose operational nature and raison d'être they contest (Barney, 1997; Fournier & Grey, 2000; Zald, 2002; Grey, 2002, 2004), and faced with students who see themselves as customers of an educational model that fosters the reproduction of the dominant liberal ideological model (Bourdieu, 1989; Pesqueux, 2007), CMSars subsequently experience real ideological tension (Tinker, 2002; Zald, 2002; Parker, 2004; Smith, 2008).

Despite the interest shown in critical approaches, there is nothing in the literature about the experiences and possible courses of action of such holders of critical approaches in Business Schools. The practical aspects of their work to produce managerial alternatives remain unexplored, as do their results. The present study aims to fill this gap and attempts to answer three questions: How do CMS manage their ideological tension and how do they introduce changes in a system of reproduction as well established as a Business School? What strategies are brought into play? What resources are used?

To this end, we adopted the concept of the tempered radical. Meyerson and Scully (1995) define the latter as an individual confronted with an ideological tension that leads to a desire for change. This gives us the two key characteristics of a CMSar in Business Schools, namely the ideological tension between their values and beliefs and the norms of their professional setting, and a determination to change the latter. Our study explores a number of challenges that face CMSars. Expounding their experiences and potential for action in their institutional setting firstly shows that it is possible for a CMSar to square authenticity (Reynolds, 2004) with conformism (Watson, 2001) without betraying their identity (Parker, 2004 ; Burrell, 2009, Beaujolin-Bellet & Grima, 2011). It also indicates that ideological tension does not necessarily lead to destructive practices but can resonate with creativity and

changes liable to influence the way the organisation is run (Watson, 2004; Smith, 2008). According to Smith (2008), understanding what ideological tension can potentially lead to in the internal operations of Business Schools is essential for the CMSar community, as it now finds itself at a turning point in history. After managing to academically legitimise their presence in Business Schools, CMSars are now faced with a new challenge to reform the way these institutions operate by introducing practices that resonate with their values. This means that they must now influence a well-established system of reproduction (Business Schools) by legitimising new practices that can lead to a review of the internal operations in their institutions (Watson, 2007).

In addition, we believe that it is important to understand the present momentum for change as the critical positioning is attracting a growing number of young scholars (Cunliffe et al, 2009). At societal level, the present study appears against a backdrop of economic crisis that reminds us of the limitations of a form of management education delivered through elitist, economics-based programmes in Business Schools (Lazuech, 1999; Ghoshal, 2005; Thrift, 2005; Mintzberg, 2005; Patriotta & Starkey, 2008), where the promotion of individualism, belief in the effectiveness of the markets and shareholders supremacy predominate. Investigating the ways in which CMSars manage or not to generate an alternative educational offer, or to introduce changes in the way Business Schools operate, involves exploring the potential scope and conditions for preparing future managers to adopt responsible management practices. It also means questioning whether the influence of internal activists can really change Business Schools, at a time when some authors (Rowlinson & Hassard, 2011) have challenged the substantiality of changes introduced by CMSars in these organisations over the last thirty years.

The article is divided into three parts. The first part reviews the literature in the field and describes the methodology used. We then detail the changes that the ideological tension experienced by CMSars has led to in the latters' Business Schools, and the strategies implemented and resources used. We conclude by reflecting on the impact of these results for the CMSar community, highlighting the factors that can promote or hamper the integration of critical ideas in the way Business Schools operate.

THE CONCEPT OF TEMPERED RADICALS: A DYNAMIC READING OF THE MANAGEMENT OF IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCE.

For Meyerson and Scully (1995), ideological tension is a response to the management of ideological difference, generating an ability to play with the organisational rules. The tempered radical is defined as an "outsider within." Even though CMSars may feel isolated or perceived as hypocrites, they combine emotional distance with genuine commit-

ment to their organisation. Their between-two-worlds position enables them to distance themselves from the two extremes of resolving ideological tension: i.e. acceptance of the status quo or the determination to introduce radical change. Tempered radicals, while remaining in a state of ideological tension, can mobilise energy from both levels. They can make their voice heard in the system where they find themselves, and can potentially initiate change which would not be accepted from a more radical, external actor. This is wholly in line with the characteristics of the Critical Management Studies (CMS) movement in Business Schools described by various authors (Grey & Willmott, 2002; Perriton & Reynolds, 2004; Parker, 2004; Grey, 2007; Rowlinson & Hassard, 2011), namely, to create the conditions for the emergence of critical Business Schools based on internal changes to the way they operate.

IDEOLOGICAL TENSION AS A SOURCE OF TRANSFORMING THE ENVIRONMENT

Meyerson and Scully (1995) distinguish two types of strategies for tempered radicals faced with ideological tension: to work towards incremental change or to go for radical change. In her latest book, Meyerson (2001, 2003) proposes five strategic options for tempered radicals (resisting quietly, turning personal threats into opportunities, extending the impact of an action through negotiation, using the small wins leverage option, and organising collective action). However, squaring the concept of reasoned change with that of radical change is present in all of the literature on the concept of tempered radicals. Various authors (Edmonson Bell et al, 2003; Creed, 2003; Meyerson, 2003; Kirton et al, 2007; Courpasson & Thoenig, 2008) have investigated the degree of radicality employed by tempered radicals when acting on their environment to integrate their ideological difference, given that they have to reconcile their desire to change their organisation without forgetting who it actually belongs to.

Changing the organisation to overcome the ideological tension.

The 'small win' strategy (Weick, 1984) is often presented as the best way for tempered radicals to go about changing their environment. Tempered radicals introduce gradual shifts in their organisation that correspond to incremental change. This strategy does not place tempered radicals in major ideological or identity-based dilemmas, but helps them to manage their dual identity. Kirton et al. (2007) highlighted the value of this strategy in the context of ideological difference experienced by managers of diversity, showing the preference of tempered radicals for repeated small-scale actions. In the article on silence by Creed (2003), the 'small win' strategy is used to foster the quality of interpersonal relations by way of controllable actions. The author shows that tempered radicals, in this case homosexual ministers, are more

than ready to enter into dialogue with opponents hostile to their ideas in their attempt to promote acceptance of their ideological difference and to change the way their organisations operate. Meyerson (2001; 2003) sees this as an expression of quiet résistance, whereby the tempered radical expresses his or her ideological difference by means of carefully structured arguments.

Meyerson and Scully (1995) argue that this strategy is easy to use. The apparently limited radical aims pursued generate a perception of reduced risk-taking for the decision-makers, making it tantamount to an experiment (Edmondson Bell et al, 2003). The small win strategy offers a very flexible field of action, which leaves room for improvisation and the unexpected. Opportunism is always possible. According to Meyerson (2001, 2003), the tempered radical seeks to extend the impact of these actions through negotiation. With small changes, tempered radicals constantly shake the foundations of the organisational culture that they criticise. Kirton et al. (2007) argue that tempered radicals do not set ambitious short-term objectives since their strategic horizon is in the long term.

Introducing small changes is nonetheless challenging for tempered radicals. It requires considerable strategic know-how to avoid generating resistance or championing a cause that is beyond them (Edmondson Bell et al, 2003). Meyerson and Scully (1995) suggest that tempered radicals should integrate the constraints specific to each sub-entity (services, ethnic, cultural, social groups, etc.) within their organisation. Taking the priorities of each of these specific identities into account and presenting the proposed changes effectively can help them to avoid being perceived as a threat, no matter what their interlocutor's position in the organisation. Creed (2003) points to the importance of 'when' and 'how' to convince. Courpasson et al. (2011) stress the importance of developing a professional agenda. The challenge is to convey the subject of discord in terms that can be accepted by the organisation and avoid over-emotional criticisms. The tempered radical tries to understand the decision-makers' priorities so as to put forward proposals that fit in with their strategic agenda. Meyerson (2003) highlights the tempered radicals' capacity to turn a threat into an opportunity for change. Ideological differences can also be expressed in a more radical way, however.

Staying authentic by refusing to conform.

Meyerson and Scully (1995) argue that tempered radicals are constantly in danger of resolving their ideological tension by conforming. Like Meyerson (2001, 2003), they suggest that to remain critical, tempered radicals must first develop the ability to speak several languages to a same population. More specifically, they must simultaneously understand the values and expectations of their interlocutors, while keeping a distance in order to retain their difference. This is the source of their capacity to impact on the status quo within the target population. Tempered radicals must be able to deconstruct the language specific to their institution so as to offer it an alternative vision of the world. They need to develop a form of rhetoric whereby they use iconoclasm to shift

the foundations and beliefs of their organisation. Creed (2003) also shows how homosexual ministers institute a reading of the bible that challenges the questioning of homosexuality by their religion.

Radicality can also be preserved by means of social support. Maintaining ties with benchmark ideological communities appears to be a crucial factor for tempered radicals in retaining their critical positioning. These ties may be collective or individual. They help to provide instrumental support (in the form of resources such as information or contacts with experts) as well as emotional support. Meyerson and Scully (1995) argue that tempered radicals can only claim to retain their radicality if they remain in contact with external individuals who share the same identity otherwise there is a real risk of their subjectivity being colonised.

