CRITICAL PEDAGOGY FOR SOCIAL SERVICE MANAGEMENT

WILLIAM WOOLRICH

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN EDUCATION
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

April 2019

© William Woolrich, 2019

Abstract

The study examines how the practice of management in the social services might be conducted with social justice values at the forefront. It builds on current Critical Management Studies (CMS) theory by considering the particular needs of social service administration. Seven managers and six post-secondary educators were interviewed for their perspectives on possibilities for critical practice as it applies to social service administration and how post-secondary education might have prepared those managers for the realities of their work. The data suggested that education for management often fails to prepare them for the complex realities of their work. Conversely, as educators try to impart a critical approach to managers, they face resistance from students. One potential way forward is the need for educators to provide more opportunities for simulation-based education, e.g., case studies or role plays while further emphasizing the reasons for the pedagogical choices they make thereby enhancing student engagement.

Keywords: post-secondary education, social services, social work, critical management education

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the very generous support of my committee, Drs. Paul Axelrod, Roopa Desai Trilokekar, and Khaled Barkaoui who provided invaluable guidance and encouragement throughout the development of this work. Gratitude also goes to Drs. Yuk-Lin Renita Wong and Ken Moffatt for their helpful comments and suggestions. I also wish to thank the many other professors I had throughout the doctoral process who gave me their time to bounce ideas off them. My appreciation also goes to the participants who gave me their time and thoughtful responses to difficult questions. There would be no dissertation without their gracious assistance. I would furthermore like to recognize the many friends and family who, despite my neglect, provided reassurance and often more instrumental forms of assistance. Mary Gilbert extended words of inspiration at a time when most people would have been thinking more about themselves. My extended family including Ryan McCullough, Laura Bleaney, Jacques Cecillon, Lea Ayuyao, Amado Ayuyao, Amelia Ayuyao, Peter Woolrich, Laura Sky, Verne Sparks, and Barry Schneider were consistent in offering me support and quiet places in which to read or write. My mother Ena Woolrich also put up with many days where I should have been calling or visiting and was instead “dissertationing”. Finally, and most especially, my immediate family: Irmina Ayuyao, Asha Woolrich, and Finnegan Woolrich never stopped rooting for me. I used up so much time and energy which meant I was “unavailable” for years; yet, despite this, they were unwavering in their support. Without their love and inspiration, I would have never finished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ii

Acknowledgements iii

Table of Contents iv

Chapter One: Introduction 1

  Background 1

  Research Questions 4

  Justification for Study 7

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework 9

  Description of Program Requirements 9

  Contrasting Pedagogical Strategies 11

  Resistance to CMS/CME 13

  Definitions 16

    Critical 16

    Critical theory 16

    The critical approach 18

    Management 22

    Social justice 23

    Critical management studies 24

    Critical management education 33

The centrality of “useful knowledge” to traditional management 40

Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology 44

Design Theoretical Framework... 44

Methodology 52

Sampling. 52

Data Analysis 56

Description of Managers. 57

Description of Educators.. 59

Chapter Four: Manager Themes 63

Social Justice is Equality of Opportunity... 63

Managerial Constraints Limit Social Justice 67

Importance of Working Non-Formulaically 80

Critical Managers Need to Go Beyond the Mission of the Agency 89

Social Service Management is Neglected in Higher Education; but Preparation Comes Through General Education.. 92

Pedagogy Should Reflect the Complexity of the Work Environment 96

Chapter Five: Educator Themes.. 108

Critical Pedagogy Acknowledges Power in the Workplace.. 109

Education Should Problematize Not Simplify..115

Importance of Discussing Values, Ethics, and of Broad Consultation 122

Expect Resistance to Critical Pedagogy 129

Critical Managers Demonstrate Leadership (and Followership), Avoiding Mechanistic Approaches 136

Chapter Six: Conclusion 147

How do Managers Engage in Critical Practice 148

Practice as Pragmatic 148

Constraints Paradoxically Inhibit Social Justice 152

“Best Practices” for Teaching Critical Management 157

Uselessness of Useful Courses 158

Translation of Education to Constraints of Practice 161

Limitations 162

Implications for Practice 166

References 172

Appendix A: Interview Prologue 183

What is a “Critical” Approach? 183

Appendix B: Interview Questions 184

Educator Questions 184

Management Focused 184

Education Focused 184

Manager Questions 185

Management Focused 185

Education Focused 186

Chapter One: Introduction

Background

A significant number of social work graduates will go on to supervisory positions in social service or non-profit[1] agencies. Indeed, I was one of them. It wasn't long after beginning my work in an agency that provided support to people who had been through the mental health system that I aspired to move up the ladder. Not unlike many people, this aspiration was partly a function of ego and partly the desire for more money. So, I resigned my position as a frontline social worker for a large urban mental health support team and began work as a team leader in another agency that provided supportive housing for consumer/survivors[2]. My first management experiences were a shock. My role, rather than direction setting for the team, was much more related to HR. Such tasks included ensuring punctuality and that staff were putting in the hours that they said they were. I was truly surprised to find myself showing up unannounced at one of our homes to ensure that one of my staff showed up and was on time. This ran outside the graduate training I had received as a social worker, which had emphasized social justice and the transformation of society into one that ensured the more equitable distribution of resources. Yet, this seemed to be much more about surveilling "suspect" employees. I might have imagined this from a large corporation, but not from a moderately sized social service agency whose reputation was one that suggested a commitment to social justice. I couldn't reconcile how this was justice for the staff who despite the challenging work, managed to support scores of people with complex needs. In a way, I felt I'd given up my profession. Indeed, this is precisely how it was describe by Pietroni (1995) who, in referencing Schön, discussed four distinct professional roles, one of which was "the managerial professional who leaves behind his [sic] discipline of origin and assumes responsibility for planning, resource allocation and personnel" (p. 43). In other words, managers are no longer practicing their profession, i.e., I wasn't a social worker any more.

