Tourism Management 32 (2011) 1389–1396

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Tourism Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/tourman

On the need for critical pedagogy in tourism education

Yaniv Belhassen [a,*], Kellee Caton [b]

[a] Department of Hotel & Tourism Management, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel
[b] Tourism Management Department, Thompson Rivers University, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 11 May 2010
Accepted 21 January 2011

Keywords:
Critical pedagogy
Teaching
Curriculum
Higher education

ABSTRACT

Critical management studies is less a coherent movement than a loose coalition of counter-discourses that have arisen in opposition to mainstream management ideology, practice, and education. The purpose of these counter-discourses has been both to offer reactionary critique to what are viewed as problems with the management status quo and to generate creative alternative theories and explanations for phenomena in the realm of management studies. This paper explores the theoretical and philosophical roots of critical pedagogy and argues for its benefits to tourism education. We argue that including a critical pedagogy in tourism curricula can result in positive outcomes on three levels: individual freedom, social justice, and business productivity.

1. Introduction

The past two decades have witnessed a flurry of intellectual work decrying what has been viewed as a shift in the practice of higher education away from notions of the university experience as a public good—as the kiln in which a critical and creative citizenry is vitrified—and toward conceptions of academia as a marketplace where better individual life chances are sold to discerning student-consumers in the form of "skills training." Some scholars place this transformation largely in the aftermath of World War II, with the rise of the United States as a political and economic force, and especially in the wake of the 1970s, when increased competition to the West from Japan led to a drive to harness the full potential of university research to produce new, marketable inventions. This helped position the university as a primary engine of direct economic growth (Washburn, 2005). The rise of the New Right in the United States and United Kingdom beginning in the 1980s reinforced this trend (Fournier & Grey, 2000; Grey & French, 1996), as did the West's growing consumer culture, in which the customer–supplier relationship increasingly came to serve as a model for ever-broader domains of human interaction. Others, however, argue that the seeds of this process were sown long ago. They note that universities have long collaborated with industry, that arguments over whether education should be viewed in intrinsic or instrumentalist terms have raged for eons—engaging the intellectual energies of philosophers as diverse as Socrates, Aristotle, Cicero, and John Locke—and that diatribes focused specifically on modern higher education's increasing commercialization and decreasing criticality date back at least to Veblen (1918) (Nussbaum, 1997; Grey & French, 1996; Giroux, 2007). Regardless of the events that set the process in motion, however, the higher education literature is increasingly populated by scholarly contentions that its outcomes are producing bitter fruits (e.g., Aronowitz, 2000; Barnett, 1994; Bok, 2003; Giroux, 2007; Nussbaum, 2010). The evocative titles of volumes in this body of literature—*The Knowledge Factory*, *The University in Chains*, *The Limits of Competence*—indicate that as higher education transactions increasingly mimic the logic of capitalist relations of production and consumption, something precious has been lost, and the resulting void adversely affects individual self-determination and collective democracy and social improvement. Ironically, it even undermines enterprise and the individual and social benefits that derive from the market.

In a meticulous assessment of recent discourses and polices in British higher education, Barnett demonstrates that the notions of "skills" and "competence" have come to receive greater emphasis whereas ideas of understanding, wisdom, and critique are increasingly being neglected. In expounding on what he refers to collectively as the "discourse of operationalism," Barnett argues that we are moving toward a situation in western culture in which society has begun to declare directly how and in what form it wishes to acquire knowledge. In other words, the seat of epistemic power is shifting from disciplines traditionally contained within the universities to the public sphere, where growing numbers of people are demanding that knowledge be produced in line with mass understandings and values. Working on behalf of the public, therefore,

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: yanivbel@bgu.ac.il (Y. Belhassen).

0261-5177/$ – see front matter © 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2011.01.014

governments influence curriculum design by creating initiatives that primarily advance economic interests (see also Dehler, 2007).

In some ways, this democratization of epistemic power is a good thing: as Barnett argues, universities have, for far too long, lived up to the ivory tower stereotype, insulating themselves from society's problems. The problem, however, is that the new approach of operationalism, through which higher education adapts to society's technostructure (Galbraith, 1969, cited in Barnett, 1994), simply substitutes one form of closure for another. Thus, Barnett writes of a "lost vocabulary" of crucial capacities, the first of which is understanding. Unlike competence, which is expressed by the reliable performance of a behavior to a level of efficacy measurable against a predetermined standard, understanding involves gaining a deep, personal, ever-evolving grasp of an issue. Understanding presupposes the world as dynamic; thus, a learner's engagement is processive and adaptable, and in contrast to the performance of a particular skill, which has a definite conclusion, it entails perpetuity.

Another element of the lost vocabulary is wisdom, which involves the ability to assess situations in a fuller context so as to grasp the consequences of one's choices. Unlike instrumental reasoning, which focuses on immediate, direct solutions to reasonably well-defined problems, wise reasoning takes into account the values that frame a situation and the interests that are served by particular actions. Yet another member of this lost vocabulary is critique. Barnett insists that this notion be distinguished from the buzz-phrase "critical thinking," which, in practice, denotes an ability to flexibly and creatively solve problems defined by some more powerful person or institution, such as a professor or a corporation. Critique, on the other hand, involves cultivating the ability to subject ideas, including one's own, to scrutiny—to recognize that all perspectives are partial and provisional. Indeed, true critique endorses unbounded, rock-the-boat questioning that reigning power structures often find prohibitively threatening. Thus, the retreat of the university from the vital concepts of understanding, wisdom, and critique undermines its ability to work on behalf of the public good in ways that transcend the promotion of short-term gains in economic productivity. It leads, in the words of Martha Nussbaum (2010), to the production of "useful machines, rather than complete citizens who can think for themselves, criticize tradition, and understand the significance of another person's sufferings and achievements" (p. 2).