Such resourcing may also occur within an organisation (Courpasson et al., 2011). Courpasson and Thoenig (2008) highlight the emergence of small groups that may include actors from other organisations. Meyerson (2003) mentions collective actions whereby the tempered radical forms alliances that can produce leverage, thus facilitating change. Kirton et al. (2007) argue that managers of diversity policies develop informal employee networks related to diversity issues. They also try to create leverage by joining forces with well-established trade unionists in their organisation. This perception of not being the only person to experience such ideological tension helps tempered radicals to feel legitimate and to openly affirm the issues that set them apart from their community (Edmondson, Bell et al., 2003; Creed, 2003; Kirton et al., 2007).

WHAT RESOURCES FOR CHANGE?

The literature on tempered radicals offers several answers to this question.

Meyerson (2003) identifies factors that can facilitate productive resistance by the tempered radical (Courpasson et al, 2011; Courpasson & Golsorkhi, 2011). The first is the existence of a culture that values differences in ideology and identity. The simple fact of knowing that some people in their workplace share their ideological mindset, or make no secret of alternative views in relation to the dominant group, provides a climate conducive to asserting their difference. Meyerson (2003) argues that the presence of such acknowledged tempered radicals in an organisation's decision-making circles stimulates the creative capacity for disorder in those who are less well placed in the hierarchy since the risks associated with non-conformity appear reduced or even non existent. The second factor is the existence of a manager who is open to ideological diversity. This tolerance, or even encouragement, to their ambivalence, enables tempered radicals to feel psychologically safe in their everyday activities. The situation is even more favourable when they can count on the support of a sponsor to give them institutional

protection or the means to continue challenging the prevailing ideology. Kirton et al (2007) also point out that their professional and technical experience means that tempered radicals can apply for positions of power, thereby making their change strategies more visible and significant.

Courpasson and Thoenig (2008) argue that resources ought to be contextualised automatically although this is not the case at present and highlight the role of social capital in the capacity to challenge. Tempered radicals have a solid reputation, based on a proven professional track record and considerable engagement that gives their activities credibility. The authors also suggest that tempered radicals are most likely to develop in the 30-45-age group. This is a pivotal period of life, when the construction of self is determined by the resolution of dilemmas affecting the private and professional spheres. They are more sensitive to challenges to their professional ideological commitments and are ready to defend them.

In the light of this analysis, the theoretical framework of tempered radicals appears to offer an interesting basis for analysing and understanding the outcomes of ideological tension in CMSars, and the resources that underpin their action within their Business School. Ideological tension between radicality and the status quo (Smith, 2008; Parker, 2003) may lead them to act on their environment, not so much to destroy it as to incorporate the values that are important to them. The combat for critical authenticity (Snell et James, 1994; Watson, 2001; Tinker, 2002) appears to drive their change strategies (Reedy, 2003). Zald (2002) suggests that it is easier for those who publish in academically recognised journals to propagate their convictions in the most prestigious Business Schools. He also maintains that it is easier for CMSars to express their critical identity when they teach organisational behaviour or management rather than finance, accounting or marketing. Despite these initial findings, there is a lack of empirical research on the practices that can be mobilised by CMSars. In effect, the image of the tempered radical varies in the literature. They may develop in a receptive environment (Meyerson, 2001, 2003), either within the organisation (existence of a culture open to ideological difference, presence of other tempered radicals) or with other tempered radicals (manager, sponsor). This environment leaves little room for reasoned radicality. On the other hand, Kirton et al (2007), like Courpasson and Thoenig (2008), draw a picture of a tempered radical with considerable social capital, who is well-established in life and is ready to fight for his or her ideals. The aim of this study is to find out more about the strategies used by these CMSars, their results and the resources mobilised.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK.

To explore these issues, we adopted the individual experience data collection approach (Bertaux, 2001; Essers & Benschop, 2007; Goodley et

al., 2004), acknowledged as a useful method for developing substantial understanding of identity-oriented work in individuals (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2008), and also to gain greater insight into the subjects' private and professional background (Bertaux, 2001; Cohen and Mallon, 2001). The data in the present study was collected from 17 CMSars working in French Business Schools.

In keeping with our definition set out in the introduction, we kept in mind three criteria to detect the CMSars for our sample population: challenging the superiority of managerial rationality, incorporation of the managerial impact on society, and denaturalisation. Aware of the multiplicity of theoretical underpinnings and the existence of conflict within the critical community (Rowlinson & Hassard, 2011), we should keep in mind that CMSars can engage positively in organisations by way of consulting activities, for instance (Smith, 2008, Voronov, 2008; Clegg et al, 2006), or can refuse all involvement in the way capitalist organisations liable to reinforce alienation and domination operate (Tinker, 2002; Parker, 2003).

Our sample population was selected in two stages. In the absence of a recognised CMSar association in France, we firstly identified 10 CMSars that met our three defined criteria. We selected them on the basis of their research work and their course syllabi available online. All those we got in touch with agreed to meet us. Following the interviews, several suggested that we get in touch with other CMSars working in Business Schools. 14 CMSars were referred to us in this way. We looked up their research work and their courses to ensure that they corresponded to our criteria. 7 of them agreed to take part in our study. This gave us a total sample of 17 CMSars from Business Schools. When we first got in touch to arrange a meeting, we used an introductory question to check that they really considered themselves as CMSars and what it meant for them. This first question generally led to the interlocutor explaining what they considered to be a critical stance, sometimes with certain nuances ("I'm heterodox," "I'm critical but not necessarily in the same sense as 'CMS' which I don't always agree with," "I'm critical in the sense of epistemologically incorrect and not mainstream.")

While our sample in no way claims to be exhaustive or representative, it does offer a certain degree of diversity with respect to several of the criteria identified by the literature on CMSars and tempered radicals who are likely to have an influence on the way CMSars in Business Schools manage their ideological tension:

- Age: Courpasson and Thoenig (2008) suggest that tempered radicals are most likely to develop in the 30-45-age group.

- The field of teaching and research: Zald (2002) argues that CMSars in the field of organisational behaviour and management are in a better position than those from other disciplines.

- The level of the Business School they work in[1] and the level of the best publications[2] (Smith, 2008; Zald, 2002).

1. We made a distinction here between Business Schools regularly ranked (in the period 2007-2010) among the top 12 in l'Etudiant magazine (group A) and the others (group B).

2. We based the measurement of this variable on the CNRS ranking in 2008.

- Critical orientation (feminism, Marxism, psychoanalysis, modernist and postmodernist analyses): Rowlinson & Hassard (2011) see this as a key factor in the experience of CMSars in UK Business Schools.

- Involvement in the world of academia (participation in the organisation of conferences, belonging to peer review panels): Tinker (2002) and Zald (2002) highlight the importance of this factor.
We decided to interview no more than three people from any one Business School.

In our sample presentation, we also mention the public involved in the critical teaching delivered by the CMSars in question (number of students, first degree or executive education…). To ensure the interviewees' anonymity, we mention neither the age (from 26 to 60) nor the gender (7 women and 10 men) of the interviewees in Table 1. These criteria were included in the analysis, however, alongside other factors (courses delivered, conferences attended, main types of publication) set out in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Sample characteristics

inter-viewees	Aca-demic involve-ment (1)	Business School ranking (group A or B)	Highest level of publica-tion ac-cording to the CNRS ranking 2008 (2)	Impact of critical courses	Research topics	Courses	Conferences attended
1	none	A	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (70% teaching work-load) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (20% teaching workload) - Managers in executive educa-tion (10% teaching workload	Theory of deci-sions, corporate leaders, enterprise and society.		

2	high	A	1*	- Over 50 students in first degree course (20% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (80% teaching workload)	Socially responsible saving, critical analysis of profit		
3	low	B	3	Over 50 students	Suffering at work, managerial abuses , violence at work		
4	high	A	1	Over 50 students and fewer than 50 managers in executive education	Health and violence at work.		
5	little	A	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (80% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (20% teaching workload)	Ethics and management, critique of paternalism, integration of the matriarchal dimension of management	- Creativity - Qualitative methods , - Critical analysis of management tools, - Psychosociology of organisations - Theory of organisations	- AOM(CMS) - Biannual CMS conference - EGOS, - EAM (European Accounting meeting) - IMP
6	high	A	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (30% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (70% teaching workload)	Deconstruction of the subject, Psychoanalytical approach to management		
7	low	B	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (80% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (20% teaching workload)	- Over 50 students in first degree course (80% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (20% teaching workload)		

8	high	A	2	- Over 50 students in first degree course (90% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (10% teaching workload)	Capitalism as ideology, figures in capitalism, critique of managerial responsibility		
9	high	B	2	- Over 50 students in first degree course (30% teaching workload) - Fewer than50 students in first degree course (70% teaching workload)	History of management, study of critical corporate movements.		
10	low	A	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (50% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (50% teaching workload)	Critical approach to management tools		
11	low	B	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (100% teaching workload)	Normalisation and democracy, figures as a tool for domination		
12	low	A	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (60% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (30% teaching workload) - Managers in executive education (10% teaching workload) Fewer than50 students	Socially responsible saving		

13	low	B	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (40% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (60% teaching workload)	A critical approach to marketing	- Creativity - Qualitative methods , - Critical analysis of management tools, - Psychosociology of organisations - Theory of organisations	- AOM(CMS) - Biannual CMS conference - EGOS, - EAM (European Accounting meeting) - IMP
14	low	B	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (100% teaching workload)	Power and institutionalisation		
15	low	B	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (50% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (50% teaching workload)	Environmental irresponsibility		
16	high	A	3	Fewer than 50 students	Employment market and gender		
17	high	A	3	- Over 50 students in first degree course (40% teaching workload) - Fewer than 50 students in first degree course (60% teaching workload)	Résistance to flexible working practices, professional standing of critical players.		