---

[1] Non-profit is a broad term that can capture a wide variety of organizations that exist for a purpose other than profit. "Social service" applies to organizations that engage in the delivery of services that seek to aid or empower individuals or groups who are, or have been, in some way disadvantaged. Note that not all non-profits are social service agencies and not all social service agencies are non-profits. For the purpose of this paper, both terms are used but it is social service agencies in particular, i.e., places of employment for social workers that are under discussion.

[2] A more inclusive term for people who have experienced the mental health system.

My next position was an administrator in a large sized university in Toronto. However, it wasn't long before I tuned into the fact that managers were there to ensure compliance from largely mistrusted unionized frontline staff. Generally, though not universally, frontline staff were assumed to be taking advantage of the system and one of our major responsibilities was to curtail that. Although, admittedly, not every staff person I worked with was what I would call "on the ball", it seemed like the assumption was always to presume incompetence, until proven otherwise. Pietroni (1995) touches on this when she remarks:

> Social workers who are care managers *or team managers* [emphasis added] continually work in the space between what Bion called pre-conception and absence; internally they pay a price. The burden of thoughtfully digesting that internally disruptive experience and continuing to practice as a bureau-professional, rather than cynically constructing in the mind an organizational world of bad objects at the level of management or policy making is immense (p. 41-42)

I don't imagine my experiences are unique. Social workers who have largely been trained for direct practice often move into management, either by choice or because they are pressured into it. It’s unlikely that many realize how discordant the practice of management is with the education they received. That disjuncture is even starker for the many students who never considered managerial positions while they were in school. The challenge, for educators, of preparing these unplanned, or “accidental”, managers is formidable for the simple reason that these students have not considered what forms of practice they may be asked to engage in at mid-career (rather than immediately after graduation). As such, even for programs that try to anticipate future skill requirements, students themselves are not considering mid-career needs and requirements—they don’t foresee a career shift into administration. As such, programs can find themselves in the position of offering educational opportunities in which students are uninterested.

My social work training was grounded in a critical perspective, which emphasized the social construction of reality, the role social work has played in past injustices, and the potential it has for encouraging systemic change that results in a fairer society. This approach to practice is one of two main streams. The first more conservative or traditional stream was based on the Charity Organization Societies (COS) and purported the use of scientific methods for the purpose of providing aid to disadvantaged people, usually through the process of providing strategies for service users to adjust themselves and/or their behaviour in ways that provided a better fit with their environment (Martinez, 2014). In contract to the COS was the Settlement House Movement (SHM). Settlement houses, while acknowledging the challenges their service users faced, also worked with them to initiate systemic change, i.e., activism, to build a society that they felt was fairer (Martinez, 2014). In short, the COS located the problem in the individual, whereas the SHM located the problem in society. It was out of the latter that a critical approach to social work was borne.

Although many agencies work from the critical perspective embraced by the settlement house movement, sadly, the current state of education can leave new managers at a loss when trying to work from this perspective because comparatively little work has been done on exploring the intersection between critical theory and management. I received almost no training in leadership or administration, and I don’t believe any was even available during my student tenure. As a result of the lack of availability of training, and of the paucity of information on the topic, even in cases where students have been taught with social justice and anti-technological[3] methods emphasized as part of the curriculum, as they enter management roles they lack a framework with which to practice and thus can often assimilate as traditional managers not unlike those found in the private sector.

One reason that students do not receive the education that would best assist them in a social justice orientation toward management, is that we do not have a clear picture of what this kind of practice would look like in the field. How would a critical manager in social service be practicing differently than a traditional manager? Not only is the goal of critical management poorly defined, but the way to get there is even hazier. How we might effectively provide opportunities for PSE students to learn the skills and attitudes to facilitate the practice of administration that minimizes the potential for harm that management can inflict.

Research Questions

The foregoing considerations raise two questions. First, how is critical management enacted? In other words, how can managers work in agencies and communities that are often immersed in hierarchical organizational structures and, simultaneously, subvert these systems of power and control over labour? There is little doubt that current systems of management often employ “chain of command” structures that demarcate decision-making authority to facilitate communication (Wren & Bedeian, 2009). To provide relevant responses to the question “how is critical management enacted”, from the perspective of someone who has worked as a social service sector administrator for several years, it is necessary for those trained in critical thought to be able to imagine ways that acknowledge the role of management as a mechanism of oppression, while at the same time complicating its conceptualization by recognizing and cultivating its emancipatory potential (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012). As Contu (2011) states, “what is critical in critical work then is not only elaborating theories, which are often underscored by strong, normative components, but elaborating strategies tactics [sic], and producing interventions to be enacted in different moments and in different ways” (p. 547).