The tendency to view academic tourism education as an applied problem-solving activity has generated a growing scholarship that generally focuses on the construction of curricula (e.g., Goodman & Sprague, 1991; Inui, Wheeler, & Lankford, 2006; Morgan, 2004; Morrison and O'Mahoney, 2003). The content of tourism curricula reflects the debate over the nature and purpose of tourism education. Similar to general management education, tourism studies has traditionally focused on the student's vocational preparation (Airey & Johnson, 1999; Amoah & Baum, 1997; Cooper & Shepherd, 1997; Jafari, 1990; McCabe & Martin, 2007; Ritchie, 1995). Tribe (2000, 2001, 2002, 2008), in particular, has critiqued this tendency, suggesting that the business orientation of tourism curricula should be balanced by including a liberal component. Liberal reflection, he suggests, offers students the opportunity to critically think about their own profession as future managers in the tourism industry. His position is in keeping with the issues raised by Grey and French (1996), who critique current models of management education and advocate an alternative approach, increasingly referred to collectively as "critical management studies" (CMS) or "critical management education." This trend of growing concern over the vocationalism inherent in tourism education, and in management education more broadly, however, continues to be met with a lackluster response from tourism academia, as demonstrated by the recent work of Ring, Dickinger, and Wöber (2009). In their analysis of the content of 64 English-language undergraduate tourism programs, they found that vocational aims dominated, being featured in every program they considered, whereas a liberal component figured significantly in only 6% of the programs in their sample.

In line with scholarship that aims to rationalize the integration of CMS into business programs (Alvesson & Willmont, 2007; Bridgman, 2007; Cunliffe, 2007; Dehler, 2007; Learmonth, 2007; Pritchard, 2009), the purpose of this paper is to explore the theoretical roots of critical management pedagogy and elucidate its benefits to tourism education. Specifically, we suggest that the inclusion of critical pedagogy in tourism education may confer positive outcomes in three domains: individual freedom, social justice, and business productivity. In what follows, we first compile a brief, and necessarily incomplete, historical survey to contextualize the evolution of the ideas that constitute critical management scholarship. We then explore the benefits of critical pedagogy for management studies and conclude by discussing suggestions for incorporating CMS principles into the practice of management education in tourism. It is our hope that this paper will further advance the dialogue about the constructive relationship between the managerial profession and management education and will help tourism education to grow in new and productive pedagogical directions.

2. Theoretical sources and intellectual legacy

Any attempt to discuss CMS as a collective concept is necessarily an academic exercise in imposing order on a broad field of individual, yet related, ideas that have only recently begun somewhat to self-institutionalize. To the extent that common trends can be analytically imposed on this body of work, three chief projects have been identified as cutting broadly across CMS: the denaturalization of taken-for-granted notions about phenomena of interest to management studies, the problematization and ultimate dethroning of performativity as the overarching logic of management studies, and the induction of reflexivity in the realm of knowledge creation for management studies (Fournier & Grey, 2000).

The goal of denaturalization entails invoking features of the existing order that are typically taken for granted and "legitimized by reference to nature and necessity" (Grey & Willmott, 2005, p. 5). In problematizing performativity, CMS argues that the conception of social relations exclusively in instrumental terms (i.e., maximizing output from input) is shortsighted, because it focuses solely on the means while ignoring the ends. Thus, there is no common ground for exploring the kinds of moral or political issues inevitably interwoven into social relations, including managerial relations, or for charting outcomes of the distribution of privilege other than those produced by the current system (Kallinikos, 1996; Roberts, 1996). Likewise, in seeking to induce reflexivity, CMS scholars aim to render the product of management studies, knowledge itself, open to scrutiny. Such an undertaking allows researchers to better assess how their own positions in the structure of knowledge production relate to the understandings they create and to better grasp the consequences of these understandings.

CMS is rooted in the social research perspective of critical theory, which views society as the product of the dynamics of power and ideologies that serve the interests of dominant groups while oppressing others (Horkheimer, 1972). Although the use of critical theory in management scholarship is generally traced to the influence of the Frankfurt School, in fact, critical thought has always been present in the public discourse on management. For example, the research agenda of Elton Mayo, the founding father of the human relations movement, can be viewed as a critical reaction to the scientific management approach established by Frederick Taylor

(Bruce, 2006). A similar but non-academic critique of Taylor's approach to management can be found in cultural artifacts such as Charlie Chaplin's movie *Modern Times* (1936), thus showing that a critical approach to the profession of management and its related issues can manifest itself through myriad venues, including cinema, literature, poetry, journalism, visual art, and political activism.

Other relatively early criticisms of mainstream management hailed from the great sociologist C. Wright Mills (1956) with his analysis of the "power elite," in which he questions the shifting social formations that have disproportionately consolidated power in corporations, big government, and the military, thus producing an interlocking "triangle of power" that results in concepts we take for granted today, such as "political economy" and "military–industrial complex." In problematizing the consolidation of power, which increases the level of intervention between the spheres of government, economy, and military, Mills prefigured by almost fifty years contemporary concerns about the fallout that can ensue when entities such as banks are considered "too big to fail." His work also highlights the need to shift the emphasis from the personal aspects of the management experience (the subject of much effort in industrial and organizational psychology in the mid-twentieth century) to broader analyses of management as a social force—a highly important project to which we will return in our discussion.

