

A Pedagogy for Critical Citizenship

The 8th International Conference in Critical Management Studies
University of Manchester, 10-12 July 2013

Dr Andrew Armitage

Abstract

This paper will respond to the concerns, and challenges as to how “liberal learning” and the “humanities” can be mobilised in management and business studies. It will draw its central thesis from the transformative pedagogy of Paulo Freire to place it within the context of the economic, cultural, social, political, ecological, and ethical issues and crisis that confronts higher educators and students in today’s higher education institutions. It will first address the need for a critical pedagogy for a critical citizenship curriculum, before turning its attentions of doing critical citizenship where scenarios taken from classroom are offered as a means of challenging the conventional wisdom that students hold within their bounded curriculums, and the pedagogical practices of higher education teachers. Central to this learning approach is the concept of conscientization, the bringing into being of critical consciousness, as teachers and students work tougher in their heightened awareness of their situated reality, and in the co-creating of knowledge, this being essential to understanding the territory and essence of critical citizenship management education. It will conclude by arguing that the beginnings of the critical turn for a critical citizenship education is rooted in a critical pedagogy, founded upon the dialogical process, and the reflexive turn, these being central to the pursuit of individual liberty and freedom in the education process.

Key words: Critical pedagogy, dialogue, reflection, reflexivity.

Introduction

‘the distinctive mark of a university is a place where [the student] has the opportunity of education in conversation with their teachers, his fellows and himself, and where he is not encouraged to confuse education with training for a profession, with learning the tricks of the trade, with preparation for future particular service in society or with the acquisition of a kind of moral or intellectual outfit to see them through life. Whenever an ulterior purpose of this sort makes its appearance, education (which is concerned with personas, not functions) steals out of the back door with noiseless steps’

Michael Oakeshott (1950)

Michael Oakeshott’s prophetic quote is still today central to the *raison d’être* of the contemporary UK Higher Education System, where many argue that the teaching profession is today a technician level activity and an instrument of government policy. To avoid criticism from government and society teachers take refuge in “rote learning” and teach to tests to ensure they are not reproached for poor performance. League tables have replaced creativity and the freedom to think – the freedom to be human. However, this league table mentality has now gone beyond compulsory school education, it now inhabits all sectors of education and includes the tertiary

and higher education sectors alike. It is a profession society should trust to “educate” our young. However, it is they who are now shackled by a performance-based system that destroys the very essence of education – that of free expression and critical thinking. In such an oppressive environment pupils become clients, clients demand service and value for money and this entails by de facto educational success in the guise of “payment for results”. Education in its quest for “higher quality outputs” has paradoxically lowered the bar of “success” to allow the vast majority to succeed as it replicates a production line mentality. This applies to all sectors of education where rote learning is the accepted method of acquiring new knowledge and skills, and stands in contrast with Knight (2005) who notes:

‘It is not the job of universities to promote a particular political orthodoxy; it is their role to educate students to examine critically policies, ideas, concepts and systems, then to make up their own minds. The Funding Council should support that objective, including, from time to time, telling the government that the university curriculum is none of its business’

Adult education and citizenship education it has been argued does not escape the gaze of critics for its lack of a critical lens, and the need of a critical turn within the higher education system. Despite the moves to introduce the notions of ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) into all areas of the university education, for example, engineering, business studies, and journalism (see, for example, Jones *et al*, 2010), the concept of the critical citizen has been foreshadowed on the one hand by the wider societal rhetoric and discourse that is enacted out in the public gaze between the media, financial, industrial corporations and their interests, and those of governmental responses on the other hand. Whilst this discourse is welcome, those whose lives are directly affected by corporate and governmental interests have been left without a voice. This is evinced by the growing concerns and criticisms as to how higher education curriculum is delivered (see, for example, Reynolds, 1999a and 1999b; Holman, 2000; Cunliffe, 2002; Hagen, Miller and Johnson, 2003; Jones *et al*, 2010; Usher *et al*, 1997), which has occurred against the backcloth of contemporary organisational environments that are underpinned by managerialist practices.

Despite these tensions, Robbins (2008) has noted that democratic ideals and human rights are still worth the struggle even though their influence is obscured by the current market driven political landscape, and is something Gramsci (1971) advocated by noting that the working class needs to develop its own intellectuals to challenge conservative ideologues so they can transform the structural conditions that reproduce social inequality that capitalism entails. As Gramsci’s (1971:10) states ‘the mode of being of the new intellectual can no longer consist of verbal eloquence but in active participation in practical life, as constructor, organizer, permanent persuader, and not just a simple orator’. Others though have identified that the challenge of higher education is one that requires the adoption of a “critical attitude” to challenge modernist practices and orthodoxy and to uphold individual values and emancipatory practices in the workplace (Brookfield, 2005). As Usher *et al* (1997:39) have noted there has been a focus whereby ‘critical pedagogy has begun to move beyond a predominately school orientation to take account of the broader educational contexts and intermeshing of the political, the cultural and the educational addressed by Freirean pedagogy’. This is also advocated by Fieldhouse (1992:11) who has argued that a community education attempts to combine a

specific social purpose of liberal adult education and a critical structural analysis of the radicals that is aimed at 'providing individuals with knowledge which they can use collectively to change society if they so wish, and particularly equipping members of the working class with the intellectual tools to play a full role in a democratic society or to challenge the inequalities and injustices of society in order to bring about radical social change'.