---

[3] “Technology” here refers to any form of practice. This sense of the word is elaborated on by the work of Franklin and is discussed below.

The impetus for this study comes out of my own experiences being educated as a social worker in a school that offers a critical perspective and working in management in the non-profit sector. I have struggled with how one performs the day-to-day functions of management while at the same time staying true to liberatory ideals. In my work, I constantly longed for better guidance in negotiating a role that had rarely been discussed in my post-secondary education (PSE). It was my experience that this crucial element of my university education as a professional was missing. On the one hand, our role as advocates for service users of non-profits was laid out in detail. There was even an acknowledgement of the oppressive elements of the work as we mollified disempowered people by “throwing them a bone”, as it were. In this way, the full terrain of the worker/client relationship was laid out for analysis. What was never addressed was the similar tensions that might exist within organizations—that organizations are in some ways microcosms of the societies in which they function (Lee, 2011) and that as supervisors, professionals are expected to make decisions that can reinforce, and/or subvert, relationships of power. It’s important that PSE considers that social service agencies, designed to provide historically marginalized people with a vehicle for empowerment, can’t address these concerns if their staff are treated in ways that reproduce disempowerment. Ideally, the internal structure of the organization should mirror and model the ideals of the mission. PSE has largely been silent on how we might prepare managers to practice in ways that encourage such a formation.

The second research question is, “how can critical management be taught”? What pedagogical strategies might be employed that would enhance managers’ ability to resist dominant forms of practice and allow for the conception and realization of alternative discourses? How might we best structure our curricula and classes to provide students with tools that facilitate and encourage the reflexivity that they might benefit from later in their career? How might we foster a resilience, with regards to their values, that is able to resist the acculturation that comes with working in a neoliberal environment; and at the same time is sensitive to the complexity and conflicting demands that will be placed on them. It is this tendency toward acculturating into dominant techniques of management that post-secondary modes of education need to address, in addition to the questions and concerns outlined above.

The two research questions are inextricably linked. Professional academic programs are required to be grounded in practice. Without a solid understanding of the freedoms and constraints that managers in the field work with, it’s impossible to develop appropriate pedagogy to meet their needs (Cavanaugh & Prasad, 1996). Knowing what works, and what doesn’t, for managers in the field who would like to practice in ways that are congruent to their values is necessary for the development of post-secondary educational instruction that is relevant. The study maps out extant practice knowledge in critical management as well as identifies gaps with a view to developing programs that explore and articulate effective strategies to cultivate the emancipatory potential of those working in non-profit management. It attempts to provide budding managers with a framework for working in ways that stay true to the ideals with which they entered the sector. Moreover, though ideal conditions for management education are outlined, educators also face challenges in their implementation. Thus, the thoughts provided by educators in meeting the educational needs of critical management are discussed.

Justification for Study

The study of Critical Management Studies (CMS) and Critical Management Education (CME) is imperative because workers who come to the social service sector with education that emphasizes strategies to resist relationships of inequity, often end up reproducing and defending those same systems as they are promoted to management positions in mid-career. They acculturate to existing, dominant, management practices and fail to question “untested feasibilities” (Coronado, 2016). In addition to the difficult identity work that this leads to among managers, it impedes needed social change. Indeed, non-profit management, as a whole, has been drifting toward becoming a tool to enforce efficiency (e.g., Stoney, 1998). This may not disturb many of those who are comfortable with traditional management and conventional transmission pedagogy. However, even those who have been trained to use orthodox methods of supervision often find unsatisfactory results or, crucially, have never been able to identify why they manage in the first place. Moreover, the progressive mission of agencies that seem to acknowledge the economic and social injustices that are a result of contemporary social systems, will seem hollow—even to more conservative management practitioners—without an analysis of how the agency itself might be implicated. Unfortunately, critically educated managers don’t fare much better and it is because PSE has largely failed them in providing the support and guidance that would be required for such a philosophy of practice. This focused theoretical analysis of how critical management can be conceived, as well as an elaboration of the opportunities and pitfalls for educating students in its parameters, will advance the emancipatory potential for management in the social services. The social justice agenda advanced by many non-profit agencies is hypocritical if within the agency the relationships between staff are reproducing the very power structures the agency purports to subvert. As Alvesson and Willmott (2003) write, “a non-technocratic agenda for management studies requires that management theory and practice be examined in a critical light—that is, a light that considers not only means-ends relationships, but also the ends and institutionalized conditions of management discourse and action” (p. 15). In parallel, the training PSE managers have received will either reinforce or undermine dominant systems of oppression. If educators are interested in encouraging their students to closely examine and problematize the function of management, it is incumbent on them to interrogate their own pedagogical practices to see that they “practice what they preach”.

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Description of Program Requirements.

As the respondents speak to the future and the possibilities for social work education, rather than what is, it is useful to provide some description of what is currently required for a BSW. BSW programs in Canada are accredited by the Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE). Standards of accreditation specify that:

> The four-year BSW curriculum reflects a balance of general education (at least 40 percent) and professional education (at least 50 percent) and a field practicum of at least 700 hours. The Quebec three-year programs essentially cover professional social work education and the field practicum, while liberal arts are principally covered at the CEGEP level (https://caswe-acfts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/CASWE-ACFTS-Standards-11-2014.pdf).