(1)   Journal editorial team, member of peer review panel.
(2)   The National Centre for Academic research (CNRS) ranks academic papers in 4 categories in decreasing order of academic value. Category 1 includes the best academic journals that play a structuring role in their disciplinary field. Category 2 includes all highly selective journals that accept major and occasionally pioneering contributions. Category 3 includes selective journals that accept major contributions. Finally, Category 4 includes journals that are less selective, with a focus on national issues.

As our aim was to explore both the public and the private lives of more or less direct colleagues, we paid great attention to the development of trust. We systematically took the time to introduce ourselves, explain

our study and answer any questions before beginning the actual interview. We also agreed to keep all the data anonymous (for this reason, no names of the person or the institution are mentioned in the presentation of the findings) and to give the interviewees the research findings. Respect for anonymity was frequently mentioned by the interviewees themselves, possibly because they were speaking to peers. There was real concern that they could not be identified from what they told us. At the same time, working with peers made us even more careful than usual in the way we handled the data.

The interviews with the 17 CMSars each lasted between 1h30 and 2 hours, using a three-part interview plan. We began by asking them about their academic and professional background, what led them to work in a Business School and how they would describe their critical position. Secondly, we asked them if this position could be a source of tension with regard to their institution, the students or their colleagues in the teaching faculty, or any other interlocutors from outside their Business School, and explored the consequences of these tensions with them. Thirdly, we asked them how they reconciled their beliefs with the expectations of their institution, and the resources used to this end. The interviews were nondirective so as to give the interviewees as much leeway as possible to express any links between events, ambiguities or contradictions that they had experienced (Cohen & Mallon, 2001), in other words, their retrospective assessment of the events and the lessons they were able to draw.

The interviews were transcribed and analysed according to a certain number of themes. Coding took place in two stages. The first codes were developed during the data collection process by the researcher. The codes were based on simple words or phrases, grouped in a dictionary that was gradually developed by adding a precise definition for each. The codes were based as much on the literature on CMSars as on tempered radicals literature, both in the definition of categories underpinning the positions identified and in the strategies deployed by the CMSars. As we arrived in the field with prior knowledge of the subject, we could describe our approach as 'theoretically oriented' (Locke, 2001). However, despite this pre-structuring, we remained open-minded to what the interviewees told us.

The first codes were tested with a second, non-specialist researcher, who went through all the materiel. This led to three outcomes: agreement with the codes developed, disagreement, and inability to understand our interpretation. In the second scenario, the author got into intense debate with the second coder about certain debateable passages. In the third scenario, the author had to explain the thinking behind the codes to the second researcher. This led us to partially redevelop the initial coding. Several adjustments were needed before the author and the second researcher finally agreed on all the material. Discussions were intense and intellectually rich, and led us to make the typology more analytical. Some codes were permanently withdrawn during the process. In order to check if the categories held water, we presented our results to four CMSars in Business Schools who we considered to represent the two profiles identified in our typology. In each case,

the presentation lasted two hours, and many questions and precisions were addressed. Once again, this led to some minor adjustments.

At the end of this process, we read through each interview and assigned the selected categories. This enabled us to define two positions (oppositional versus activist) that were structured around three categories: scepticism versus optimism regarding the potential of critical activity to influence the way Business Schools operate, a space where critical action can be developed in priority (in Business Schools as opposed to society), and the level of ideological tension perceived (high versus low). Both the positions identified were based on ideal-types in line with Weber (1997, p.88): *"An ideal type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct.."* The ideal-type approach appeared to correspond best to our aim to explain a situation while retaining our interviewees' anonymity. We attempted to qualify each position in terms of strategy used (conflict within the Business School, acting as a clandestine radical CMSar, using the 'small wins' strategy, being quietly open about their ideological difference, and organising collective actions). These correspond to the categories identified by Meyerson (2003). We followed the same pattern with the resources used (defensive use of specialised social capital, offensive use of diversified social capital, existence of a culture that welcomes ideological difference, existence of a manager open to ideological difference, teaching quality as perceived by the students, and moment when they joined the School) and the findings (an individual or a collective and individual dynamic).

Finally, we asked two second-year Master in Management students, with no experience of our topic, to code a third of our research material according to our categories. We first asked them to note the category they felt was best adapted to each part of the text and then calculated the percentage of inter-coding agreement. This was .85, which is above the .70 threshold considered as critical by Cohen (1960). Finally, we gave the students the full interpretation grid and asked them to classify the 10 CMSars in the two positions, namely oppositional and activist. There was no disagreement with the original categories.

Between authenticity and conformism: an analysis of the changes generated by CMSars in Business Schools in the management of their ideological tension.

The analysis of our data enabled us to identify a clear contrast between the 17 CMSars, with two directly opposing positions: oppositional (7 cases) versus activist (10 cases). Three dimensions informed this contrast:

- scepticism versus optimism with regard to the potential of critical activity to influence the way that Business Schools operate
- Business Schools as a useful space to develop critical action versus society

- the level of ideological tension perceived as high versus low with certain elements.

After presenting these two positions, we detail the changes introduced by the holders of each of them and then describe the results and the resources mobilised.

Oppositional versus activist position

For the 7 holders of the oppositional position, their values (justice, emancipation, environmental responsibility…) fail to influence their Business School to a significant degree. They question it too deeply. Business Schools appear to them as established, locked-in systems, where all attempts to introduce new practices inspired by critical values will inevitably be hijacked and distorted by the institution: *"I don't believe that Business School is a place where critical practices can develop or survive. The system is blocked. Whatever we do, it's reworked so as not to upset the business organisations that finance us! There's no hope!"* These CMSars believe that their Business School and most of their hierarchy are deaf to dialogue and that they don't want any critical practices in their midst.

This scepticism is linked to a view of society as a whole as the main space for developing critical action. *"Business Schools are institutions of the past, totally left behind by history. It's not here that society can change. Recent events have shown this. These schools are ossified. My action takes place outside, in society, where I give conferences. That's where I can put my critical engagement into practice"* one CMSarar with relatively extreme views told us. These radical CMSars do not see their students as future business leaders. They view their public mainly as future middle managers with little room for manoeuvre. Because of this, they believe that their teaching will have little impact on the way business organisations are run. They focus on producing alternatives to managerial practices in places outside their Business School, wherever social movements develop, and believe they can only induce change outside of their organisation. It should be noted, however, that this strategy is difficult for some of them who do not have enough relations to infiltrate such societal dynamics. This is why, in both cases, their involvement in social movements remains largely at the level of talk.

This orientation goes hand in hand with strong ideological tension. The CMSars work in an organisation, namely, a Business School, whose values conflict with their own: *"I feel awkward in my School. It puts forward ideas and supports projects that I disagree with. There's a real ideological difference between my position and that of my employer."* This correlates with the situation described by Memmi (1965) in his concept of the "coloniser who refuses," which describes a person working for an organisation (here the colonial state, for us Business School) while at the same time being opposed to their values.

The ten holders of an activist position, on the other hand, were more optimistic. For them, Business Schools are not closed systems by nature which cannot be changed from the inside: *"As far as I'm concerned, things won't change from the outside but from the inside. We have to*

act on the way Schools operate if we want to have an influence on the whole of society. We're in a strategic position and we have to take advantage of it." Activist CMSars consider themselves to be in a position with access *t*o future business leaders. For them, Business Schools are strategic places where it's important to be present and to develop ideas. CMSar activists also believe that it is possible to have an impact on their own School. Business Schools are described as spaces where it's possible to take forward their critical ideas: *"In my School, like many others, the managers are not against proposals that allow them to run their institution better. They don't care whether the proposal is critical or not! All they're interested in is whether the new idea can help them to deal with an issue better. Not all the proposals are taken on board but there are ways to get some through if you make the effort."* There is thus room to develop new practices, based on critical values that go against the current operating rules. They are not automatically rejected or misrepresented.

The vision of an all-powerful managerial power that refuses ideological differences in Business Schools is challenged by an approach that values CMSar convictions and the partial open-mindedness of its managers to their critical proposals. This interest in internal action can even be to the detriment of societal involvement. The latter appears to them as less concrete and less likely to produce concrete results: *"I'm pragmatic. I'm not against investing in social movements but I don't see the impact of my involvement. The approach seems laudable in its aims but I have a problem with its actual outcomes."*

Finally, these CMSar activists are characterised by ideological tension that appears in a more limited number of ways. This is particularly true with respect to the dimension of search for performance. One of them told us: "I understand that we have to get results, it's an essential component of business life and I don't have a problem with it." While there may be disagreement about the course content, or the role of Business Schools in perpetuating belief in a supreme managerial rationality, CMSar activists do not experience strong ideological tension: "Obviously, I don't agree with everything. Far from it. But it would be an exaggeration to speak about tension to describe what I feel. I prefer to say contradiction or slight tension."

Having made this distinction between oppositional and activist positions, we need to analyse its concrete expressions, in other words, how the ideological tension is managed. To clarify our typology, we decided to articulate our presentation of each of the two positions by linking the strategies, then the results, and finally the resources employed. We sought to qualify each position in terms of strategies.