Other mid-twentieth century concerns that constitute the CMS legacy include influential arguments by general sociocultural theorists such as the Frankfurt School scholars and Foucault, as well as analyses by researchers working more directly in the field of management studies. Frankfurt scholars such as Adorno, Benjamin, Fromm, Habermas, Horkheimer, and Marcuse can be seen as the progenitors of CMS through their philosophical critiques of the ills of western society. Collectively, they emphasized how powerful cultural structures, particularly those associated with advertising, media image, and consumption, curtail human freedom by systematically oppressing our instincts of doubt and constructing the way we feel and behave (Geuss, 1981; Illouz, 2007). Similarly, Foucault's work presaged much contemporary CMS analysis through his ideas on power in organizations and the ways in which occupational and professional know-how are created within the context of control. His notion of the panopticon has been implemented by various researchers (e.g., Hollinshead, 1999; Townley, 1993) to explore issues of power and surveillance in the workplace.

The idea of the panopticon descends from the work of the eighteenth-century political scientist Jeremy Bentham, who conceived an architectural design for prisons whose cells were organized in a ring-like formation surrounding a central watch-tower, which concealed the guards and facilitated their observations of the cells. The inmates of such a prison have no way of knowing when the guard is present (i.e., when they are actually being watched), but likewise, they know that they could potentially be under surveillance at any given moment. Thus, the prisoners come to internalize this sense of being watched and eventually regulate their own behavior accordingly. The notion of the panopticon has been fruitfully applied in the analysis of modern organizational structures, in which technological developments have given management the ability to establish and maintain a sense of control through the monitoring of employees' computers and telephones or of their behavior by installing cameras in the workplace. Foucault's work on knowledge production, which descended from Nietzsche's insights that scholarship is never an objective representation of reality but always the product of discourses between people with different interests, has also been highly influential in CMS. It has prompted investigations about the reigning ideologies in the education and practice of management that query the interests of certain groups in promoting particular types of management knowledge. It has also questioned how such dominant understandings influence everything from life in the workplace to the impact of corporate culture and power on society.

Efforts by scholars working directly in the field of management studies that have influenced today's CMS movement include analyses by Baritz (1960) and Anthony (1977) of the cooptation of the social sciences to produce work that serves the ideological interests of corporate elites and work dealing with issues of inequality (regarding gender, ethnicity, etc.) in the job market and in the workplace (e.g., Henning & Jardin, 1978). These areas of early academic concern are now frequently explored by contemporary scholars (e.g., Cooke, 2003).

Such is the general flavor of what can be considered critical management scholarship: a complex strain of thoughts much too numerous to completely capture here, emerging both from within and from outside the field of management studies. They (intentionally or unintentionally) share an agenda of rendering taken-for-granted ideologies and practices open to questioning, denying the idea that life can or should be analyzed strictly in instrumentalist terms, and reflecting on the roles of those who create management knowledge in producing sociocultural outcomes that may be desirable or undesirable.

3. The benefits of critical pedagogy for tourism education

The effects of the technocratic approach to higher education are evident across virtually the entire academic landscape, with "applied" fields being the hardest hit. In the case of disciplines such as engineering or medicine, this conceptualization of the meaning and purpose of higher education is arguably reasonable due to the high level of technical knowledge required to practice those professions. Therefore, to a certain extent, it makes sense to dedicate a major part of the curricula to skill-building and to test students on their mastery of it. Tourism education, however, cannot be conceived in such strictly applied terms. There is a small but vocal minority of scholars who question whether management is a "skill" that can be taught at all. Instead, they contend, the conceptualization of management in higher education must be broadened, such that it can be explored not simply as a set of applied professional activities, but also as a socio-political practice (Grey & French, 1996; Thomas & Anthony, 1996). From the perspective of Grey and French, management is simply too important and contested a moral activity to be treated unproblematically. They therefore offer an alternative formulation of management education more akin to a political science than to a medical model of pedagogy. As they explain in this analogy,

> The relationship between politics as a discipline and politicians as practitioners is quite different from the relationship between medical education and doctors. . . . There is no expectation that politicians will have undergone training in political science, and indeed this is rarely the case. Nor is there any assumption that a politics course will equip students with political skills. Instead, there is the expectation that students will learn to understand and to analyse political activity (1996, p. 6).

Such a pedagogical approach would thus allow for an analysis of management that transcends traditional attempts to enhance managerial effectiveness, instead enabling academic engagement with the idea of management as a consequential social practice.

Therefore, it is the contention of this paper that, for a variety of reasons, an intellectual transfusion of the core ideas and ways of thinking that characterize CMS is sorely needed to enliven today's management curriculum. The cultivation of currently neglected capacities—that is, understanding, wisdom, and critique—through the implementation of a critical pedagogical approach to tourism

management education has numerous benefits, not only for individuals and society in general, but also for the business world and for the students who seek to forge successful careers there. In what follows, we argue that the application of critical pedagogy to tourism education will confer three types of benefits: namely, individual freedom, social justice, and business productivity.

3.1. Informed consent? On the making of free individuals

Integrating CMS into tourism curricula holds promise for the expansion of human freedom. We can begin to understand its emancipatory potential by exploring the classic, perennially relevant social critiques offered by the Frankfurt School scholars Habermas and Marcuse. Habermas (1978) argued that three fundamental interests underlie the human drive for knowledge production. The first, an interest in understanding and controlling the world around us, produces instrumental reason. The second, an interest in understanding and connecting with our fellow human beings, entails a search for expression and meaning-making that constitutes a communicative or hermeneutic interest. The third is an emancipatory interest in freeing ourselves of our constraints. Through his reading of modern society, Habermas argues that instrumental interests are becoming increasingly dominant as they evolve to "colonize the lifeworld," squeezing out other meaningful goals of human existence. This trend has been similarly critiqued by Marcuse, who cogently notes that the hegemony of technical, instrumental rationality leads to a situation in which "liberty is confined to the selection of the most adequate means for reaching a goal which [the individual] did not set" (Marcuse, 1998, p. 45, quoted in Giroux, 2007, p. 124).