Standards for the MSW program are:

> Programs for students admitted with a first level social work degree include a specialized or advanced study component of at least 18 credit hours of course work, a practicum of at least 450 hours and/or a thesis or memoire, as defined by the program’s university, such as to provide an opportunity for the integration and demonstration of advanced social work skills in practice, and/or policy analysis and/or research (https://caswe-acfts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/CASWE-ACFTS-Standards-11-2014.pdf).

Two examples, chosen because they both take critical perspective to social work, are McMaster and Ryerson. Both offer the option of entering a BSW with advanced standing based on another degree or diploma (referred to as post-degree program). McMaster’s direct-entry, i.e., non-post-degree, program focusses on “a search for the principles of social justice. Preparation for the general practice of social work requires the development of competence in effecting change in a variety of situations affecting individuals, families, groups, organizations or communities in the broader society based on a knowledge of social structure, human behaviour, social welfare services, and social work methods” (https://socialwork.mcmaster.ca/programs/honours-bachelor-of-social-work). Students apply to the program after their first year in the Social Sciences program. Once admitted to social work they are required to complete an additional 90 units (one half course is three units), all of which are foundation courses, to complete the program. Foundation courses are intended to cover the core competencies of the profession. Examples include courses in anti-oppressive perspectives, working with communities, working with families, and two field practica. Though there is no course in management or organizational behaviour at the BSW level, they do have a specialized Master of Social Work titled, “Critical Leadership in Social Services and Communities” where students are required to take seven required courses that address policy, organizational behaviour, and leadership; as well as a leadership focused practicum. McMaster University is also offering a Graduate Diploma in “Critical Leadership in Social Services and Communities” which offers courses such as “Changing Social Services, Changing Communities: Focus on Leadership”; “Organizational and Social Change: Theories, Practices and Possibilities for Leadership”; and “Critical Approaches to Evidence and Evaluation in Social Services and Communities”.

Unlike McMaster’s program, it’s possible to enter Ryerson’s program directly, i.e., without the first year in a generalist program. Like McMaster, the program is a generalist one and courses are intended to cover core competencies in addition to a broad range of possible practice areas, e.g., working with seniors. The undergraduate program does offer the option of one course in leadership, cross listed with Critical Disability Studies, which is described in this way: “This course looks at leadership theory and the challenges of leading in neo-liberal times. It touches on political discourse, public policy and the legislative process. It examines the problem of working across differences and complicates empowerment. Students will meet and talk with leaders from social movements. By the time students complete their assignments, they should be able to imagine themselves as leaders and be better able to assist disabled people in becoming leaders” (http://www.ryerson.ca/calendar/2017-2018/courses/disability-studies/DST/727/). Unlike McMaster however, Ryerson has no specializations or courses at the graduate level in leadership or organizational theory. Some universities, rather than offering the comprehensive programs as described above have single courses to offer students who anticipate moving into leadership positions. For example, Trent offers a BSW course in “Social Work Organizations and Leadership”

One other example is the University of Toronto where there are focused options addressing management and administration. MSW students choose a field of study in their second year. One option is the specialization in Human Services Management and Leadership which includes courses like “Human Services Management and Leadership”, “Financial Management and Leadership in Human Service Organizations”, and “Human Resource Management in Human Service Organizations”.

Contrasting Pedagogical Strategies

It is helpful to consider a framework provided by Ursula Franklin in her Massey Lecture, The Real World of Technology (1999). She describes any practice as a technology, prayer for instance. Using this definition, she goes on to outline two very different technological models. The first is a production model where she uses the making of Chinese pottery as an exemplar.

Making pottery in ancient China was a very rigidly defined process where one person would throw the pottery, another would fire the kiln, a third would glaze the item, etc. Using this method, that foreshadowed the modern assembly line, they could produce numerous items of extremely high and consistent quality. Franklin argues that this method was ideally suited to its purpose.

In contrast, Franklin posits, what she describes as a growth model. Here she uses the analogy of a plant. There’s nothing that anyone can do to make a healthy plant. The role of the gardener is to create the best conditions she can, such that the plant will thrive: sufficient water but not too much, sufficient light but not too much, etc; however, when all is said and done it’s the plant that grows, or not. If the circumstances are right many plants will do well—but not all. Some will do extremely well and others only moderately so. Moreover, the ideal environment for each individual plant will differ slightly and there’s no one ideal. Different conditions will produce different “kinds” of healthy plant. A great deal of light may result in a very leggy plant whereas one starved for light may result in flowers. Is growth better or worse than flowers? Obviously, this is a radically different model than that of the production line. Its inputs are highly varied, and its outputs are uncertain. Even what constitutes a good result is open to debate and interpretation. Franklin argues that we have tried to apply a production model to education when a growth model would be more appropriate. Toffler (1981) wrote of this model even earlier than Franklin:

> In one Second Wave country after another, social inventors, believing the factory to be the most advanced and efficient agency for production, tried to embody its principles in other organizations as well. Schools, hospitals, prisons, government bureaucracies, and other organizations thus took on many of the characteristics of

> the factory—its division of labor, its hierarchical structure and its metallic impersonality (p. 31)

If we imagine the critical education of managers with the lens of a growth model it opens up new possibilities as to how we might foster a sense of crisis[4] so as to question and unsettle the perceived "facts" of education and of managing. As educators, we must better create the conditions under which crisis in the classroom might happen and, perhaps more importantly provide the tools for students to be able to do the same in their practice as managers. The sense of ambiguity and uncertainty that is an intrinsic part of crisis can open the door for a biophilic approach toward learning, growth, and a renewed and broadened purpose. It acknowledges the false certainty, the discursive closure, which isolates students (and educators) from new ideas and imposes an artificial and unrealistic vision of what is done in management. In this way, justice as an overarching goal of supervision and management becomes a possibility.