With the oppositional position, two strategies develop:
- conflict with the Business School (3 cases)
- existing clandestinely as a radical CMSar (4 cases)

With the activist position, three strategies develop:
- the 'small wins' strategy (9 cases)
- organising collective actions (7 cases)

- being quietly open about their ideological difference (10 cases)

We repeated the same schema with the resources mobilised.
Three resources underpin the oppositional position:
- teaching standards as perceived by the students
- defensive use of a specialised social capital
- moment when they joined the Business School.

Three resources underpin the activist position:
- offensive use of diversified social capital,
- existence of a culture that is receptive to ideological difference
- existence of a line manager open to ideological difference

While the oppositional position generates outcomes that could be qualified as marginal (restricted to a few individual cases), the activist position has an impact at both collective and individual level.

The oppositional position: insistence on authenticity without concession.

Entering into conflict within the Business School.
With this strategy, CMSars enter into open conflict as much with the school management as with their colleagues. However, their main target is the management and its representatives (Director of the School, the Dean, programme managers). These CMSars are not afraid of conflict and describe themselves as critical employees: *"I'm a critical employee, which means that I don't hesitate to challenge the management about their choices. I'm ready to argue with them if I think that their decisions go against my values."* Their authenticity is asserted forcefully. Radical CMSars seize on any difficult managerial situations, which they use as an opportunity for conflict.
Conflict is mainly direct. Radical CMSars use several methods. They become the spokesmen for issues of faculty discontent in areas like teaching workload or accreditation demands, which result in meetings with the institution's programme or research department managers to deal with the issues. They actively support the introduction of alternative election lists, or sharply challenge prevailing management situation during elections for the Dean. Confrontation also occurs in teaching faculty meetings, such as at the beginning of the academic year, when they are ready to ask difficult questions or to humorously point to the limitations of decisions taken by the school management: *"During the annual new academic year meeting, I argued that we're not obliged to accept accreditation system conformities but that it takes courage to do this. I pointed out that the London School of Economics' management had it, but that it's obviously not the case here."*
They may also challenge the management indirectly, bringing in third parties that are able to put pressure on the management, such as the labour inspectorate by informing them of stress-related issues in the

school so they can act on situations of injustice, or discreetly helping the school's trade union delegates to mobilise the teaching faculty over issues concerning the careers of some of their colleagues.

There may also be conflict with colleagues. This can be in the form of debate on the interest of working for rather than against the management. These debates can get heated with "mainstream colleagues": *"They don't acknowledge my work. They liken what I do to philosophy. It doesn't matter, I set off the debate!"* These CMSars challenge their colleagues over the environmental impact of their work, as well as the real impact of publications on the way business works. They openly question the number of readers of the journals that their peers publish in. During department meetings, radical CMSars voice their doubts about the content of some programmes. They express surprise over the disappearance of certain courses or question the impact of trends, or even the links with companies that finance the chairs. They challenge the programme directors about their real vocation: to train emancipated managers or to make a profit? Their opposition is also expressed indirectly through articles in the management press, where radical CMSars question the interest of certain courses which, according to them, only seek to consolidate students' beliefs in an all-powerful manager. At times, the conflictual situation is startlingly evident, such as, on the one hand, an article by a radical CMSar criticizing a practice or subject, while at the same time their Business School writes about its expertise or programmes in these same areas.

Existing clandestinely as a radical critical scholar.

While radical CMSars openly affirm their critical identity in the first strategy, in the second case, they develop more discreet, clandestine actions. This is especially true in the field of teaching. As they cannot openly design critical courses, radical CMSars resort to ruse to achieve their goal, namely to put across their critical ideas to the students. In the core courses that are the main part of their workload (around 70% of teaching workload), they opt for a neutral title that will be accepted by the management ("Organisation management", "Organisations and organisation management"). Then, as they cannot deliver all the courses and in-class work themselves (involving over 50 students), they carefully select outside contributors with critical ideas similar to theirs.

They also work on the course content. As they cannot deal with critical issues like power, environmental irresponsibility or gender, or include a bibliography of work that is openly critical, they firstly introduce more consensual topics like motivation or the manager's role, using mainstream support materials. They then become highly critical when tackling the subject, however. Radical CMSars use both filmed and live examples that highlight managerial abuses and challenge some of the students' convictions: *"To explain performance indicators, I let a student joker take the stage."* The same CMSar also used a video that showed some ridiculous corporate decisions in order to relativize the notion of superiority of managerial decisions. They actively encourage debate in their classes and send the students on field studies to see for themselves the gap between the prescriptive nature of theory and real-life business situations. They also use the students' own work

experiences to put managerial theories into perspective. In a second phase, they introduce critical subjects like economic downturns, power or domination either during an academic year, or by gradual changes to the syllabus over a number of years. This enables them to openly introduce and distribute critical articles. They then develop more radical topics like challenging the value of work and the political responsibility of management in the development of violent practices in business and society. Their aim is to foster engagement in society and transform it by transforming their students: *"I try to propose an alternative to getting involved in the student union, promoting civil engagement that can have greater leverage in the emancipation of these young people."*

They may also introduce critical thinking to students in executive education courses. Here again, restricted by the school's marketing offer, they act behind a mask. The target is more limited (10 to 20 people). They may launch a debate on managerial practices in the companies of the people on the course, for instance: *"This involves discussing difficult everyday management situations with local managers. After each presentation, I debrief with the group, using theoretical input that can help to clarify the situation. I suggest going beyond the traditional idea of leadership by tackling situations through a psychoanalytical lens."*

This clandestine existence is also evident in the field of research. They do not want to publish in ranked journals or even so-called critical journals. One CMSarar explained, *"Publishing in top-ranking journals as decided by the Financial Times? No, thank you! That would be akin to joining the system that destroys society. Business School research is simply a marketing ploy to sell courses. Research, whether it's critical or not, is a pillar of the worst form of doxa and I don't want anything to do with it."* But then: *"There's no doubt that as a scholar, I'm a failure. I don't publish in the Academy of Management Journal or in Organization. And so? What's the point of publishing in this type of journal that only a hundred or so people will read? What impact does it have on social injustice? None. I'd say that publishing in Organization Studies is a good excuse for doing nothing. It's playing by the same rules as the system I'm fighting against."* He writes articles for low-ranking and even unranked journals. He is quite willing to publish articles in fields other than management (philosophy, ergonomics). He adds that his is the culture of the book. Articles are therefore not his favourite support. Finally, he conducts research alone or with colleagues from other Business Schools or universities. He describes himself as a clandestine researcher in his Business School.

What results? Which resources? In which contexts?

What are the outcomes of this more or less active and visible conflict? All the CMSars who adopt an oppositional position agree that in their three areas of activity (management, teaching, research), their critical action has had little impact, although this doesn't bother them but simply corresponds to their expectations: *"It's true that my actions haven't changed very much in the way the school is run. It remains what it is, namely an institution that is very far from my values."* Only a few, often individual and limited outcomes illustrate the introduction of critical practices in the way the Business School operates.

In administrative terms, one radical CMSar managed to put a stop to the moral harassment of one of his colleagues. His denunciation of discriminatory practices in career promotion led to blatant inequalities being redressed. On the other hand, other actions like challenging the relevance of rankings or supporting alternative lists during the election of the Dean had little effect. No collective dynamics occurred as a result and the outcomes are modest. Only a few individuals have seen an improvement in their situation. Entering into conflict, like existing clan-destinely, appear to be strategies with little impact on the way Business Schools are run.

In teaching terms, the results again remain modest. Radical CMSars say they have managed to *"set off a critical spark in the minds of some students."* With respect to managers in executive education, radical CMSars even remain more modest in their assessment of the emanci-patory impact of their teachings. However, all 7 CMSars adopting this oppositional approach consider that their impact has been most signifi-cant in this area. This appears to indicate that the clandestine strategy is more effective than direct confrontation, which is more commonly used in the area of management and research.

In terms of research, radical CMSars failed to dissuade their colleagues from publishing in top-ranking journals supported by Business Schools. Far from generating consensus, their challenge can generate violent reactions from both colleagues and the institutionas illustrated by the following anecdote: "A petition was drawn up against me claiming "he isn't fit to be a teacher." I had begun contextualising the course content and my colleagues didn't want me to change their content. They only wanted me to teach technical stuff but I wanted to introduce Braudel. Some colleagues told me that you couldn't be a teacher at X and not vote for the right." These CMSars are less likely to be promoted than their colleagues, especially as they refuse to publish in acknowledged top-ranking journals. Several radical CMSars were excluded from their research laboratory with the backing of the Dean. Others mention how they reached the limits of their space of freedom when they tried to publish articles including data that came from a chair financed by business organisations. They had to accept "a real right of veto" which forced them to censor their own articles. The term "docility" was used several times. The radical CMSars describe an experience akin to a personal renunciation.

An analysis of these findings indicates that the oppositional position marginalises CMSars in their institutions. Only some relatively marginal results affecting a few individuals emerge. The Business School's well-established system of reproduction remains virtually untouched by the oppositional position. These CMSars often depict themselves as frus-trated and tired, and the ability to control certain resources is a decisive factor in enabling them to cope with this strong ideological tension.