A critical pedagogy approach incorporates critiques like these and applies them in the context of tourism management education. CMS scholars envision an alternative to the traditional curriculum, in which students learn not just how to be effective managers in the current tourism system, but also how to think about management as a social force. In other words, they view the goal of management education not simply as a means to solve management problems, but rather as a starting point from which to address management as the problem that is to be analyzed and understood (Parker, 2002; Roberts, 1996). Thus, in a CMS-oriented curriculum, in addition to learning management techniques, tourism students would be exposed to the writings of scholars such as Marcuse (1964), for example, who strived to unmask modern society's sophisticated marketing system that encourages compulsive consumption to feed the interests of corporate profit. His analysis posited the creation of a vicious cycle, in which marketers construct a false sense of need in consumers, thus leading people to revise their expectations for what is necessary in life. In chasing these "false needs," humans become servants of a system of production and consumption, the ideological power of which is so complete that it leaves them unable to easily question whether they are acting in their own best interests. Marcuse's thoughts, in turn, echo the work of the celebrated Indian social theorist Tagore (1917), who wrote very early on of the danger of humans becoming subservient to their material blessings. Being exposed to the unconventional thinking of scholars like Marcuse and Tagore could thus challenge students to reflect on dominant assumptions about marketing, consumption, materialism, and happiness and could enrich their worldview about the role of the tourism industry in the decadence of western society.

A related body of CMS work that exemplifies the movement's potential to deepen the intellectual experiences of tourism students by exposing them to alternative perspectives deals with the relationship between work and leisure and its consequences for human freedom in the postindustrial age. Course topics in management and economics generally deal exclusively with issues of work and productivity rather than with leisure, which conceptually is perceived as less relevant to business studies. Startling issues, such as the decrease in employee leisure time during the second half of the twentieth century despite the numerous technological advances that seemed to portend the opposite or the blurring of the boundaries between work and leisure among white-collar workers, tend to go unquestioned despite their importance in the lived experiences of many workers and managers. Valuable questions to explore thus include whether it is desirable to have a clear separation in space and time between work and leisure, where the balance lies in coping with the demands of work in the postindustrial age, and whether increasing work hours at the expense of other activities has problematic effects on workers' emotions and happiness (Lewis, 2003; Lane, 2000; Van Dijk & Kirk, 2007)

Similarly, an exposure to contemporary tourism scholarship on various conceptions of social justice (e.g., McCabe, 2009) and environmental sustainability (e.g., Wheeller, 2003) would allow tourism students to debate and critique different perspectives on these issues to forge their own understandings and moral commitments. There is, for example, a growing body of literature that critiques contemporary financial systems, arguing that the global market economy functions to intensify ecological crises, widen social gaps, and stimulate terrorism and fanaticism (e.g., Stiglitz, 2002). Thus, rather than take the present state of modern global capitalism for granted, students could be encouraged to analyze how the current system enables or constrains particular outcomes, and they could also consider potential alternatives. Some scholars have already shown how capitalism can produce a false response to the maladies that so-called "responsible tourism" is intended to address (Hall & Jenkins, 1995; Marino, 2001; Ryan, 2002; Wheeller, 2003). Wheeller (1992, 2003), for example, argues that the demand for ethical (e.g., sustainable, responsible, ecological, locally owned, fair trade) products and services in tourism is artificially addressed by the tourism industry only to sustain the ego of sophisticated consumers in an ethically conscious marketplace. After all, in a capitalist market, a demand will be answered even if it runs counter to the very essence of capitalism. Sustainable products, therefore, can be seen as a packaged panacea that answers criticisms about tourism's impacts instead of providing effective solutions to the ethical problems involved in tourism development. A similar critique has also been raised by Ryan (2002) against special interest tourists (e.g., ecotourists, cultural tourists, adventure tourists, jetsetters, sports enthusiasts), who are often presented as representing a healthier expression of tourism in comparison with mass tourists, but whose activities are nevertheless motivated by western cultural forces such as consumerism, self-actualization, self-gratification, individualism, and so forth, just like their mass-tourist counterparts.

Broadening tourism curricula in ways like those discussed above essentially invites dialogue about values, power interests, and desirable ends back into the conversation, thus allowing students to reflect critically, as free thinkers, on the kind of world they want to build. As such, students are awakened to humanity's unique endowment of moral reasoning capacity with a revitalized social imagination that can be engaged to help bring about transformative ends (Freire, 1995; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005; Nussbaum, 2010). In stark contrast to frameworks that mindlessly reproduce the existing social order, academia is precisely the societal institution in which alternate futures can be envisioned. It is, in fact, a primary duty of universities to sponsor such imaginative labor. Perhaps it will be determined that the current social order is best—that consent to the system is desirable to achieve well-thought-out ends. If this is the case, then at least students will be confident that their actions are purposeful, because they have

reflected on the kind of society they really want to create, and they have taken responsibility for their ideological positions—their consent to the status quo will be an informed one.

3.2. The good society: On the advancement of social justice

In the previous section, we emphasized the connection between critical reflection and human freedom, arguing that such reflection allows us to make informed choices and contending, in line with Habermas, that this freedom is intrinsically valuable. We left open-ended the question of what kinds of choices are ultimately made, but this issue is also important. Much work in critical management studies has been dedicated to questioning historical practices, both within organizations and as part of the relationship between organizations and broader society, in the interest of producing a more just world.