Resistance to CMS/CME

Finally, I also wish to touch on the concept of resistance and how both CMS and CME are dismissed. It is no doubt unsurprising that they are marginalized by academe. On the one hand, as noted above, the very notion of CMS is seen by some critical theorists as oxymoronic; and on the other, practitioners of orthodox management view critical ways of managing as tangential to its true and proper goals of ensuring productivity and compliance. Yet, often the greatest resistance to CME comes, remarkably, from its students (Reynolds, 1999b). Brookfield (2005) identifies five potential sources of this resistance. The first, is the emphasis on Marx. Marx positions a critical approach as fundamentally about class; and, moreover, class as defined in ways that are specific to the 19th century. Marx never anticipated the politics of identity, nor did he unpack the complexity of class in the 21st century. Whereas he saw a distinction between bourgeoisie (and perhaps petite bourgeoisie), and proletariat; he did not envision the layers of class power in a post-industrialist society (Clark & Lipset, 1991). One of the factors in education to which students are very finely tuned, is relevance. Students could be resistant to this aspect of CME because of the perceived irrelevance of Marx.

---

[4] Crisis, in this case, is used in the same sense as Felman (1992) who speaks of the necessity of crisis for learning. The term is further discussed below.

The second is the critique of capitalism. Our students know, as well as we do, how deeply embedded in the capitalist system we are. They recognize the ambivalence that this comes with, e.g., they hate the exploitation of workers but love their new jeans. It's simply not a critique that's amenable to a good guy/bad guy dichotomy. And, where students recognize their own culpability in this socio-economic system, the challenge of developing a nuanced critique that CME demands to these conflicting macro level issues may be overwhelming.

Third, is the challenge to democracy that CME proposes—not to the idea of democracy; but rather to the idea that the socio-political environment we currently inhabit is democratic; or that all forms of democracy will invariably lead to greater social justice. This contradiction is modelled in the class when we use, what we think of as democratic strategies for teaching, e.g., sitting in a circle; but those strategies often result in reinforcing existing structures of power, e.g., sitting in circles creates more opportunities for teachers to surveille their students.

Fourth, is the inaccessibility of its theoretical language. As discussed above, CME relies on critical theory and critical theory is challenging. This has been pointed out by many and indeed was a barrier that I experienced in reviewing relevant literature. I would argue that passages like:

> I see a reinstatement of definitive meaning (a quasimodernist approach to reading and interpretation) as the outcome of the “deconstructive” readings of management theory that arrive at (unintended) closure because a politicized position has predetermined the role deconstruction is expected to play (Monin, 2004, p. 24).

are surprisingly common among the literature (I found that quote after selecting a topical library book at random and casually flipping through it for a minute), and would be challenging for anyone, never mind an undergraduate student, to parse.

And last, a final source of student resistance is what might be viewed as the pessimism that is seen to permeate critical discourse. The literature often focuses on the failures of modern socio-economic systems, their links to education, and the practice of management, and fails to posit viable visions of a fairer future. Although, no one is expected to buy into utopian alternatives; students can certainly imagine scenarios whereby wealth and power are redistributed in ways that are more just than current systems. Unfortunately, such alternative visions are not often put forth.

If CME is to meaningfully confront traditional management practices, it will have to clear these potential difficulties. Although Brookfield responds to each of these in detail, what’s important to note here is that while we set the stage for the growth of our students, we must also create conditions in which we as critical educators are likely to show growth. Each of these loci of resistance can be worked through when we open ourselves up to curiosity and complexity of meaning. In doing so, we demonstrate to students a sense of solidarity in “being with” their resistance and identifying its source and deeper nature.

Definitions

Critical.

Unfortunately, the word “critical” has been used in so many ways that it has lost much of its meaning (Coronado, 2016; Fournier & Grey, 2000; Johnson & Morris, 2010). It resembles Orwell’s complaint about the word “fascism” which, he argued, is used in so many, sometimes contradictory, ways that, if we hope to avoid misunderstanding, it is best to eschew its use altogether (http://orwell.ru/library/articles/As_I_Please/english/efasc). First, it has been used in place of the word “critique” as in “to find fault or uncover fallacious reasoning”. In this sense, it takes on the connotation of disagreement or negativity. It has also referred to the ability to weigh and consider evidence and argument thereby resisting the sway of demagoguery and poorly constructed argument—thus the phrase ‘critical thinking’. A critical approach could be defined as a way of understanding the world that does not accept commonly taken-for-granted givens.

Critical theory.

One way “Critical” has been used is to refer very specifically to the work of the Institute for Social Research, which led to the Frankfurt School of political thought. Four philosophers formed the core of this group: Adorno, Horkheimer, Habermas, and Marcuse. In sum, critical theory began with the assumption that current economic and social systems are not “natural”, i.e., there are many ways socioeconomic and political forces could be organized, and our current system is just one of them. A further assumption is that social structures as they are currently articulated are fundamentally unjust and depend on injustice for their maintenance. Careful analysis can reveal how and why people have come to see structural inequality as inevitable.