A pedagogy for critical citizenship

Hyslop-Margison and Thayer (2009) have argued the case for education for democratic participation and claim there is growing political alienation caused by the lack of genuine choice available to citizens within neo-liberal market economies, stating that 'a program for citizenship and democratic education must be embedded within a transformative framework that view democratic citizenship and society as fluid, dynamic and flexible in character' (Hyslop-Margison and Thayer, 2009:97). However, as Rowe (1990:129) has previously noted:

'...the university has shaped itself to an industrial ideal – the knowledge factory. Now it is overloaded and top-heavy with expertness and information. It has become a know-how institution when it ought to be a know-why institution. Its goal should be deliverance from the crushing with of undervalued facts, from bare-bones cognition or ignorant knowledge: knowing in fragment, knowing without duration, knowing without commitment'

Stan Rowe's prophetic words could have been written about contemporary university education, which is now a fragmented production line of knowledge, where skills are delivered in "bite sized" modules. The education system and universities in particular, have "unlearned" society how to think critically by the continuous quest for examination success and certified status. We have now reached a point where education itself has become uncritical and has alienated teachers, lecturers, administrators and researchers from the true quest of its endeavours – that of free thought and expression, innovation, tolerance, equity, justice, integrity, rigour and transparency. Munck (2008:7) echoes these sentiments when citing Banks (2003) stating that:

'in reality it is the universities that are failing in their traditional educational function. Therefore, we should grasp the nettle and admit that most universities have not done a terribly good job of educating global citizens in a diverse world'. It can be argued that university education has been sacrificed on the "alter of compliance".

However, since the 1990's there has been a gradual creep of anti-intellectualism in the higher education system, whereby creativity and individual genius have been pushed to the margins, and children who display an enquiring mind that goes beyond the boundaries of the national curriculum and learning outcomes are regarded as "troublemakers" who do not fit in. We have stifled and failed those who are in need of intellectual challenges that go beyond the "course text book" by systemising and "procedurising" education packages that are produced at the end of a production line. The education system has "unlearned" society how to think critically by the continuous quest for examination success and certified status. For example, O'Toole (2005) has identified that there has been preponderance for business schools to

“churn out” irrelevant research that has not translated into curriculum design and teaching delivery outputs, and stands in contrast with a UNESCO (2004) report concerning the function of a university’s contribution to research and teaching as being:

‘Universities must function as places of research and learning for sustainable development....Higher education should provide leadership by practicing what they teach through sustainable purchasing, investments, and facilities that are integrated with teaching, and learning....Higher education should emphasize experiential, inquiry based problem-solving, interdisciplinary systems approaches, and critical thinking. Curricula need to be developed, including content, materials, and tools such as case studies and the identification of best practices’

This it can be argued this is not entirely the universities’ fault. The problem lies in the way such institutions are judged to be excellent or otherwise against the Research Excellence Framework (REF), whose formula is the higher the research quality and outputs of an institution as measured against the REF framework, the more research funds it attracts, either from central government funding, and research councils. This “rush to publish” mentality in order to secure research funding has paradoxically created a dysfunctional state of affairs whereby universities are producing outputs that are either unfinished, untested, and lack rigorous scrutiny as academics scramble to promote their careers, and to perpetuate a myth that it is only they who can produce credible research outputs. As such, the notion of competition is now firmly rooted within the university sector itself, a point not lost on Munck (2008:2) who notes that:

‘The global market place for ideas, commercialization and increasingly researchers and students, transforms the university into a player in a global game. This game is, of course, competition in terms of global ratings’.

In response to the competitive environment, and in meeting the demands of government policy, university teaching has been reduced to a “technician level” activity to ensure that it covers pre-determined learning outcomes. The reasons for this are three fold. First, it is a response to the contractual and consumerist culture of university education. Second, in order to cater for a more diverse university intake the delivery of the curriculum has now become standardised and “text book” led to ensure that all students receive the same learning experience. Third, in order to meet the demands of a league table culture it has resulted in universities micromanaging curriculum and classroom delivery to ensure that students obtain the highest degree classification possible. This has led to the adoption of a didactic approach in curriculum delivery to pre-set learning outcomes in order to increase the proportion of higher-degree classifications awarded to students. Whilst this might contribute to league table positions, it is problematic as whether any effective learning has taken place (Gill, 2009). Moreover, league tables have encouraged a target driven culture with the UK HE sector and have marginalised creative and the intellectual pursuits thus stifling the freedom to think critically as universities clamour for a status of “excellence” via measurable government set target setting. The university sector is now open to public scrutiny and is shackled by a performance-based system that destroys the very essence of higher education, namely that of

free expression and critical thinking. In such an oppressive environment students become clients, clients demand service and value for money and this leads by de facto to educational success in the guise of “payment for results”. As a consequence, university education in the UK has adopted an instrumentalist approach that focuses on the fragmentation of the curriculum in the delivery of its educational programmes and has reduced intellectual pursuit, imagination and genius to one of measurable outcomes and performance indicators. The standardisation of the education experience to a prescribed set of measurable metrics stands in direct opposition to exploration, experimentation, and critical discourse, and it can be argued that a university education now adopts expediency over excellence, consumerism over connoisseurship, group think over genius and conformity over creativity.