With regard to their internal situation, several radical CMSars told us that if their courses had not been popular with the students or their external clients, they would have been fired. However, their high course standards and professionalism are well recognized. Externally, radical CMSars can count on social support from groups of like-minded critical

teachers and researchers, mainly from universities. They make defensive use of this specialised social capital. In addition to the resources they can find for their clandestinely critical courses, belonging to such groups is reassuring identity-wise: "Joining this group that studies work-related issues at the university gives me a space that I can't find anywhere else. I really feel I exist, which is not the case in my Business School where I'm usually ignored intellectually speaking." This aspect of sense of identity is especially important in the long term. The relationships are based on friendship without an ideological or disciplinary rationale.

An analysis of their career background, like the organisational context, gives us greater insights into the way this oppositional position is both possible and difficult. In particular, it shows the importance of the "date of arrival" of radical CMSars in their Business School. Be it at the end of the 1980s, the beginning of the 1990s (3 cases) or the beginning of the 21st century (4 cases), they joined the Business School when publishing in prestigious journals was still not really an obligation. This enabled them to join the school having published very little in comparison with today's standards (publications in level 3 journals maximum, depending on the CNRS benchmark). Consequently, the arrival of new, often foreign, colleagues, who are fully in tune with the demand for academic publication, and the departure of colleagues who were more lecturers than researchers, accentuates the feeling of isolation within the faculty, especially as their involvement in the academic community remains relatively undeveloped. Moreover, closer examination of the career path of these radical CMSars indicates that their status as teacher or researcher in a Business School often follows a change of career after starting out in a job where they were able to measure the full impact of asserting critical opinions about their workplace (problems in finding a job in the private sector or the university): "I can't afford to lose my job a second time. This time I must be more careful, more diplomatic." On the other hand, neither age (27 to 60), or the level of the school, or the critical orientation (Marxism, post-modernism, feminism), or the field of teaching or research (organisation, management, accounting, finance) appear to be variables that influence this strategy as the literature on CMSars or tempered radicals would seem to suggest.

The activist position: acknowledgement of some compatibility.

Small wins: looking for leverage.

CMSars look out for difficult management situations, particularly in the area of management and administration, in order to gain some win–win agreements: *"I try to get my ideas across in the school by taking the interests of the management into account in my efforts to change beliefs. Trying to force change doesn't work. The management just dig their heels in. My experience has proved that the best solution is to find potential areas of agreement and to build on these. It's not a revolution, but it's more effective!"* Several examples illustrate this desire to co-produce change, and the persuasive arguments developed to fa-

vour the emergence of an alternative course offer in Business Schools, challenging the managerial hegemony.

To fight against environmental irresponsibility, one CMSarar activist developed a real "battle plan" to convince the management of the relevance of her action. First, she developed a strong marketing argument and then pointed out that the School would enjoy a positive image with its institutional environment by investing in this area. She got as much publicity as possible by inviting outside experts to come and debate the topic in the School. However, she did not use this opportunity to make life difficult for the management, but instead let the School use the situation to promote its past and future action. The same is true of another CMSar activist who agreed to manage the setting up of a new programme track (over 200 hours of courses), negotiating the different courses to introduce with the hierarchy. Using concerns about stress development, cases of suicide, and media coverage on musculoskeletal problems and health at work, she managed to deflect the school management's proposals to add value to the technically-oriented courses (time or career management techniques, project management). She succeeded in including disciplines that challenge managerial practice to some extent, like ergonomics and psychosociology. She underscored the School's interest in taking a stand on such matters. She reassured her hierarchy regarding the social legitimacy of this demand at local level, reminding them that it was an issue explored in institutions like the local Aract or Medef. She also argued that she had contributors who could come in from these institutions and that the latter were open to partnerships with the school. In two other cases, CMSar activists managed to integrate critical modules within the existing syllabus (on diversity and environmental responsibility respectively), taking advantage of their hierarchy's interest in these topics.

CMSar activists' actions are not only developed with short-term goals. Their determination to change the Business School institution implies acting with a great deal of foresight. This was the strategy one CMSar applied when he attempted to introduce a fairer system of statutory changes for the administrative staff. He had a meeting with a member of the management team and tried to understand their strategic agenda. He presented the project to the latter, highlighting the small risk involved and emphasising his personal ability to mobilise the teaching faculty to this end. They then drew up a sales argument of the project together so that the director could more easily sell it to his hierarchy at the Chamber of Commerce. The CMSar activist argued that this type of action helps him to change the Business School's culture at its roots, which, in the longer term, will help him to introduce practices that challenge managerialism: *"I work here to challenge certain obvious inequalities. We can't think about introducing critical education practices or claim to change the role of Business Schools as reproducers of an elite as long as such inequalities remain in place. By working to improve the administrative staff's situation, I act on an important cultural aspect which, in the long run, will make it possible to introduce institutional changes that integrate critical values. We have to think in the medium or even the long term."*

Moreover, this capacity to work on projects that at first sight are not central to the strategic agenda of leaders requires the ability to develop a capital of trust with the School's various stakeholders. Meyerson (2001; 2003) argues that we often reduce analysis of the small wins approach to the strategies used, but in fact it should also include all the preparatory work that goes into achieving the small wins. That's why CMSar activists develop civil behaviour which represents numerous 'small wins' that together can create momentum. They work on elements which may appear minor, but which, over time, lead to concrete results: "It's a bit like a very delicate balance between acceptance and getting things moving. Something like, let's get inside a system and try to change it." They help others in many different ways in the hope of getting a return. As one of them said, he became "a good little soldier." Examples of exemplary civil behaviour are multiple. They may be for the organisation (taking on unpaid administrative tasks, agreeing to represent the institution outside the school walls, coordinating or managing cross-department projects, taking part in meetings to prepare for accreditations) or for their colleagues (tutoring young colleagues, picking out promising young colleagues, agreeing to represent the faculty in front of the management).

Organising collective movements.

CMSar activists try to promote their ideas by creating influential groups. To this end, they develop a long-term strategy, forming a population of "detonators" and "intermediaries" in their Business School. As one of them put it, they encourage people they consider as harbouring critical values to take managerial responsibility in running the School. These can include positions as staff representatives for the personnel, trade union delegates or members of an academic committee. Their work does not end with the teaching faculty but involves joining the management. This determination to multiply the sources of change or to drive the Business School's social body towards a collective dynamic of emancipation also involves direct personal work.

This was how one CMSar activist tried to get the dangers of psycho-social risks recognised within her organisation. She set up a working group on the issue and got as many people as possible involved in the project. She presented it to several influential professors in order to get their advice and make them her allies, and attempted to create links between the administrative staff and the teaching faculty. This was also true of another CMSar activist who sought to challenge the extreme managerial practices of some colleagues (a canyoning course) to develop the students' managerial skills. In this case, the CMSar activist met the director of the school to remind him of the risks of such practices. He worked with colleagues who were well-acknowledged in the school so they could make a stand with him against these transgressive practices. He explained the interest of developing courses that would make students think about power struggles, and suggested that other colleagues set up a module integrating this issue from a critical perspective. He tried to raise the trade union representative's awareness to the issue, without attempting to take over. The CMSar activist focused his attention on developing an alternative course offer.

This type of collective dynamic can also found in the field of research. Here, a CMSar activist worked to create a collective critical laboratory structure that would be supported by the A or B ranking Business School. Critical research spread through the School structure without ever becoming completely institutionalised, for fear of losing its corporate backing: *"When we had to create laboratories, there was a debate about the topics. At one point, I was told to do something. I suggested a CMS laboratory, which would balance our offer. We changed the name as there was a fear it would scare the companies. That was the only issue. It was rather a case of "do what you like but don't make it too obvious."*

Quietly open about their ideological difference.

CMSar activists are quietly open about their critical ideas, not vehemently, but without hiding them. In the teaching field, they openly describe their courses as critical: "I don't feel at all limited in my teaching, whether in the content or the form of my courses. I design the courses I want. They can be critical and incorporate any analytical framework, it's not a problem for me. To some extent, there's a cult of humanities in Business Schools. It's not central, but it adds that extra spark of humanity." She uses this to introduce material that's openly critical which she adds to her course bibliography. The action attempts to be effective on a small-scale basis (the majority of courses are electives with fewer than 50 students). She has a big impact on the teaching faculty: "I only have one elective but it helps to open a window. With those (teachers) who have doubts about the model, we talk about it more. I was recently given more responsibility in the school's academic programme; it's still only utilitarian, but it helps to get things moving anyway."

CMSar activists use the school's exploitation of their quietly open ideological difference to put across their ideas: "I'm the living proof of the school's biodiversity to the outside world. They use my reputation to show that we don't just teach technical matters in our institution but that we think too. I'm well aware of the situation but it doesn't bother me as long as it helps me put my ideas across." From being a potential problem, the CMSar activist has become a real resource for the School's external legitimacy. He uses this image capital to become president of the faculty association, which gives him greater access to decision-makers both in the school and at the Chamber of Commerce. He can also count on certain resources to introduce openly critical programmes, like support from the communications department and the use of a secretary.

In terms of research, CMSar activists focus their work on their personal convictions. Based on their expertise in academic publishing, they invite other non critical researchers to join them in writing conference papers or articles. This leads to constructive debates in which the CMSar activist clears up misunderstandings: "I get into discussion with non critical researchers. It's always a bit difficult the first time. They equate my work with a critical thinking approach. I show them that I'm just looking for alternatives to promote a democratic system in the business organisation. At first, they're surprised and then we gradually start talking." This activist tries to promote critical research by raising aware-

ness of the topics through the organisation of academic or more managerial events in the School. He invites external critical scholars so that they can firstly raise faculty and student awareness to these areas and secondly help local researchers to better understand how academic publishing works. Finally, he tries to get budgets from inside or outside the school to finance the critical studies he conducts with colleagues external to the school.