The work of Habermas stands out as a very specific approach through its emphasis on language as a system of fostering liberty and/or encouraging further domination. This interpretation of the human services, management, and most importantly education, problematizes the individual, i.e., a rational, decontextualized, actor, as the unit of analysis and places greater significance on the social, economic, and political realm. More broadly, Horkheimer (1972) wrote that critical theory on the one hand accepts the mechanistic outcome of our society and on the other consciously opposes that which is the product of human work. The promise of the Enlightenment, i.e., the notion that as we progress in our knowledge (positivist knowledge in particular), we would move toward more ideal states of living has not come true; or more specifically, it has only come true for elite classes and groups which were in a position to gain from the production of certain kinds of knowledge. For instance, scientific advances which have created an unparalleled standard of living through technology for some, have also been responsible for exploitative and unsafe conditions for many workers who manufacture these technologies. Suffice to say that the guarantee of a better world through science has not been fulfilled unequivocally.

In the world of management, modernism, i.e., the techniques by which the goals of the Enlightenment would be fulfilled, assured a new age in labour relations—where managers are able to exercise control over their staff; but more importantly, control that staff actually embrace (Rose, 1990). The contented worker is envisioned as a necessary stage toward greater productivity and command over the labour process. Ehrenreich citing Peterson (2009) writes: “hard-headed corporate culture is becoming interested in how to get more work out of fewer workers. They’re realizing that if their workers are happy, they will work harder and more productively. So, they’re leading the charge” (p. 149). Modernist approaches to management have also promised an expansion in the ability to monitor staff with a view to shaping behavior by deterring malingering as well as offering the potential for objectively measuring efficiency.

One way critical theorists have responded to modernism is through critiquing its ethics. While a technology of management has developed, this knowledge is produced for purposes that further the aims of capital. It is not for human benefit that managerialism arises but rather to further productivity and enhance economic indicators. Effective strategies to drive efficiency and elicit worker productivity are seen as intrinsic to the need for overall productivity. Economic measures like GDP have become reified as indices of the good life. It is taken as a given that those that live well, do so because of the sterling performance of their economies. This has not gone unchallenged. Nussbaum (2010), for one, questions this notion and asserts that GDP is a very poor measure of quality of life; yet robust economies are what modernist notions of capitalism, and managers that propel it, encourage. Gramsci's (as cited in Brookfield, 2005) conception of hegemony, furthermore, delineates how ideology is propagated such that it is the unquestioned truth—even for those people who suffer most greatly under the economic system as it is currently constructed. Surprisingly, hegemonic constructions of knowledge actually create conditions such that those groups who are historically marginalized are often those who eagerly embrace policies that, while seemingly working in their favour, usually serve to exacerbate conditions of inequality and injustice by, for example, basing arguments for austerity on unquestioned assumptions of competition for limited resources. Critical theory attempts to uncover what is posited as unquestionable and normative and by doing so reveal the hierarchy of power and privilege that social structures support.

The critical approach.

Critical has also been used as a word that denotes a philosophical or theoretical approach to social structures and roles that build on the "critical thinking" sense of the word. In this way, "critical" draws on a variety of theoretical positions to question and reconsider commonly held assumptions about why people are where they are and do what they do. Generally, this conceptualization attempts to privilege historically marginalized positions. Knowledge and understanding are not seen as value neutral but in fact, often reinforce social and economic hierarchy. Critical analysis attempts to uncover the mechanisms through which power is constructed and manifests itself. The role of social and economic systems and individual agency is acknowledged as local, complicated, and nuanced (Cavanaugh & Prasad, 1996). This perspective asserts that there is a dialectic relationship between people and the societies that surround them (Brookfield, 2005). In this sense, "critical" can invoke Critical Theory specifically but more broadly draws on the work of poststructuralist philosophers such as Foucault. A critical method, furthermore, examines how groups and people come to construct one another through knowledge, language, economics, and other structures. It is this sense of the word that this author most often draws on.

As a transformative theory, it emphasizes praxis in the movement toward a society built on humanistic values and social justice. As Horkheimer (1972) writes, "it is the task of the critical theoretician to reduce the tension between his own insight and oppressed humanity in whose service he thinks" (p. 221). In determining the reason for in/justice it neither denies agency to individuals by placing causality completely within social organizations (which would disempower people to act for change), nor does it negate the contention that subjectivities are constructed through self/other relations (and therefore recognizes feelings of individuation). In this sense it attributes causes and solutions for societal problems as dynamic, layered, and requiring complex and subtle theorizing leading to action.