One popular research subject that has been examined critically is organizational culture. A critical approach to the study of organizational culture in the tourism industry views such culture as a source of normative control over individuals in the workplace (Roberts, 1996). Culture takes shape as an organizational ideology that serves the interests of the elite. Specifically, management seeks to control its employees by creating a culture that induces them to internalize values of loyalty to the organization while neglecting their own self-interests. Such a position could be seen as fair if one accepts the idea of members of an organization, supervisors and supervised alike, being "all in the same boat." If one questions structures and policies that lead to dramatically different distributions of rewards based on where members rank in the organizational hierarchy, however, then it is easy to see how an organizational culture that encourages employees to subsume their own needs and desires in favor of what is "good for the company" is actually a tool of social control that manipulates individuals into accepting unfair compensation for their contributions.

Such observations, a clear throwback to Marx, have lost none of their fervor in certain critical circles (e.g., McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005), and they are particularly relevant to tourism, an industry that has long been characterized by low-wage jobs that induce predictable and justified frustration in employees (Andrews, 2005; Ehrenreich, 2001). Indeed, the hospitality industry has been described as marginal not only because hotel staff have a weak labor market position due to their limited bargaining power as low skilled workers (Crompton & Sanderson, 1990; Rose, 1988), but also because its working environment creates and perpetuates deviant behavior (Miller, 1978; Shamir, 1981; Wood, 1992).

Research into organizational culture has contributed to management studies by tracing the mechanisms through which control occurs. Kunda's (1992) celebrated study *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*, for instance, used an interpretive analysis of ethnographic findings from texts internal and external to organizations to investigate organizational culture as a form of social control in a high-tech company in Silicon Valley. Similarly, Barker (1993) explores the concept of "concertive control" through a study of post-bureaucratic organizations, which have abandoned hierarchical structures and moved to self-managing teams. Barker argues that this system, devoid of central authority, actually produces a greater sense of social control, as employees respond to social pressure generated by interactions among members of the group, which produces its own norms and sanctions. In this situation, group pressure may cause employees to feel less comfortable voicing their personal needs (e.g., the need to come to work late due to family circumstances). Thus, even in modern organizations that have purportedly abandoned steep hierarchies in favor of more egalitarian structures, there is still a need to consider how such structures embody power dynamics and to what extent organizational structure may be affecting the quality of the employees' working lives.

Likewise, tourism students should also understand the power dynamics of organizational culture and of the culture of the business field at large. Many students tend to be drawn to undergraduate and master's programs in tourism because of their own egoistic ambitions to become part of the power structure. Indeed, the managerial literature relevant to tourism education tends to address students "as if they were to be part of the glamorous and most powerful cadre of senior managers" (Roberts, 1996, p. 68). Such a construction is at odds with the realities most students will eventually face as middle managers, especially in an era of downsizing, when chances are good that they will face job insecurity and find that their own interests conflict with those of the larger organization. In short, many of them will become the very type of employees that traditional management training seems to be offering them the power to exploit.

In contrast to studies focusing on intra-organizational issues of the type discussed above, research on the relationship between organizations and the broader society emphasizes that the tourism workplace is not merely a microcosm in which the social relations of hosts and guests can be examined, but rather, that it is a powerful force in its own right in the larger world. As such, the consequences of organizational practices in particular, and of the entire system of global capitalism in general, are important social outcomes that should not be left unanalyzed. Works by scholars like Stiglitz (2002), Korten (1995), and Barber (1995), which exemplify this strain of critical study, illustrate the ideological agendas and problematic consequences of global economic institutions (e.g., the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization) and the consequences of the centralized power of international corporations. A similar approach can be employed to examine the goals and policies of tourism organizations on international, national, and local levels.

Although research in the field of CMS related to issues of social justice is highly varied, such work tends to reject means-end reasoning. Furthermore, CMS embraces a view of human potential and life-meaning that transcends the values of material production—it problematizes reward distribution systems that involve vast material inequalities, and it espouses commitment to the inclusivity and participation of people from all social groups, not simply those that have traditionally been dominant. Such critiques are sorely needed, as the world is experiencing its greatest wealth disparity of all time, with the cumulative income of the three wealthiest individuals on the planet equal to the combined income of the world's poorest forty-nine countries; as large wage disparities continue to exist between social groups, such as men and women, despite both groups performing the same labor; as extreme quests for personal gain lead long-established financial institutions to spiral out of control; and as research in psychology and beyond continues to demonstrate that the accumulation of material wealth beyond a certain level does not equate with human happiness, but actually creates problems of its own (Barber, 2007; Kasser, 2002; Lane, 2000; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005).

As noted in the previous section, the mere exposure of tourism students to such alternative viewpoints does not automatically guarantee that they will experience ideological realignments as they develop intellectually—nor should it. The formation of one's values should be a matter of free and reasoned choice, not of coercion by any institution or individual. It is our hopeful contention, however, that this outcome is more likely to happen than not. A variety of reasons justify our optimism.

As philosophers such as Rorty (1989) have argued, it is more challenging to ignore the plights of others and to see others as somehow different from oneself in terms of the way they experience suffering and injustice if one is aware of the details of their existence. The awareness of one's own role as a person of privilege in an unfair system has the potential to cultivate a productive form of cognitive dissonance, in which individuals would find it increasingly difficult to justify their own advantages knowing that they come at the expense of other people's life chances or of the natural systems that sustain life on this planet. In Socratic terms, after examining the lives of other, less fortunate people, one is left with fewer places in which to hide from responsibility (Nussbaum, 2010).