University education is now a fragmented production line of knowledge, and where skills are delivered in “bite sized” modules. The education system and universities in particular, have “unlearned” society how to think critically by the continuous quest for examination success and certified status. We have now reached a point where education itself has become uncritical and has alienated teachers, lecturers, administrators and researchers from the true quest of its endeavours – that of free thought and expression, innovation, tolerance, equity, justice, integrity, rigour and transparency. Munck (2008:7) echoes these sentiments when citing Banks (2003) stating that:

‘in reality it is the universities that are failing in their traditional educational function. Therefore, we should grasp the nettle and admit that most universities have not done a terribly good job of educating global citizens in a diverse world’. It can be argued that university education has been sacrificed on the “alter of compliance”.

If we are heed Rowe’s earlier assertion of universities shaping themselves in to an industrial ideal – the knowledge factory, than it can be argued a more “radical” educational experience is needed to counter its sacrifice on the “alter of compliance”. Paulo Freire (1970 and 1972) argued that dialogue and critical reflection are central to what is termed critical pedagogy, and what he called a *problem posing* education that focuses upon the concerns of the student-teacher relationship, the learning context and the process of learning. Freire describes this process as an education of liberation and he uses the concept of *conscientization* as a means whereby individuals gain critical awareness to overcome the oppression of their situation, and to achieve their socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives, and to collectively transform that reality. Transformative pedagogy according Freire (1972) is central to humanistic and emancipatory practices, whereby individuals “exist *in* and *with* the world”. Freire (1972:51) notes that *conscientization* is where ‘Only men, as “open” beings are able to achieve the complex operation of simultaneously transforming the world by their action and grasping and expressing the world’s reality in their creative language’. For an individual learner, *conscientization* is the process of developing their sense of being a *subject*, and of apprehending their ability to intervene in external reality (McCowan, 2006). Freire contends that people must first (critically) recognize how their reality comes into being so that their ‘transforming action can create new realities, which makes possible a fuller humanity’ (Freire, 1972:29). Critical reflection is central to understanding reality and an individual’s relationship with the world and where ‘Consciousness is constituted in the dialectic of man’s

objectification of and action upon the world' (Freire, 1972:53). The process of conscientization has two central pedagogical features: *dialogue* and *problematization*. Freire's conception of *conscientization* is just not verbal interaction, as traditional education is, this being regarded as ineffective and a mono-directional transmission of knowledge from teacher to student via the so-called "banking" method of education, but rather it can only be achieved through a dialogical encounter, where the student is fully involved in the educational process (McCowan, 2006).

The "banking" method of education for Freire (1972:57) emphasizes permanence and becomes reactionary, whereas problem posing education does not accept neither a 'well behaved present nor a pre-determined future....it roots itself in the dynamic present and becomes revolutionary'. Freire (1976) describes the process of *conscientization* as having three stages, where the learner moves from magical, to naive, and finally to critical consciousness. Freire is emphatic that this learning process is one of *praxis*, being a dialectic of reflection and action, and the gaining of critical consciousness will not of itself transform the world (McCowan, 2006). As Freire (1972:47) notes 'this discovery cannot be purely intellectual but must involve action; nor can it be limited to mere activism, but involve serious reflection'. Furthermore, *conscientization* is not a purely one of individual development, as it must be located within the context of the collective, in mutually supportive horizontal relationships (McCowan). According to Bolton (2001) critical pedagogy and effective reflective practice is a dynamic and challenging process, and requires those who partake in its process learn to question, through dialogue, their personal and professional practices, and the impact these will have on the wider society and individuals they interact with (Lehman, 1988; Power, 1991).

Furthermore, Bolton (2001) has responded to the forgoing, by advancing what she calls a "*Through the looking glass*" approach to learning where she compliments the transformative and reflective principles of the Freirean critical pedagogy with a reflexive turn. This she claims locates the individual as *self* in the centre of their social, political, and cultural contexts by shifting the burden of self-realisation and determination away from any interventions the teacher may make in the learning process, despite any well intentioned motives might be on their part. Instead Bolton argues the burden of realisation must be shifted onto the individual (student) as the creator of their own 'social, political, and psychological position and reality, and to question it, as well as their environment' (Bolton, 2001:31). Siraj-Blatchford and Siraj-Blatchford (1997:237) note that reflexive practice involves making connections between our personal lives and professional careers, and defines this as 'the self-conscious co-ordination of the observed with existing cognitive structures of meaning'. As Steier (1995:163) notes, reflexivity is when 'we contextually recognise the various mutual relationships in which our knowing activities are embedded', and where according to Glass (2001:21):

'The practice of freedom, as critical reflexive practice, must grasp the outward direction, meaning, and consequences of action, and also its inward meaning as a realization and articulation of the self. Therefore, education as a practice of freedom must include a kind of historic-cultural, political psychoanalysis that reveals the formation of the self and its situation all their dynamic and dialectical relations'.