Real results based on varied resources.

As one CMSar told us, this activist position helps her to influence the way the management system works in her Business School: "Sometimes I think I'm not in my place, think about leaving or distancing myself because I have to put up with practices and discourse that are very far from my beliefs, but I soon realised that this malaise is worth it as I saw my action bear fruit. Sometimes, I think that I have the influence, with others of course, to change things for the better." Several CMSar activists reported both individual and collective results over time. One of them was able change the way the Dean of Faculty was chosen by realising how to take advantage of the difficulties that arose during prior elections. Another obtained a more collaborative system of faculty promotion by taking up the issue during a meeting on course distribution. He also helped to introduce faculty career management parity commissions by using negotiations conducted with Chamber of Commerce representatives. In another case, the CMSar activist obtained a reassessment of the status of his research assistants. Yet another managed to obtain a supplementary pension allowance paid by the Chamber of Commerce after the withdrawal of a specific system for all the personnel.

In teaching terms, this activist position has enabled several crucial electives to run for many years (critical approaches to management tools, reflections on socially responsible savings…) as major options. The CMSar activist has managed to attract a regular flow of students. He creates a loyal following of colleagues from his institution, ensuring that his courses are reputed for their quality. In terms of research, his investment in both collective and individual dynamics has yielded encouraging results. In the first instance, critical research structures have been set up or critical avenues have appeared in mainstream laboratories, which were applauded during visits by accreditation bodies. Secondly, productive collaboration has resulted in the publication of work that is valued by the institution. The CMSar activist has been able to convince colleagues who previously had doubts about the critical perspective. Some of the events developed have led to collaboration between CMSar activists in different institutions, enabling critical research to develop further.

Analysis of the findings indicates that the activist position enables CMSar activists to enjoy relative autonomy and influence, leading to the development of collective dynamics that impact on the way Business Schools work. Their central position, illustrating their acceptance within the structure, implies knowing how to manage a range of resources.

Firstly, internally, when there is a culture of tolerance to ideological difference. The internal climate is marked by tolerance to ideological

diversity: "I've never felt like a victim of censure. We're very free, we have the resources, and the School supports us in our professional development." CMSar activists' careers were not affected by their critical position. All the members of the organisation know about their critical positioning and respect it. CMSar activists noted that it is possible to reach positions of responsibility in the School (Dean, department head, or even manager of a group entity), even with a critical positioning and this, no matter what the level of the Business School (A or B ranking).

These CMSar activists were able to count on a manager's open-minded attitude to ideological difference, and were able to develop relationships built on trust. This trust is based on the idea of reciprocity, which does not appear to bother the CMSar activists interviewed: "Yes, I know that I'm used. But I know. I go to see the Director to get commitments from the School. I don't care if people talk about me afterwards. I'm beginning to have influence and legitimacy: perhaps in the long-term I'll get more resources as well as the potential to recruit." Several insisted on the importance of building these relations of trust with the managers, although they added that the departure of the latter meant that they had to rebuild the relationship.

Externally, they make offensive use of diversified social capital. Firstly, they are involved in the world of academia. Compared to other faculty members in their Business School, they rank as top-flight researchers and this no matter what the level of their Business School (A or B). In the first case, they have published in level 1 and 2 journals according to CNRS rankings, or are members of peer review panels or association committees at both national and international level. In the second case, they have published in CNRS-ranked level 3 journals, their reputation is national (member of peer review panels, association committees). CMSar activists feature as a key element in the academic quality of the critical course offer proposed by the School. They also have local or even national business connections and their internal institutional position, like chairing the faculty association or holding the status of Dean, has also helped them to develop ties with decision-makers in the Chamber of Commerce.

DISCUSSION

Implications for research

After noting that ideological tension management (belonging to an organisation with a conflicting ideological orientation) for CMSars in Business Schools has previously been depicted in the literature largely as a solitary and defensive search for identity in a hostile environment, the present article analyses its potential to impact on how institutions are run (in terms of administration, teaching and research). More specifically, it seeks to answer three questions: how do CMS manage their ideological tension and how do they introduce changes in a reproduc-

tive system as well-established as Business Schools? What strategies are brought to bear? What resources are used?

Equating CMSars with tempered radicals (Meyerson & Scully, 1995), the present study shows that two distinct positions are adopted (oppositional and activist) in the management of their ideological tension. This finding adds to the critical community debate between the protagonists of critical engagement (Grey, 2007) and the notion of critical distance (Rowlinson & Hassard, 2011). More specifically, examining each position enabled us to define both "the conditions of possibility" (Fournier and Grey, 2000) and the difficulties inherent in critical education in Business Schools, or of envisaging areas for change (Grey, 2007).

The activist position provides an answer to the question raised by several authors (Zald, 2002; Smith, 2008), namely, is it is possible for CMSars to move beyond their marginal status and acquire a central role in the running of their Business School without losing their critical identity (Alvesson & Willmott, 1996; Voronov, 2008)? CMSar activists hold a range of managerial responsibilities (heads of department, research laboratories, Dean) and their actions are developing. Although we only interviewed a limited number of CMSars, the data collected shows that it is possible not only to survive, but also to exist as a CMSar, and to have an impact on the "course of things." Even if not all the achievements of CMSars (improvement of staff working conditions) related here will change the role of business schools as reproductive systems of an elite and a dominant economic order in the short-term, they show that forms of intrusion in decision-making systems are possible. If they their power is insufficient to ensure the emergence of critical Business Schools (Grey, 2007), CMSars can nonetheless acquire relative autonomy and influence the way their institution operates. There have been some significant advances: the creation of critical laboratories and courses (core programme and electives), fairer career practises, and the development of environmental responsibility. Our work, like that of Dany (2009b), contradicts the notion that only the work of 'mainstream' authors counts.

Our study illustrates how CMSar activists achieve encouraging results, and are optimistic with regard to the potential for change in Business Schools. Without denying that such institutions are at the heart of an ideological reproductive system (Lazuech, 1999; Thrift, 2005) which they disagree with, they believe they can alter the system from the inside. In other words, they believe it is possible for them to find partners open to dialogue on projects that incorporate their critical values. They do not see the hierarchy or mainstream researchers as adversaries or people whose positions are set in stone. Their actions thus fit into two temporal horizons. Initially they focus on a short-term goal and obtain various results with the introduction of critical courses or critical programmes. With regard to research, they begin to manage laboratories or get involved in projects with new colleagues. Secondly, in the longer term, they attempt to make the School operate in a more socially or environmentally responsible way. These outcomes correlate with a number of mini victories that permit the CMSar activists to consolidate

their identity and create a loyal support base for longer-term, more critical projects. Without refuting the importance of short-term initiatives, CMSar activists realise that they cannot easily introduce critical programmes without firstly changing some of the institution's modes of operation at the root. Far from being minor, over-valued victories that compensate for a lack of development of more obvious critical changes in the short term, these changes are seen as stages in an arduous process. CMSar activists take on board the idea that their Business School can be a perfectible organisation, combining its members' emancipation with economic performance (Smith, 2008). By positioning themselves as engaged scholars (Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006; Voronov, 2005), they move away from the more intransigent definition of a critical researcher who refuses to get involved with the management (Contu, 2009).

Lastly, they underscore the importance of the Business School arena for developing their critical action compared to society as a whole. They use the Business School as a privileged space for critical action in that it concentrates the business leaders of tomorrow and is therefore an ideal platform for achieving considerable leverage. This builds on a number of studies supporting such a position (Perriton & Reynolds, 2004; Zald, 2002; Grey & Willmott, 2002; Ford et al, 2010). The last condition is the low ideological tension felt by CMSar activists (Smith, 2008). They insist that it is entirely possible to square their work in a Business School with their critical values. This is far removed from the identity tensions described by Smircich (1986) or Parker (2004).

Our findings indicate that these orientations need a favourable environment in which to flourish. To develop an activist position, CMSars must be able to count on three elements: a culture and a manager open to ideological difference, and diversified social capital. This finding is worth noting as, while the literature on tempered radicals (Meyerson, 2001, 2003; Courpasson & Thoenig, 2008) has identified the importance of the first two factors, little research on CMSars has focused on the latter. Zald (2002) and Smith (2008) suggest that the culture of openness to ideological difference is crucial for CMSars to achieve anything in their Business School, but do not mention the role of the manager, while Parker (2005) and Burrell (2009) do not mention their line manager's support in their examples. Parker (2005) describes these relations as difficult, fearing that proximity with the School's management would distance them from the faculty, particularly the critical faculty that they feel close to. Our work contradicts this view. On the contrary, the CMSar activists we met value the role of the manager whose advice and open-mindedness offers them avenues to work on that can lead to operational success. Here we see one of the pillars in the construction of a space for coproducing change, where the different parties do not see each other as irreducible enemies but rather as players with divergent interests who are capable of finding common ground (Courpasson et al, 2011).