Alternatively, Wright (2000) has postulated a more self-interested path to solidarity, but his narrative is equally powerful in connecting an increased awareness of others with more socially productive moral commitments. As he argues, the collective human experience is one of increasingly recognizing the individual gains that derive from collaborations with others. It is, increasingly, the destiny of individuals, and ultimately of social groups and of entire civilizations, to engage in non-zero-sum exchanges with broader and broader social networks, to capitalize on the benefits that such exchanges hold for each party. This process has implications for human moral growth because, as our networks for productive collaboration expand, so too does our capacity for empathy with ever-greater circles of humanity.

Thus, regardless of whether we are driven by a pure desire for justice as we become more aware of the struggles of others or whether that desire is filtered through a more selfish process of coming to relate to, and hence care for, others based on what we can gain from our interactions with them, there is reason to believe that exposure to and deliberation of information about some of the darker consequences of the way we currently do business, both within organizations and beyond, can lead to the formation of ideological commitments that are more in line with the common good. Such beliefs are a prerequisite for changing actual social conditions.

As educational institutions founded to further not only individual but also collective good, university tourism departments have a duty to facilitate such positive change. Despite their applied natures and close ties to private industry, academic tourism programs are not immune from this social responsibility. For tourism education to be successful, tomorrow's graduates must exit the classroom with more than just the technical skills needed to abet their own ascent up the corporate ladder. They must leave with the recognition that they are moral architects in their occupational domain.

3.3. Engaging the invisible brain: On productive human relations

Thus far, we have argued that embracing critical pedagogy in tourism education can lead to improvements in both human freedom and social justice. Such arguments may strike more pragmatic readers as unduly utopian, considering the socio-economic reality under which the tourism industry operates. Although we contend that the ability to envision alternative futures is a key function of academia (including academic projects such as this publication), and as such, that utopian visions have their place, we are not unaware of the constraints that produce business schools in their current form. Economic uncertainty in an era of post-industrialization and downsizing, staggering student debt levels (Washburn, 2005), and cultural norms that drive students to construe learning as having primarily extrinsic rather than intrinsic value (Ottewill, 2003) no doubt push students toward what they perceive to be the most "practical" educational investments. As such, fields that "make money, study money or attract money" are viewed as the most desirable, and accordingly, students seek academic programs they feel will provide them with the keys to success (Engell & Dangerfield, 1998, cited in Washburn, 2005). Thus, it would be naïve to argue for the need to incorporate critical pedagogy in tourism education without contextualizing its value in terms of the traditional goals of university management programs.

There are reasons to believe that the operationalist approach currently embedded in academic tourism curricula is not necessarily the best preparation for students in terms of what they will encounter beyond the gates of the ivory tower. Typical arguments note that in a knowledge-driven economy, it is more important for students to learn how to exercise their creative capacities and nurture their own continued intellectual growth than to memorize bodies of technical information, especially since knowledge is changing so rapidly. Such arguments are often invoked in problematizing the university's turn away from criticality and toward operationalism, precisely because higher education is "the major institution in society organized for cognitive change and flexibility" (Barnett, 1994, p. 30). We can transcend these generalities, however, and exploit the more philosophically developed positions in the literature that articulate such concerns specifically, in the tourism education context.

Kallinikos (1996), for example, who critiques currently conceived notions of management and management training, conceives of the will to manage as being deeply embedded in a technocratic outlook that views life and human interactions as a set of problems to be broken down, analyzed, mastered, and controlled—a world orientation that is part and parcel of the project of modernity (see also Shenav, 1999, for analyses on this role of rationality in the professionalization of management). This instrumental approach to both management scholarship and business education derived from the West's Cartesian inheritance of viewing the knower as standing in opposition to what is to be known (and thus what is ultimately able to be controlled), causes education to adopt a particular form, which increasingly involves the substitution of expertise for norms, techniques for moral capacities, and so forth. In a similar vein, Habermas (1971, 1989) has written extensively about the rise of a "technocratic consciousness," noting that technical rationality is progressively slipping outside the bounds of normative social constraints, such that *technicality* is coming to be reified as synonymous with *practicality*, and hence, effectiveness. A technocratic educational approach thus casts the manager as a "morally neutral technician" whose role is to apply appropriate techniques to bring about effective and efficient outcomes (Roberts, 1996, p. 54).

So what are the reasons why the technocratic educational approach has gained so much success in tourism departments? It would be reasonable to argue that technocratic curricula in tourism have become self-sustaining because they conform to students' consumer-oriented desires to receive predigested units of knowledge and provide them with a comforting sense of certainty that the world is, in fact, well understood. In addition, such curricula also bestow upon universities a "quality control" mechanism as they cast scholars in the role of experts who can, rather tautologically, be evaluated mostly on their ability to transmit the received canon of knowledge in an entertaining and engaging manner (Boje, 1996).

The irony, however, is that abandoning the more philosophical components of the higher education curriculum in favor of "morally neutral" skills training can actually be detrimental to human productivity. Such an approach may not really prepare students to make their way in a world that does not necessarily function on the principles of technical rationality but that the modern mind nevertheless insists on imposing on it. MacIntyre (1981), for example, argues that although the practice of

management is premised on the idea of being able to manipulate human beings to adopt predictable and compliant behavior, the practical implementation of such a task is functionally impossible. Social life is inherently unpredictable for many reasons, not the least of which derives precisely from people's basic desire for freedom—to escape the control of others.