Roebuck (2007) has also noted that reflexive practice together with reflective practice can be described as a process of inquiry which facilitates appreciation and understanding of contextualised views (outside the learners own experience), a deeper learning experience, the development of ideas, and conditions for actual change. Cunliffe (2004) notes that reflexivity is where students and the teacher are engaged in a process where their roles are more equal and where 'Critically reflexive practice embraces subjective understandings of reality as a basis for thinking more critically about the assumptions, values, and actions on others'. Furthermore, Cunliffe (2004:407) asserts that reflexive practice is important to management education, because 'it helps us understand how we constitute our realities and identifies in relational ways, and where we can develop more collaborative and responsive ways of managing organizations'.

A pedagogy for critical citizenship

'My respect as a teacher for the student, for his/her curiosity and fear that I ought not to curtail or inhibit by inappropriate gestures or attitudes, demands of me the cultivation of humility and tolerance. How can I respect the curiosity of the students if, lacking genuine humility and a convinced understanding of the role of the unknown in the process of reaching the known, I am afraid of revealing my own ignorance? How can I consider to be an educator, especially in the context of open-minded and enlightened teaching practices, if I cannot learn to live – whether it cost me little or much – with what is different? How can I be an educator if I do not develop in myself a caring and loving attitude toward the student, which is indispensable on the part of one who is committed to teaching and the education process itself'.

(Freire, 2001:65)

Usher et al (1997:43) note that 'In contrast to liberal adult education privileging of the autonomous rational subject located within a certain type of consensual liberal capitalist democracy, critical pedagogy has focused on the politics of identity and difference as a key reference point for education for citizenship'. Usher *et al* (1997) propose an agenda of what critical education for citizenship might consist of, this being made up of: experiential learning whereby individual experience needs to be placed in the wider social and political context in which they inhabit; consumerism, the politics of consumption, the possession and access to culturally valued knowledge and to view it critically; literacy, which is the way a critical learner/citizen is empowered to challenge the power embedded in and created through language; vocationalism, which is to engage critically and productively with the democratization of work; empowerment, whereby there needs to be a situated meaning in direct relation to the living and working contexts of adult learner/citizens. A curriculum for citizenship studies, if it is to explore Usher *et al*'s aforementioned agenda, requires a pedagogy whose modus operandi is based upon the shared learning of teacher and students in a unified act of discovery. It is a curriculum founded in humility and mutual respect for those participating in the co-creation of knowledge and the furthering of their naive understandings of the world; it is an epistemological break from conventional wisdom and "banking" education, in other words a critical pedagogy. If management education if it is to embrace critical citizenship as its core mission, and challenge issues concerning economics, ethics, and organisational sustainability issues then its solace and comfort can be found in the words of David

Orr (2004:13) 'The goal of education is not the mastery of subject matter but mastery of one's person. Subject matter is simply the tool. Much as some would use a hammer and a chisel to carve a block of marble, one uses ideas and knowledge to forge one's personhood'. This is exemplified by Latta (2004:94-95) who throws out a challenge to teachers to facilitate a learning experience that meets the needs and capacity of students which fosters them to develop, form, and act upon ideas, that foster connections, that see potential, make judgments, and arranging conditions. She notes that 'Each aesthetic trace causes me to wonder how teachers learn to create experiences that focus student's participation in the world aesthetically' and offers the following considerations concerning pedagogical practice:

- Given the emphasis in schools on outcomes and results, how do we encourage teachers to focus on acts of mind instead of end products in their work with students?
- Given the orientations towards technical rationality, to fixed sequence, how do we help teachers experience fluid, purposeful learning with students in which the imagination is given room to play?
- Given the tendency to conceive of planning in teaching as the deciding of everything in advance, how do we help teachers and students become attuned to making good judgments derived from within learning experiences?
- How do we help teachers build dialogical multi-voiced conversations instead of monolithic curriculum?
- What do we do to recover the pleasure dwelling in subject matter? How do we get teachers and students to engage thoughtfully in meaningful learning as opposed to covering curriculum?
- A capacity to attend sensitively, to perceive the complexity of relationships coming together in any teaching/learning experience seems critical. How do we help teachers and students attend to the unity of a learning experience and the play of meanings that arises from such undergoing and doing?

The forgoing has resonance with the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement in Higher Education. In *Rethinking Undergraduate Business Education: Liberal Learning for the Profession Report* (Colby, et al, 2011:132) that note if students are to make sense of the complexities of the world as well as their place in it need 'a broad knowledge of many fields in arts and sciences. Allowing for considerable flexibility in that content makes sense but science, social science, history literature, and the arts all play key roles in understanding the world'. Therefore it can be argued that universities, need to adopt a more eclectic and socially embracing curriculum that goes beyond the confines the natural disciplines and language of business education. This idea is not new, for example, Cardinal Newman in his oft forgotten, but seminal work *The Idea of University* states:

'...all knowledge is connected together, because the subject-matter of knowledge is intimately united in itself, as being the acts of and the work of the Creator. Hence it is that the sciences, into which our knowledge may be said to be cast, have multiplied bearings on one another, and an internal sympathy, and admit, or rather demand comparison and adjustment. They compete, correct, and balance each other'