Critical approaches (as opposed to critical theory) also embrace elements of postmodernism. Whereas Critical Theory addresses and opposes existing structures that prop up injustice, postmodernism sees that approach as one more grand narrative, i.e., a mechanism for totalizing knowledge (Knights, 1992). Postmodernism celebrates the diversity and complexity of organizational relationships while at the same time acknowledging that all relationships are inherently relationships of power. Alvesson and Deetz (1996) identify seven core features of postmodernism: first, the key importance of discourse. Discourse, much like the hermeneutic use of the word “text”, refers more broadly to communication and systems of thought. We are immersed in discourse when discussions of “management” or “teaching” are evoked in that these concepts, like all others, depend on shared meaning and sets of assumptions that largely go unchallenged. Second, is the acceptance of fragmented identities as intrinsic to the human condition. We maintain the perception that we and others are unified and consistent. The platitude “be yourself” is one we offer to young people; however, postmodernism questions this notion that there is one self. Indeed, this echoes Buddhist teachings which suggest that rigorous meditation and self-reflection yield insight into one’s own shifting identity and reveals that there is no “self” (Shiah, 2016). Third, is the critique of the “philosophy of presence”. This refers to the notion that objects and ideas are not defined in isolation but are only realized in relation to other objects. This is reminiscent of the Hegelian dialectic in which social constructs are created, destroyed, and remade through their opposition (Fox, 2005). “Manager” only has meaning in relation to “staff”; “teacher” makes no sense unless we understand “student”. A fourth feature is the loss of grand narratives. As discussed above, postmodernism acknowledges that grand narratives like Critical Theory or Marxist theory are only relevant in piecemeal and contextualized fashions. Stories that explain or predict human behavior only have use as historicized theories that are bound by time/space/people. The argument that power and knowledge are inseparable is the fifth aspect of postmodernism that Alvesson and Deetz discuss.

This idea which was extensively developed by Foucault posits that a close understanding of systems of knowledge, for example the diagnoses and treatment of “mental illness”, demonstrate that knowledge is constructed in such a way as to create and/or reinforce relationships of power and regulation. Foucault applied his genealogical analysis to several institutions to make the point that many different technologies and incidents came together, often through happenstance, to form a particular method through which people could be classified and demarcated, which reveals mechanisms by which some people are marginalized. The concept of hyper-reality is the sixth facet of postmodernism. It refers to the notion that in the modern world so many objects are, in fact, referring to other objects which themselves are merely signs, in an iterative fashion such that the original referent is lost, and the copies become more real than the original. For example, the idea of the management instructor being expected to dispense sage advice comes from the idea that the manager him or herself is expected to display a kind of unwavering, yet ill defined, magnetic leadership (Ford, Harding, & Learmonth, 2008). This circumscribed vision of management is itself a product of military command where officers are expected to issue orders that inspire soldiers to sacrifice themselves or others for a cause that they may or may not believe in (Ford et al., 2008; Levy, Alvesson, & Willmott, 2003). These relationships are obscured, however. The ideal of “sage on the stage” becomes in of itself a defining feature of effective course instruction. Thus, the very idea of management is a simulacrum yet is reified so it embodies more meaning than the original. Ehrenreich (2009), citing Khurana describes “the image of a CEO changed from being a capable administrator to a leader—a motivating, flamboyant ‘leader’—very much like a motivational speaker, in fact” (p. 99).

Last, is the idea of postmodernism’s devotion to indeterminacy. Positivism argues universal knowledge is context independent, or, for post-positivists, knowledge is true for this time and place. Postmodernism suggests that even these qualified assertions are attempts to create substance out of nothing. For example, standardized test scores, often used in competency based education (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-robert-mendenhall/competency-based-learning-_b_1855374.html), ostensibly represent the state of student knowledge on a given topic. They provide a degree of objectivity and precision in the evaluation of individual attainment as well as gauge the performance of programs or universities when data is aggregated. However, scores represent so much more than what they purport. Their development, deployment, and interpretation are subjective. Often, they are more reflective of larger systemic issues, e.g., resources. Yet, because they're numbers, they don't well reflect the indeterminacy that postmodernism acknowledges, and often, celebrates (Seife, 2010). The managerial privileging of metrics (quantitative data) over "anecdotal" (qualitative data) also exemplifies this trend in the social services (Learmonth & Harding, 2006).

Management.

Although, management is as old as the human tendency to work in groups (Wren & Bedeian, 2009), it is a contested term. Both coercive and non-coercive forms of management can be traced back to military, religious, and economic organizations in some form or other everywhere in the world; though the specifics on how leadership is structured, sanctioned, and carried out differs markedly between nations, and eras (Cavanaugh & Prasad, 1996). Its current conception has largely been explored in terms of the maximization of efficiency, usually defined in terms of cost-benefit (Cavanaugh & Prasad, 1996). To some extent, management and leadership have bifurcated into distinct concepts. Whereas managers are expected to maximize worker productivity through the development of ever more rational processes and the imposition of monitoring and controls of employee performance, leaders inspire their staff and their agencies more broadly to greater heights through creative word and deed. Yet the perceived value of leadership, much like wisdom, is being replaced by a focus on skills that foster accountability. Pietroni (1995) refers to this when she comments on how, “individual and team mentally join forces against the management of the organization who, since quality and inspection units have been introduced, are often seen as part of a general ‘more for less’ climate rather than the protectors of good practice” (p. 39). Leadership is expected only rarely and, almost always, to be practiced by upper management.

Social justice.