In the face of the reality of the interdependence of human behavioral outcomes, Roberts' analysis (1996) stresses the limits of technical rationality as an effective approach to coordinating human activity in the pursuit of productivity (whatever we may consider that to mean in the tourism industry). Such a reality is not simply limiting, however; it can also be viewed as a productive force that, when properly understood, can enable human progress. We return to the work of Wright (2000), discussed earlier, to make sense of this idea. In his sweeping analysis of the growth of human civilization, Wright argues that the story of human progress is essentially the story of individuals and groups finding increasingly complex ways to collaborate toward mutually beneficial ends. Drawing on Adam Smith's notion of the "invisible hand," Wright posits that human society works like an "invisible brain," whose individual actors function like the neurons. As these individuals pursue their own creative endeavors and share information with one another, ideas with merit tend, on the whole, to be adopted, and the potential for synergy also emerges. Although Wright admittedly paints with very broad strokes, his volume offers a compelling argument for non-zero-sum engagements by relatively autonomous parties as the driving force behind civilizational progress. His arguments can be seen as demonstrating that the organic unfolding of human interactions within organizational contexts is not necessarily dysfunctional and in need of having strict order imposed upon it for the purposes of prediction and control. Thus, drawing on the CMS literature to focus on human interaction in organizations in ways that go beyond positing behavioral control as the bottom line augments students' potential to learn to cope with the realities of life in the business world in more productive ways.

4. Conclusion

Even if one is unconvinced by the specific arguments of the scholars whose work is explored in this paper, the spirit of questioning the status quo is vital for rejuvenating today's antediluvian tourism programs. In this sense, CMS can be seen as a healthy evolutionary mechanism that ensures the existence of a variety of ideas and opinions in the realm of management. As in natural evolution, some of these ideas may be viewed as unproductive mutations of revered traditional approaches, but in times of crisis, when nontraditional solutions are sought, they may offer inspiring alternatives. Thus, at the very least, implementing a more critical approach in tourism pedagogy can encourage the proliferation of more diverse potential solutions to problems and can add philosophical depth to management training in an era in which academics seek to professionalize the practice (Khurana & Nohria, 2008). At best, the adoption by tourism pedagogy of CMS principles may effect the kinds of benefits outlined in this paper, instilling in future managers an awareness of their power to shape the kind of world in which they want to live, engaging them in the project of expanding social justice, and equipping them to deal more productively with the messy realities of the workplace and the limits of their profession.

As we have attempted to illustrate here, a variety of benefits can potentially accrue by embracing a more critical approach to management education. Although critical management studies is sometimes caricatured as a sort of hard-line revolutionary Marxist movement that seeks to overthrow business education and practice as we know it, we hope we have been able to demonstrate that the real picture is much more complex. Far from being a coherent project with undisputed political aims, and (on the whole) far from seeking to undermine management as a profession or an academic field, CMS is better conceptualized as an agitating force that seeks to improve management education and practice by inducing reflexivity and by rendering taken-for-granted assumptions up for questioning. The inclusion of CMS in university curricula carries intellectual, pedagogical, ethical, and professional added values that traditional approaches lack.

Rather than leading students to believe that tourism education effectively places the tools of control in their waiting hands, academia would be better serving them with educational preparation that cultivates more critical understandings of social systems, such that students reconcile themselves to the limits of their own power and "instead begin to develop the habits of mind and action consistent with the reality of organizational interdependencies" (Roberts, 1996, p. 58). Such a view restores human agency, including moral agency, to those who seek to work as coordinators and leaders in the tourism industry.

References

Airey, D., & Johnson, S. (1999). The content of degree courses in the UK. *Tourism Management, 20*(2), 229–235.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2007). *Studying management critically*. London: Sage.

Amoah, V. A., & Baum, T. (1997). Tourism education: policy versus practice. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 9*(1), 5–12.

Andrews, T. (2005). "Made by toile"? Tourism, labor, and the construction of the Colorado landscape, 1858–1917. *Journal of American History, 92*, 837–863.

Anthony, P. (1977). *The ideology of work*. London: Tavistock.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Barber, B. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld: How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Barber, B. (2007). *Consumed: How markets corrupt children, infantilize adults, and swallow citizens whole*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Baritz, L. (1960). *The servants of power: A history of the use of social science in American industry*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Barker, J. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: concertive control in self-managing terms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*(3), 408–437.

Barnett, R. (1994). *The limits of competence: Knowledge, higher education and society*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Boje, D. (1996). Management education as a panoptic cage. In R. French, & C. Grey (Eds.), *Rethinking management education* (pp. 172–195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bridgman, T. (2007). Reconstituting relevance: exploring possibilities for management educators' critical engagement with the public management learning. *Learning Management, 38*(4), 425–439.

Bruce, K. (2006). Henry Dennison, Elton Mayo and human relations historiography. *Management and Organizational History, 1*(2), 177–199.

Cooke, B. (2003). The managing of the (third) world. *Organization, 11*(5), 603–629.

Cooper, C., & Shepherd, R. (1997). The relationship between tourism education and the tourism industry: implications for tourism education. *Tourism Recreation Research, 22*(1), 34–47.

Crompton, R., & Sanderson, K. (1990). *Gendered job and social change*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Cunliffe, A. (2007). The philosopher leader: on relationalism, ethics and reflexivity—a critical perspective to teaching leadership. *Management Learning, 40*(1), 87–101.

Dehler, G. (2007). Prospects and possibilities of critical management education: critical beings and a pedagogy of critical action. *Management Learning, 40*(1), 31–49.

Ehrenreich, B. (2001). *Nickel and dimed: On (not) getting by in America*. New York: Henry Holt.

Engell, J., & Dangerfield, A. (1998). The market-model university: humanities in the age of money. *Harvard Magazine*, 48–55, May–June.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations, 53*(1), 7–32.