Our study identifies the mobilisation of diversified social capital in addition to these two contextual resources that CMSar activists use in an

offensive manner, in other words, to advance their ideas in their Business School. This brings us to their involvement in the world of academia (Tinker, 2002; Zald, 2002) and the level of publications (Perriton & Reynolds, 2004; Smith, 2008) identified by the literature on CMSars, in the same way as the role of the network is identified by the literature on tempered radicals (Meyerson & Scully, 1995; Meyerson, 2001, 2003; Courpasson & Thoenig, 2008). Till now, however, the literature on CMSars in Business Schools has considered social capital as a means to maintain their threatened critical identity (Smircich, 1986; Perriton & Reynolds, 2004). Our work suggests a more offensive reading, indicating that CMSar communities use their social capital to advance their ideas and values and not simply to defend them, and that they try to gain influence in their organisation to this end. Moreover, unlike the literature that emphasises the homogeneity of social capital, our study highlights its diversity. It's this capacity to mobilise and develop resonance between very different spheres (the world of national and international research or the world of local and national entrepreneurship) that forms the basis of change dynamics for CMSar activists.

Our study also makes a number of contributions to the analysis of strategies. The activist position appears to use three strategies in its development: the small wins logic, being quietly open about their ideological difference, and organising collective action. This indicates that some kind of genuine political orientation is at work. The capacity to articulate the collective and individual dimensions as well as management, teaching and research indicates a situation not previously described in the critical education and research literature, and is an important contribution of our research. Based on their experience as managers, Parker (2004) and Burrell (2009) highlight the tensions linked to managerial position for a CMSar. Even if it seems obvious to them that they are holding this type of position to further their ideas, they remain vague as to how to go about creating legitimacy for the new practices in a system as well-established as a Business School. Our study shows that CMSar activists are able to develop collective meaning around projects shared by all the employees in a Business School (administrative staff and teaching faculty) and to analyse the strategic agenda of decision-makers.

On the other hand, the oppositional position appears to show a CMSar who seeks to remain "an outsider within." In this case, we find the positioning described by critical autonomists (Harney, 2007; Rowlinson & Hassard, 2011) for whom it is not possible to change Business Schools from the inside. Most critical actions must therefore be conducted from outside Business Schools at the level of civil society. This divide leads radical CMSars to feel deep ideological tension similar to that described by Smircich (1986) or Parker (2004). Their action generates modest results with regard to introducing alternatives to existing practice (improvement of some personal situations, adhesion of a few students to critical values). The radical CMSar is sidelined and pays a considerable professional price (less promotion) and personal price (stress, frustration). They put more effort into the social sphere than academia. To retain this delicate positioning (Perriton and Reynolds, 2004), radi-

cal CMSars develop conflictual strategies (entering into conflict in their Business School), or a form of withdrawal (existing clandestinely as a radical CMSar) and make defensive use of available resources (specialised social capital, quality of teaching as perceived by the students, moment when they joined the Business School).

This is not to say that those adopting an oppositional position do not get results, but they tend to be modest in relation to the personal price they pay. Not much can be learnt from this oppositional position with regard to the question raised in the present article, namely, what does the management CMSars' ideological tension generate in the way of change in a system of reproduction as well-established as Business Schools? The main answer to this question from the oppositional position can be summed up as we saw in the fairer treatment of a few isolated cases and high teaching quality according to the students. It would appear that the less conflictual strategy (existing clandestinely) achieves better results than direct conflict. These results build on other research work (Watson, 2001; Perriton and Reynolds, 2004; Parker, 2003, 2004) by offering concrete examples of the activities of these radical CMSars. They also show that the oppositional position can lead CMSars to consider leaving, or even to leave.

Prospects and limitations

We do not claim to have covered all possible situations with just 17 cases. There is certainly a lot more diversity among the CMSar community in Business Schools than that suggested here, which contrasts 'radicals' with 'activists'. The analysis needs to be pursued with a much larger sample population. Thus, is it possible for very negative radical CMSars to exist in Business Schools if they have considerable research output that has made them 'untouchable'?

More globally, our research gives concrete reality to the second scenario depicted by Grey (2007), namely, engagement in the future and the potential for existence of CMSars in Business Schools. He shows that it is possible to shift the debate in Business Schools in a more critical direction. However, this means taking further what Smith (2008) describes as CMSar activists' key orientation: "to play the game until the critical movement is able to change the rules" (p.23). Several avenues are suggested with this in mind.

The first is to have a say in recruitment. To this end, far from hampering their work, the pressure to publish that has spread through Business Schools can be an advantage. Our data indicates that CMSar activists increase their capacity to influence the decisions made in their Business Schools thanks to their research output. In their view, promoting the critical academic community by attending conferences or joining peer review panels to make critical journals more prominent in the rankings is a key factor in increasing their influence within their institution. In the same way, our findings suggest that becoming a PhD supervisor or co-authoring with young researchers enables many critical scholars to enhance their academic legitimacy in their institution, consequently facilitating their recruitment. Moreover, this same pressure to publish that has emerged in universities can lead CMSars to leave as they do not

have the means to finance their work. They thus join Business Schools in order to pursue their research work.

The second potential for further research concerns getting involved at managerial level, at the risk of becoming a target for criticism from more radical colleagues (Harney, 2007; Contu, 2009; Rowlinson & Hassard, 2011). Grey (2007) describes this in his third scenario of taking control of a Business School. He argues that by joining the mainstream in these institutions, CMSar activists will obviously be the target of new forms of criticism. The paper by Rowlinson and Hassard (2011) offers a striking example. Describing themselves as autonomous critics, the authors, sharply question CMSar activists in Business Schools. They point to the lack of results obtained after 30 years of effort in these institutions, particularly in managerial terms. Nonetheless, if critical Business Schools still remain a long way off, some CMSar activists do hold managerial positions (heads of department, research laboratories, Dean) and their actions are developing. CMSar activists now need to move beyond the first stage by applying for managerial positions in their institutions. This is quite a leap forward but it is achievable. Our work leads us to believe that it could happen in a number of cases. Of course, many studies, like those of Rowlinson and Hassard (2011), and accounts by radical CMSars of the careers of more activist individuals, lead us to underscore the identity-related pressure that can be felt by CMSars who accept such new managerial challenges. This is why we suggest that the future of CMSars in Business Schools also requires closer links between CMSar activists in different institutions. Several CMSar activists told us that they had developed mutual ties. Some are now considered as models and accept this role. They give advice on how to successfully introduce a critical programme or provide contacts with suitable outside contributors. They also suggest lines of critical thinking that the management would be ready to listen to.

Finally, several of the limitations in the present study could open up new lines of research. One weakness concerns the resources and strategies described. While we attempted to describe them in as much depth as possible, there is potential for more work in this area. In this regard, a study that analyses the impact of the role of the manager or an open-minded culture on the capacity to develop an activist position could be of great interest. For example, we noted that in both cases when the manager left the institution, the legitimacy of the CMSar's work was undermined. The latter then had to rebuild a capital of trust. Worse, in one case, the arrival of a person opposed to his "ideological subversion" work, in the words of the CMSar, made it impossible. A study that examines the impact of a change to the head of department, the Dean or the Business School director, could give useful insights into this area. It could be especially interesting to identify the impact at different levels, or to analyse certain combinations (departure of the Dean and the Director). Regarding the open-minded culture, it would be interesting to conduct a longitudinal study on the impact of the growing internationalisation of the faculty. Several CMSars pointed out that almost all of these profiles adhere to the mainstream model. Their high rate of turnover makes it more difficult for CMSar activists' to

implement change strategies which imply a long-term commitment. We also believe that it would be useful to gain more insight into the role of mentors in developing strong convictions, something we were unable to follow up on in the present study. This line of enquiry would help us to compare the contribution made by different forms of social support, whether interpersonal (manager and mentor) or collective (Business School network and culture).

The second promising line of research involves an investigation of the critical scholar's career. Several factors point to the potential of this line. Firstly, there has been a growing migration of academics towards Business Schools. Secondly, it is an important variable in the position adopted by CMSars in Business Schools in the UK. For Rowlinson and Hassard (2011), Business Schools are the refuge of CMSar activists running away from the private sector where they can no longer develop professionally as their values differ so radically from those of their organisations (Zizek, 2007). Our data does not allow us to confirm if this is true in France as none of the CMSar activists we interviewed mentioned this factor. However, we believe it would be interesting to conduct a comparison of CMSars in French and UK Business Schools with regard to this aspect of their career.

Finally, we believe it would be useful to explore the links between radical and activist CMSars. More specifically, how do CMSar activists manage the most radical? Rowlinson and Hassard (2011) and Harder (2004) both point to managers' difficulties in making choices with critical colleagues. It would be useful to conduct several case studies to question both profiles within a single Business School on this area. This could help us to identify areas of agreement and conflict, and to study the obstacles and contributions to creating internal legitimacy for critical analyses by radical CMSars in their actions conducted outside the Business School.

François GRIMA is Lecturer at UPEC and Associate Professor at Reims Management School. Member of the IRG, his research work focuses on managing role conflict and career transition in difficult contexts.

REFERENCES

■ Adler, P. (2008).
CMS: Resist the Three Complacencies. *Organization, 15*(6), 925-926.

■ Adler, P., Forbes, L., & Willmott H. (2008).
Critical Management Studies. In J. Walsh & A. Breif, *The Academy of Management Annals* (pp. 119-179). London: Routledge.

■ Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1996).
Making Sense of Management: A critical Introduction. London: Sage.

■ Barney, R. (1997).
Higher Education: a Critical Business. Buckingham: Open University Press.

■ Bertaux, D. (2001).
Les récits de vie. Paris: Nathan.