Newman's call for a liberal education has a contemporary currency and imperative. It is also call for a liberal business education, and one that puts at its centre the critical citizen in order to seize the moment to probe and challenges our current business and global issues, as exemplified by Colby *et al* (2011:11) who note their concerns of 'such a frightening, large-scale catastrophe, that threatened to destroy the global economic system itself [as] this potentially teachable moment seems to have been a missed educational opportunity'. The following teaching scenarios, that are guided with Usher *et al*'s agenda for critical citizenship, are taken from classroom practice as a curriculum response to address Colby *et al*'s (2011) concerns, in bringing to the attention of management students the role that economic, cultural, social, political, ecological, and ethical issues play within management education, and more importantly, a critical citizenship education. The first concerns the role of business and the climate change debates, the second asks students to think about sustainability, the third concerns sustainability and gender, and are intended to address David Orr's objections in the way in which learning occurs is as important as the content of particular courses, and where 'Process is important for learning. Courses taught as lecture courses tend to induce passivity. Indoor classes create the illusion that learning only occurs inside four walls, isolated from what students call, without apparent irony, the "real world" (Orr, 2004:14)'.

Scenario 1: Climate change: Making the unfamiliar familiar

Ernest Boyer (1990:21) in *Scholarship Reconsidered* notes that 'there are three elements of scholarship 'The first two kinds of scholarship – discovery and integration of knowledge, reflect the investigative and synthesizing traditions of academic life. The third element, the application of knowledge, move toward engagement as the scholar asks, "how can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problem? How can it be useful to individuals as well as institutions? And further, can so called problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?' One of the challenges facing educators at the beginning of a programme of study is to open students' horizons to issues that go beyond the confines of mainstream management practices, especially those concerning global warming, and scientific debate. In small dialogue group's students spend an hour discussing the following issues related to climate change (Box 1), and are asked to address the questions that follow, and to be feedback to their peer groups.

An increasing number of reports and scientific evidence on climate change have acknowledged the economic consequences of the rising level of carbon emissions in the atmosphere (see, for example, the IPCC). Companies, governments and organisations are facing increasing damage in their infrastructure due to floods and scarcity of resources linked to draughts and the destruction of natural habitats, as well as growing risks to human health. In the United Kingdom, the Stern Review has demonstrated that the global economy is at risk of shrinking between a 5% and 20% if measures to reduce carbon emissions are not implemented in the short term.

Box 1 Climate change

- What are the arguments given by some that global warming is a consequence, of the earth's natural life cycle and has nothing to do with the emission of greenhouse gases?
- To what extent do you agree the Stern Report?
- To what extent do you trust the evidence and reporting of the scientific evidence concerning global warming – for example, the Greenland ice cap?
- Do businesses in your opinion need to be involved with issues of sustainability - if not, why not?
- Why are some responses to carbon emission reduction ethically controversial, for example, off-setting and carbon trading?
- How does the media play its part in informing the public concerning issues of global warming?

As Orr (2004:79-80) states 'The world now faces a somewhat analogous choice. On one side a large number of scientists believe that the planet is warming rapidly....Others, however, claim to have looked over the brink and have decided that hell may not be so bad after all, or at least that we should research the matter further'. In response to the Orr's statement, much can be made of the use of readily available information from the media to raise students' awareness of how global warming is location within political, social and cultural contexts. This simple exercise achieves three outcomes. First, it invites students to think about who owns the dominant discourse of the global warming debate, and lead students to think about the role of the media in portraying the issues concerning climate change, and invites them to step beyond the normal boundaries of the business school; curriculum by engaging with arguments in the scientific community. The introduction of the debates to challenge the conventional wisdom and discourse concerning global warming is rarely examined in any meaningful way. Second, this exercise shows students there are "no right answers", but rather they need to justify their responses in the gaze of their peers. This also provides an opportunity for students to become reflective and critical thinkers and shows that the ownership of opinions and knowledge is not solely the "gift of the teacher" or even that of scientists. Third, it helps create an authentic learning environment and engagement with the world in coming to terms with social, political and cultural meanings and interpretations of global warming debates and issues, for example, the role of consumerism, and by so doing they can gain a sense of the paradox between the political between the ethical consumer and these posited by the motivations of economic expansion and the demands of global materialism.

Scenario 2: Sustainability

Teaching is just not the transferring of knowledge (Freire, 1970); it is about questioning personal assumptions, and coming to terms with self-doubt, and making the uncertain certain. As Orr (2004:13) notes 'knowledge carries with it the responsibility to see that it is well used in the world', and calls for an inductive teaching approach in becoming conscientized that locates itself in their everyday reality or what Biggs and Tang (2007:93) call 'Building on the known'. This scenario (Box 2) addresses the issues of sustainability, which is often taken for granted terms in many business courses. The tutor asks students to consider and research information relating to current sustainability issues in the scenario below, and to address the questions provided. However, it is also intended to extend students

beyond the confines of business rhetoric as well. Besides asking the obvious questions about shareholders and the profit motive of organizations, it also introduces the competing discourse concerning environmentalism, and the UN Global compact. It attempts to reconcile the local responses in juxtaposition to global responses to sustainability, and illustrate the relationship and competing demand of sustainability between local communities, and ecological issues.