Freire, P. (1995). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Galbraith, J. (1969). *The new industrial state*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Geuss, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Giroux, H. (2007). *The university in chains: Confronting the military–industrial-academic complex*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Goodman, R., Jr., & Sprague, L. (1991). The future of hospitality education: meeting the industry's needs. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 32*(2), 66–70.
Grey, C., & French, R. (1996). Rethinking management education: An introduction. In R. French, & C. Grey (Eds.), *Rethinking management education* (pp. 1–16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Grey, C., & Willmott, H. (2005). *Critical management studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Habermas, J. (1971). *Towards a rational society*. London: Heinemann.
Habermas, J. (1978). *Knowledge and human interests*. London: Heinemann.
Habermas, J. (1989). *The theory of communicative action, Volume 2*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. (1995). *Tourism and public policy*. London: Routledge.
Henning, M., & Jardin, A. (1978). *The managerial woman*. New York: Pocketbook.
Hollinshead, K. (1999). Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: foucault and the eye-of-power. *Tourism Management, 20*(1), 7–23.
Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical theory: Selected essays*. New York: Herder and Herder.
Illouz, E. (2007). *Cold intimacies: The making of emotional capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Inui, Y., Wheeler, D., & Lankford, S. (2006). Rethinking tourism education: what should schools teach? *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education, 5*(2), 25–35.
Jafari, J. (1990). Research and scholarship: the basis of tourism education. *Journal of Tourism Studies, 1*(1), 33–41.
Kallinikos, J. (1996). Mapping the intellectual terrain of management education. In R. French, & C. Grey (Eds.), *Rethinking management education* (pp. 36–53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Kasser, T. (2002). *The high price of materialism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Khurana, R., & Nohria, N. (2008). It's time to make management a true profession. *Harvard Business Review, 86*(10), 70–79.
Korten, D. (1995). *When corporations rule the world*. San Francisco: Berret–Kohler.
Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Lane, R. (2000). *The loss of happiness in market democracies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Learmonth, M. (2007). Critical management education in action: personal tales of management unlearning. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 6*(1), 109–113.
Lewis, S. (2003). The integration of paid work and the rest of life: is postindustrial work the new leisure? *Leisure Studies, 22*(4), 343–355.
MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue*. London: Duckworth.
Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Marcuse, H. (1998). Some social implications of modern technology. In D. Kellner (Ed.), *Technology, war, and facism* (pp. 39–66). New York: Routledge.
Marino, M. (2001). The tourist sector: public versus private. The Italian and Spanish experience. *Tourism Management, 22*(1), 43–48.
McCabe, S. (2009). Who needs a holiday? Evaluating social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(4), 667–688.
McCabe, S., & Martin, E. (2007). Part time work and postgraduate students: developing the skills for employment. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education, 6*(2), 29–40.
McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism: A critical pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.
Miller, G. (1978). *Odd jobs: The world of deviant work*. New Jersey NJ: Prentice Hall.
Mills, C. R. (1956). *The power elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Morgan, M. (2004). From production line to drama school: higher education for the future of tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 16*(2), 91–99.
Morrison, A., & O'Mahoney, G. B. (2003). The liberation of hospitality management education. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 15*(1), 38–44.
Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Nussbaum, M. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Ottewill, R. (2003). What's wrong with instrumental learning? : the case of business and management. *Education and Training, 45*(4/5), 189–196.
Parker, M. (2002). *Against management*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Pritchard, C. (2009). Three moves for engaging students in critical management studies. *Management Learning, 40*(1), 51–68.
Ring, A., Dickinger, A., & Wöber, K. (2009). Designing the ideal undergraduate program in tourism: expectations from industry and educators. *Journal of Travel Research, 48*(1), 106–121.
Ritchie, J. R. B. (1995). Design and development of the tourism and hospitality management curriculum. *Tourism Recreation Research, 20*(2), 7–13.
Roberts, J. (1996). Management education and the limits of technical rationality: The conditions and consequences of management practice. In R. French, & C. Grey (Eds.), *Rethinking management education* (pp. 54–75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Rose, M. (1988). *Industrial Behaviour*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Ryan, C. (2002). Equity, management, power sharing and sustainability—issues of the "new tourism". *Tourism Management, 23*(1), 17–26.
Shamir, B. (1981). The workplace as a community: the case of British hotels. *Industrial Relations Journal, 12*, 45–46.
Shenav, Y. (1999). *Manufacturing rationality: The engineering foundations of the managerial revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton.
Tagore, R. (1917). *Nationalism*. New York: Macmillan.
Thomas, A., & Anthony, P. (1996). Can management education be educational? In R. French, & C. Grey (Eds.), *Rethinking management education* (pp. 17–35) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, power, knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 518–545.
Tribe, J. (2000). Balancing the vocational: the theory and practice of liberal education in tourism. *The International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research (The Surrey Quarterly Review), 2*, 9–26.
Tribe, J. (2001). Research paradigms and the tourism curriculum. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*(4), 442–448.
Tribe, J. (2002). The philosophic practitioner. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(2), 338–357.
Tribe, J. (2008). Tourism: a critical business. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*(3), 245–255.
Van Dijk, P., & Kirk, A. (2007). Being somebody else: emotional labour and emotional dissonance in the context of the service experience at a heritage tourism site. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management, 14*(2), 157–169.
Veblen, T. (1918). *The higher learning in America: A memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men*. New York: B. W. Huebsch.
Washburn, J. (2005). *University Inc.: The corporate corruption of higher education*. New York: Basic Books.
Wheeller, B. (1992). Is progressive tourism appropriate? *Tourism Management, 13*(1), 104–105.
Wheeller, B. (2003). Sustaining the ego. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 11*(2), 121–129.
Wood, R. (1992). Deviants and misfits: hotel and catering labour and the marginal worker thesis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 11*(3), 1979–1982.
Wright, R. (2000). *Nonzero: The logic of human destiny*. New York: Vintage Books.