■ Bourdieu, P. (1989).
La Noblesse d'Etat. Grandes écoles et esprit de corps. Paris: Minuit.

■ Burrell, G. (2009).
Handbooks, Swarms, and Living Dangerously. In M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman & H. Willmott (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies* (pp. 551-62). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

■ Clegg, S., Kornberger, M., Carter, C., & Rhodes, C. (2006).
 For Management? *Management Learning, 37(*1), 7-27.

■ Cohen, J. (1960).
A coefficient of agreement fot nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*(1), 37-46.

■ Cohen, L., & Mallon, M. (2001).
My brilliant career? Using stories as a Methodological Tool in Careers Research., *International Studies of Management and Organizations, 31*(3), 48-68.

■ Cooke, B. (2008).
If Critical Management Studies is your problem…. *Organization*, 15(6), 912-914.

■ Contu, A. (2009).
Critical Management Education. In M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman & H. Willmott (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies* (pp. 536-550) Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

■ Courpasson, D. Dany, F., & Clegg, S. (2011).
Resisters at Work: Generating Productive Resistance in the Workplace. *Organization Science,* forthcoming, 1-19.

■ Courpasson, D., & Thoenig, J.-C. (2008).
Quand les cadres se rebellent. Paris : Vuibert.

■ Courpasson, D. & Golsorkhi, D. (2011).
Power and resistance : Variations on "what's going on politically in anda round organizations?". *M@n@gement, 14*(1), 1-46.

■ Creed, D. (2003).
Voice Lessons: Tempered Radicalism and the Use of Voice and Silence. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*(6), 1503-1536.

■ Cunliffe, A., Forray, J., & Knights, D. (2002).
Considering Management Education: Insights from Critical Management Studies. *Journal of Management Education, 26*(5), 489-495.

■ Cunliffe, A. (2008).
Will You Still Need Me…When I'm 64 ? The Future of CMS. *Organization, 15*(6), 936-938.

■ Cunliffe, A., & Linstead, S. (2009).
Introduction : Teaching from Critical Perspectives. *Management Learning, 40*(1), 5-9.

■ Czarniawska, B. (2001).
Having Hope in Paralogy. *Human Relations, 54*(1), 13-21.

■ Dany, F. (2009a).
Comment échapper aux dérives managérialistes ? Des apports des auteurs critiques pour la recherche en GRH. *Economies et Sociétés, 43(*12), 2153-2184.

■ Dany, F. (2009b).
Recherche critique en GRH et critique de la recherche : un voyage au cœur de la littérature qui met à mal certaines idées reçues. In D. Golsorkhi, I. Huault & B. Leca (Eds.), *Les approches critiques de management* (pp. 307-328). Laval, France: PUL.

■ Dehler, D. (2009).
Propects and Possibilities of Critical Management Education: Critical Beings and a Pedagogy of Critical Action. *Management Learning, 40*(1), 31-49.

■ Edmondson Bell, E., Meyerson, D., Nkomo, S., & Scully, M. (2003).
Interpreting Silence and Voice in the Workplace. *The journal of applied behavioural science, 39*(4), 381-414.

■ Essers, C., & Benschop, Y. (2007).
Enterprising Identities: Female Entrepreneurs of Moroccan or Turkish Origin in the Netherlands. *Organization Studies 28*(1), 49-69.

■ Ford, J., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2010).
Who is it that Would Make Business Schools More Critical ? Critical Reflections on Critical Management Studies. *British Journal of Management, 21*, 71-81.

■ Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000).
At the Critical Moment: Conditions and Prospects for Critical Management Studies, *Human Relations, 53*(1), 7-32.

■ Ghoshal, S. (2005).
Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4*(1), 75-91.

■ Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Clough, P., & Moore, M. (2004).
Researching Life Stories: Method, Theory and Analyses in a Biographical Age. London: Routledge Falmer.

■ Grey, C. (2002).
What are the Business School for? On Silence and Voice in Management Education. *Journal of Management Education, 26*(5), 496-511.

■ Grey, C., & Willmott, H. (2002).
Contexts of CMS. *Organization, 9*(3), 411-418.

■ Grey, C. (2004).
Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education. *Academy of Management learning and Education, 3*(2), 178-186.

■ Grey, C. (2007).
Possibilities for Critical Management Education and Studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 23*(4), 463-71.

■ Harney, S. (2007).
Socialization and the business school. *Management Learning, 38*(2), 139-153.

■ Huault, I., & Golsorkhi, D. (2006).
Pierre Bourdieu : critique et réflexivité comme attitude analytique en Sciences de Gestion. *Revue Française de Gestion, 32*(165), 15-34.

■ Kirton, G., Greene, A., & Dean, D. (2007).
British diversity professionals as change agents – radicals, tempered radicals or liberal reformers? *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(11), 1979-1994.

■ Lazuech, G. (1999).
L'exception française. Le modèle des grandes écoles à l'épreuve de la mondialisation. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

■ Locke, K. (2001).
Grounded theory in management research. London: Sage.

■ Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2008).
Intensive Remedial Identity Work: Responses to Workplace Bullying Trauma and Stigmatization. *Organization, 15*(1), 97-119.

■ Memmi, A. (1965).
The Colonizer and the Colonized. Boston: Beacon Press.

■ Meyerson, D. (2001).
Tempered Radical: How People Use Difference to Inspire Change at Work. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

■ Meyerson, D. (2003).
Tempered Radicals: How Everyday Leaders Inspire Change at Work. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

■ Meyerson, D., & Scully, M. (1995).
Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change. *Organization Science, 6*(6), 585-600.

■ Mintzberg, H. (2005).
Des managers, des vrais! Pas des MBA. Un regard critique sur le management et son enseignement. Paris : Editions d'Organisation.

■ Parker, M. (2002).
Against Management. Oxford: Polity.

■ Parker, M. (2003).
Introduction: Ethics, Politics and Organizing. *Organization, 10*(2), 187-203.

■ Parker, M (2004).
Becoming Manager – or, the Werewolf Looks Anxiously in the Mirror, Checking for Unusual Facial Hair. *Management Learning, 35*(1) 45-59.

■ Patriotta, G., & Starkey, K. (2008).
From utilitarian morality to moral imagination: Reimagining the business school. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 17*(4), 319-327.

■ Perriton, L., & Reynolds, M. (2004).
Critical Management Education: From Pedagogy of Possibility to Pedagogy of Refusal. *Management Learning, 35*(1), 61-77.

■ Pesqueux, Y. (2007).
La gestion, exception sectorielle ou prototype de la 'privatisation' de l'enseignement supérieur? *Revue française de gestion, 9/10*(178-179), 43-54.

■ Reedy, P. (2003).
Together We Stand? An Investigation into the Concept of Solidarity in Management Education. *Management Learning, 34*(1), 91-109.

■ Rowlinson, M., & Hassard, J. (2011).
How come the critters came to be teaching in business schools? Contradictions in the institutionalization of critical management studies. *Organization, 18*(5), 673-689.

■ Smircich, L. (1986).
Can a Radical Humanist Find Happiness Working in a Business School? Paper presented at the symposium Alignment in the Development of Social Science – Towards a New Role for Organizational Development, Annual Meetings of the Academy of Management, Chicago.

■ Smith, W. (2008).
Critical Management Studies: Accountability and Authenticity. *Critical Sociology, 34*(1), 15-28.

■ Snell, R., & James, K. (1994).
Beyond the Tangible in Management Education and Development. *Management Learning, 17*(1), 43-64.
Speaking Out on Critical Management Studies. *Organization, 15*(6), 911, 2008.

■ Stookey, S. (2008).
The future of Critical Management Studies: Populism and Elitism. *Organization, 15*(6), 922-924.

■ Tinker, T. (2002).
Disciplinary spin. *Organization, 9*(2), 419-427.

■ Townley, B. (1993).
Performance Appraisal And The Emergence Of Management. *Journal of Management Studies, 30*(2) 221-238.

■ Thrift, N. J. (2005).
Knowing capitalism. London: Sage.

■ Van de Ven, A. H., & Johnson, P. E. (2006).
Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(4), 802-821.

■ Voronov, M. (2008).
Toward Engaged Critical Management Studies. *Organization, 15*(6), 939-945.

■ Walsh, J., & Weber, K. (2002).
The Prospects for Critical Management Studies in the American Academy of Management. *Organization, 9*(3), 402-410.

■ Watson, T. (2001).
Beyond Managism: Negotiated Narratives and Critical Management Education in Practice. *British Journal of Management, 12*(4), 385-396.

■ Watson, T. (2004).
HRM and Critical Social Science Analysis. *Journal of Management Studies, 41*(3), 447-467.

■ Watson, T. (2007).
HRM, critique, pragmatism and the sociological imagination. Paper presented at the fifth conference on "Critical Management Studies", Manchester.

■ Weber, M. (1949).
The methodology of the Social Sciences. (E.A. Shils & H.A. Finch, Ed. & Trans.). New York: Free Press.

■ Weick, K. (1984).
Small Wins: Redefining the Scale of Social Problems. *American Psychologist, 39*(1), 40-49.

■ Willmott, H. (2008).
Critical Management and Global Justice. *Organization, 15*(6), 927-931.

■ Zald, M. (2002).
Spinning Disciplines: Critical Management Studies in the Context of the Transformation of Management Education, *Organization, 9*(3) 365-85.

■ Žižek, S. (2007).
Resistance is Surrender. London: London Review of Books.