During the last three decades, the increasing power and influence of large corporations has been a matter of debate and questioning regarding their Corporate Social Responsibility. Topics ranging from environmental protection to social responsibility need to be balanced with their responsibilities to shareholders and profitability. A number of initiatives at the international level have addressed the salient problems of corporations working in a globalized economy, for example, The UN Global Compact, and proposals such as social responsibility and a wider approach to sustainability. However, it can be argued that despite major attention to this issue the impact of these measures has not altered the basic approach of companies to their Social Responsibility.

Box 2 Sustainability

The tutor in order to stimulate class discussions can pose questions such as:

- How would you define the term “corporate social responsibility”? Evaluate to what extent stakeholder theory works in practice?
- Critically evaluate to what extent the UN Global Compact has achieved its intentions?
- Do you agree with Milton Friedman that ‘Only people can have responsibilities?’
- Do you agree measures of a company’s success in the field of corporate social responsibility will influence investment decisions in the future more than measures of monetary profitability?
- How can we deal with the interests of competing economic, social, political, and cultural issues?
- How can natural resources we used to ensure that future generations can enjoy suitable lifestyles?
- What type of information is needed for societies in order to make informed decisions concerning global warming?
- Is it possible to attain economic growth whilst at the same time no damaging the biosphere?

Scenario 3: Citizenship and gender

Gender and the role of women is a topic that gets little or no attention on many business courses, albeit in human resource management courses if only in terms of the legal requirements of equality in the workplace. It can be argued that women and men should be treated equally, with respect and dignity, and that their contributions are given equal recognition within societies that are free from gender based discrimination. This can also be extended to how boys/girls, men/women are also educated. The following scenario (Box 3) attempts to put the gender perspective on the “table” and the important role that it plays not only with organizations but in

society as a whole. It is intended to encourage for students to consider and debate the traditional roles that men and women occupy in contemporary society. It can also open up discussions as to how gender roles are formed in societies, for example, socialization through formal education systems, professional identity and the types of jobs expected of each gender, and the impact cultural and religious issues and perspectives have in determining pre-determined behaviors and societal roles.

The 2010 report of the Institute of Leadership and Management titled “Ambition and Gender at Work” in the United Kingdom states that although half of the workforce are women (49.9%), and that female enterprise contributes £130 billion to the UK economy each year, their participation in top-executive positions is not necessarily proportional. Women hold just 12% of FTSE 100 directorships and 22% of senior management positions. In some European countries measures have been taken to ensure an equal access to top-management positions, like in the case of Norway. In the United Kingdom this discussion has also been commented upon in by special reports, for example, the Lord Davies report on Women on Boards, the Chartered Institute for Personal Development, and also in the media.

Box 3 Citizenship and gender

Typical questions that can be addressed are:

- What barriers do women face in society?
- Quotas to increase female representation on executive boards are a good idea – discuss.
- What are the contents of the Lord Davies report concerning Women on Management Boards?
- What are contents of the Institute of Leadership and Management Report “Ambition and Gender at work” report?
- Explain the three waves of feminism: first wave; second wave and post-feminism.
- What are the main barriers to women occupying top executive positions in the workplace
- Why does poverty have an adverse effect on women
- What are the advantages of having more women on management boards?

Implications for practice

If we are to change traditional management pedagogy we have to challenge the ownership of its “intellectual and moral high ground”. As Freire (1970 and 1972) extols we have to move the teacher-student relationship from that of object-subject to that of subject-subject. According to Valentin (2007:179) ‘creating dialogue calls for an active role on behalf of the tutor: mediation, posing problems, encouraging participation’. However, this can only be achieved through dialogue, and demands of educators to challenge their own teaching practices whereby they reject the “banking” education and for educators ‘to “problematize” and to use the critical faculty (Freire, 1972), This is important if we are to teach critical citizenship, as Orr (2004:17) notes:

‘...we continue to issue forth a steam of technologies and systems of technology that do not fit the ecological dimensions of the earth. Most of this was not done by the unschooled. Rather it was done by people, who in the words of Gary Snyder (1990): ‘Make unimaginably large sums of money, people impeccably groomed, excellently educated at the best universities – male and female alike – eating fine foods and reading classy literature, while orchestrating the investment and legislation that ruin the world’

An approach that requires an authentic learning environment is one where learners are engaged in transformational engagement of their socio-historical-political worlds of self and other (Freire, 1970).and as Marx (1962:212) advocated a ‘relentless criticism of all existing conditions, relentless in the sense that the criticism is not afraid of its own findings and just as little afraid of conflict with the powers that be’. By challenging their political, social, cultural, historical, and professional contexts that they find themselves in, and in recognizing this new “status” of their reality, individuals (students) will be able to critically reflect upon their situation, and take the initiative to enact change, for example, through an ethics for social good or by modifying personal and group behaviors of colleagues in the workplace. This requires a pedagogy that challenges students to reflect, and become reflexive of the social context in which management practice is played out within, and the power relations underpinning the social context they inhabit as students, and as practitioners (Thanem and Wallenberg, 2009). As Freire (2001:33) notes ‘Only in this way can we speak authentically of knowledge that is taught, in which the taught is grasped in its very essence and therefore learned by those who are learning’. This also demands that educators have to submit themselves to a similar attitude whereby they acquire new knowledge in the process of teaching, not just the facts of subject knowledge, but knowledge of the process and creation of knowledge-in-transformation. The use of dialogue requires management classroom practice to resist, and re-think the temptations to adopt rote learning approaches in order to ensure learning outcomes are systematically “ticked-off” thus reducing the educational experience to a reductionist, and mechanical process. It has to adopt other strategies that “extract” students’ experiences by introducing the notion of “understanding”. For example, Valentin (2007) identifies group processes, and the dynamics of group work in the early stages of a program as essential to the notion of “understanding”. As such, management pedagogy has to ‘go beyond the cognitive and apolitical notion of critical thinking as a generic skill limited to skill building, problem-solving, self-reflection and questioning’ (Thanem and Wallenberg, 2009:190). The challenge can be summarized by the following four principles for a pedagogy for critical citizenship, which are underpinned by Freire’s notion that education should be rooted in the present, and pose problems about our lives in the here and now:

Principle 1: A pedagogy for critical citizenship requires the provision of a safe learning environment to help the development and awareness of our and others’ feelings and emotions. This allows the development and building of relationships through shared understandings by creating a learning community founded on mutual trust and dialogue. It is an inclusive democratic process that does not exclude those who hold different points of view to our own, and requires that students be accountable to each other.

Principle 2: A pedagogy for critical citizenship is not always about utility, it is about people, and their relationship to each other and the environment. Students need to take control of their own learning and discovery of the world if they are to participate as active and global citizens in order to understand an ever evolving and complex world. Critical citizenship should challenge the conventional wisdom, and the power structures of global societies and economies.

Principle 3: A pedagogy for critical citizenship commences in the classroom, whereby students are enabled to listen, suspend prejudices, and not pre-judge. Citizenship requires respect, dignity and equity of treatment of students towards fellow students, tutor towards students, and students towards tutor. To be able to be called critical citizens we must foster and develop personal relationships with each other in the co-creation of knowledge. Citizenship requires we create knowledge together through critical discourse and dialogue.

Principle 4: A pedagogy for critical citizenship requires that we discover how our world works; it is not merely the acquisition of facts, or the transference of knowledge. It is being able to mould of and understand the implications of the “big ideas”. Citizenship is about the immediacy and relevance to our political, social and cultural contexts. Facts stifle our mode of thinking; they can have a tendency to lead individuals to re-produce the same old solutions to exiting problems, and points of view as before. Understanding the bigger picture, concepts, and wider issues require the exercise of the mind for creative solutions.

The foregoing requires educators to have a heightened awareness of reflective and reflexive pedagogical practices, which can only emerge if learning environments emerge through the dialogical process. Educators have to be more responsive to the opportunities dialogue presents to them and their students alike, whereby they can both engage in critical reflection and the reflexive moment of their practices through the dialogical process. As Freire (1970:90) states ‘The task of the dialogical teacher....working on the thematic universe....is ‘to “re-present” that universe to the people from she or he first received it – and “re-present” it not as a lecture, but as a problem’. The beginnings of a critical and reflexive pedagogy must commence in the classroom if new entrants to higher education are to acquire *conscientization*, and the skills of the “collective dance” to enable learning to take place beyond the confines of traditional classroom environments (however these might be defined). Critical pedagogy and dialogue, together with the “reflexive turn” is central in acknowledging the individual and their voice, enabling them to problematize themselves and their roles within political, social, and professional situations that they will or do find themselves, in order to question and reject the meta-narrative of those in authority over them.

Conclusion

This paper has responded to the concerns, and challenges as to how “liberal learning” and the “humanities” can be mobilised in management and business studies. It has drawn its central thesis from the transformative pedagogy of Paulo Freire to place it within the context of the economic, cultural, social, political, ecological, and ethical issues and crisis that confronts higher educators and students in today’s higher education institutions. Orr (2004) notes that all education is environmental education where students must be taught they part of the natural

world, and to teach subjects, for example, economics apart from physics or ecology is a misguided approach to learning. This has imperatives for citizenship education. Universities have to decide, what their function is if its programme and legacy are to be for the social and economic good. However, whether we will see some universities become either predominantly research or teaching focused institutions there is no argument for the academic community to abandon critical discourse between themselves and their students or lose sight of their responsibilities to current and future generations in educating critical citizens, and must reject Bertrand Russell's quip that 'Most people would die sooner than think; in fact they do so'.

References

- Banks, J. (2003) *Educating Citizens in a Diverse World*,
[<http://www.newhorizons.org/strategies/multicultural/banks2.htm>]
- Biggs, J. and Tang, C. (2007) *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*,
Maidenhead: Open University.
- Bolton, G. (2001) *Reflective Practice*, London: Sage.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990) *Scholarship reconsidered*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brookfield, S.D. 2005, *The Power of Critical Theory for Adult Learning and Teaching*,
Maidenhead and New York: Open University Press.
- Feildhouse, R. (1992) Tradition in British University Adult Education and the WEA. In
C. Duke (ed), *Liberal Adult Education: Perspectives and Projects*, Warwick:
Continuing Education Research Centre, University of Warwick.
- Freire, P. (1970) *The pedagogy of the oppressed*, London: Penguin.
- Freire, P. (1972) *Cultural Action for Freedom*, London: Penguin.
- Freire, P. (2001) *Pedagogy of Freedom*, Maryland: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers.
- Gill, T. (2008) 'Come out of the woodwork now': MP's challenge to standards critics,
The Times Higher Education Supplement (6 November.2008)
- Glass, R. D. (2001) On Paulo Freire's Philosophy of Praxis and the Foundations of
Liberation Education, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 30, No.2, pp.15-25.
- Hagen, R., Miller, S. and Johnson, M. (2003) The "Disruptive Consequences" of
introducing a critical management perspective in to the MBA Programme,
Management Learning, 34(2), 241-258.
- Holman, D. (2000) Contemporary models of management education in the UK,
Management Learning, 31(2), 197-217.
- Hughes, K. and Moore, D.T. (1999a) *Pedagogical: strategies for work-based
learning*, Institute on Education and Learning, Columbia: Columbia University.

Hyslop-Margison, E.J. and Thayer, J. (2009) *Teaching Democracy: Citizenship Education as Critical Pedagogy*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Krause, K. (2005) Engaged, inert or otherwise occupied? Deconstructing the 21st century undergraduate student. Sharing Scholarship in Learning Symposium, James Cooke University, 21st September 2005.

Latta, M.M. (2004) Traces, Patters, Texture: In Search of Aesthetic Teaching/Learning Encounters, in David, M. Callejo Perez, Stephen, M. Fain. and Judith. J. Slater. (Eds.) *Pedagogy of Place*, New York: Peter Lang.

Marx, K. (1962) *Writings of the young Marx on philosophy and society*. L.D Easton. and K.H Guddat. (Eds. and Trans.) New York: Anchor Press.

McCowon, T. (2006) Approaching the political in citizenship education: The perspectives of Paulo Freire and Bernard Crick, *Educate*, Vol.6, No.1, pp. 57-70.

Mulcahy, D. 2006, The salience of space for pedagogy and identity in teacher education: problem-based leaning a case in point, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 14(1), 53-69.

Munck, R. (2008) *Students and Global Citizenship in an Uncertain Era*, Paper presented at The Internationalization of UK Higher Education, Learning and Teaching, University of Edinburgh, 27-28 November.

Neimark, M. (1996) Caught in the Squeeze: An Essay on Higher Education Accounting, *Critical Perspectives on accounting*, Vol.7, pp.1-11.

Newman, J. H. (1854/1982) *The Idea of a University*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

O'Leary, J., Cannon, T., Hindmarsh, A., Kingston, B. and Loynes, R. (2008) (eds.) *The "Times" Good University Guide*, London: Times Books.

O'Toole, J. (2005) How Business Schools Lost Their Way. *Harvard Business Review*, May 2005.

Oakeshott, M. (1950/2003) *The Idea of a University, The Listener*, reprinted from the *The Voice of Liberal Learning: Michael Oakeshott on Education in Academic Questions*, Winter 2003-2004.

Orr, D. (2004) *Earth in Mind: On Education, Environment, and the Human Prospect*, London: Island Press.

Panton, J. (2005) *What are Universities For? Universities, Knowledge and Intellectuals*, in Cummings, D. (ed.) *The Changing Role of the Public Intellectual*, pp. 139-157, London: Routledge.

Prasad and Caproni (1997) Critical Theory in the Management Classroom: Engaging Power, Ideology, and Praxis, *Journal of Management Education*, 21(3), pp.284-291.

Prpic, J. (2005) Managing academic change through reflexive practice: A quest for new views, *Research and Development in Higher Education*, 28, 399-406.

Reynolds, M. (1999) Grasping the nettle: Possibilities and pitfalls of a critical management pedagogy, *British Journal of Management*, 10(2), 171-184.

Reynolds, M. and Vince, R. 2004, Organizing reflection: an introduction, in M. Reynolds and R. Vince (eds.) *Organizing Reflection*, Ashgate: Aldershot

Roebuck, J. (2007) Reflexive practice: To enhance student learning, *Journal of Learning Design*, Vol. 2, No.1.

Rowe, S. (1990) *Home Place: Essays on Ecology*. Edmonton: NeWest.

Siraj-Blatchford, I & Siraj-Blatchford, J. (1997). Reflexivity, Social Justice and Educational Research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 27, 235-248.

Steier, F. (Ed.) (1995). *Research and Reflexivity*. London: Sage Publications.
Stewart, J. 2007, The ethics of HRD, in *Critical Human Resource Development*, London: Prentice Hall.

Thanem, T. and Wallenberg, L. (2009) *Paradoxes of academic practice: managerialist techniques in critical pedagogy*, in Cox, J.W., Le-Trent-Jones.,

Usher, R. and Edwards, R. (1994) *Postmodernism and Education*, London, Routledge.

Usher, R., Bryant, I. and Jones, R. (1997) *Adult Education and the Postmodern Challenge: Learning Beyond the Limits*, London: Routledge.

Valentin, C. (2007) How can I teach critical management in this place? A critical pedagogy for HRD: possibilities, contradictions and compromises, in *Critical Human Resource Development*, London: Prentice Hall.