Although there is a common sense of what the phrase means, there is really is no universally agreed upon rigorous, theoretically grounded, definition for social justice. Though this author feels that this can be an empirical question, i.e., one that can be defined by the study participants; it nevertheless merits some further comment. Leaving out the “social” for a moment, defining justice is a task that has been wrestled with since the classical period. A subset of Justice is the concept of Distributive Justice of which there are several theories (for an excellent overview of current debates in this field see, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice-distributive/). One that stands out as being most in line with social service work are “Equality of Opportunity”, which was very consistently mentioned by participants. Interestingly enough, this approach only considers, e.g., racism or sexism, as undesirable in so far as it disproportionately advantages some groups based on luck. To be born into some groups and gain social or economic advantage is largely a matter of chance. As such, benefits that are accrued due largely to luck or circumstance, such as race or gender, is unfair. Thus, this approach advocates for a distribution of resources that “levels the playing field” with regard to opportunities. What the theory seems to fail to acknowledge is the special disadvantage that is accrued to people due to the kinds of group membership. Many are more willing to tolerate luck advantage bestowed by, e.g., natural talent, than they are to being a member of a group where membership has no bearing on merit, e.g., male or white.

The main reason it is important to define the concept is so that participants will have a common understanding and, if education is supposed to reflect social justice values, we require a firm grasp on what exactly we are working toward. For example, if one participant interprets education for management as maximizing the capacity of administrators to exploit workers which will further the agency’s mission, that will not be equivalent to a situation where educators and managers are speaking about the complexity of managing organizations in ways that consider the wellbeing of a variety of stakeholders.

Critical management studies.

CMS and its sister discipline CME question more traditional approaches to management and management education (Adler, Forbes, & Willmott, 2007; Grey, 2007). It’s useful to begin with defining and elaborating on CMS first, since pedagogical strategies are often catered to their content (Reynolds, 1999a). For instance, so called “hard” sciences rarely rely on class discussion to impart foundational knowledge. The content of those disciplines simply does not lend itself well to that method of instruction. Similarly, CMS will have a range of pedagogical approaches that will be well suited to its content but in order to determine what those strategies may be, we need to have a firm understanding of the content. CMS problematizes management that incorporates technologies of staff monitoring and compliance that fail to carefully consider: the larger purpose of those techniques; the kinds of evidence used to evaluate their efficacy; the conditions under which such evidence is produced; the context under which prescribed strategies are considered effective or ineffective and why; and finally other explanations and approaches that might be envisioned as alternatives and how those alternatives might be better or worse than what is currently suggested. It draws on critical approaches—both ideology critique/communicative action, i.e., the Frankfurt School—and postmodernism as a bedrock for analysis in the production of alternative narratives that shift the emphasis to other perspectives on management and its role. It tells the story of the worker, or the environment, or the agency—all of which are easily lost or forgotten when the bottom line is so much more salient; in other words, when all ethical standards, aside from market ethics, are regarded as irrelevant. In an excellent example of "corporate ethics" where the standard is not ethical guidelines based on moral reasoning but rather an appeal to stock performance Starbucks CEO Howard Schultz was recently quoted, "'if you feel, respectfully, that you can get a higher return than the 38 per cent you got last year, it's a free country,' Schultz continued, 'You can sell your shares of Starbucks and buy shares in another company. Thank you very much'. His comments drew loud applause from the audience" (http://www.cbc.ca/news/business/story/2013/03/26/business-starbucks-gay-marriage.html?cmp=rss). The implication being that the stock is doing well, so Starbuck's stance supporting same sex couples is sound business practice—irrespective of principles. Examples like these demonstrate what Levy, Alvesson, and Willmott (2003) describe as strategic management which "downplays the ongoing discussion and reconsideration of values and objectives" (p. 106)

CMS argues that our stakeholders are often more than the people listed in the mission statement but include our communities, our staff, their families—not just the service users (and the funders). Ehrenreich (2009) writes, "'corporations are chartered to serve both their shareholders and society as a whole,' including such stakeholders as employees, customers, suppliers, and communities" (p. 97). Moreover, it behooves us to ask what the critical manager's role really is. Is s/he expected to enable a social justice agenda but also expected to respond to performance indicators and other quantifiable measures of quality service; is s/he expected to even consider “the why” of what s/he does or just perform her/his job function without question?

CMS defines critical management as differing from traditional methods of workplace leadership in that a critical approach eschews mechanistic practice. Orthodox management, which we might call managerialism, emphasizes organization, efficiency and hierarchical structure (Roberts, 1996) which evokes Freire’s (1993) conception of the necrophilic educator. By this I mean managerialism depends on order and predictability. It “embed[s] language, norms and cultures…that have little to do with the ‘lifeworld’: managerial imperatives of economy, efficiency, measurement, outcome, performance; legal mechanisms of control and exclusion” (Henkel, 1995, p. 80).

Instead, the critical method focuses on how professional supervision can be performed in ways that lay bare relationships of power and privilege: an “alternation from a focus upon system rationalization and efficiency to a focus upon human potential and community building” (Zald, 2002, p. 374). One may even argue that CMS models and lauds the subtleties of how management often *is* done rather than imposing an artificial structure of how it *should* be done.

Students of CMS are a relatively new but engaged group who are focused on responding to this very problem, i.e., the overwhelming dominance of the discourse of technical rationality. CMS was borne from a variety of disciplines including sociology, anthropology, and psychology (as does critical theory from which it draws). It employs the use of several epistemological frameworks such as standpoint epistemology and poststructuralism (Adler, Forbes, & Willmott, 2007). In Zald’s (2002) excellent overview of where CMS has come from, the position it currently occupies in academe, and where he sees it heading, he identifies CMS as a latecomer among professional disciplines who've incorporated critical theory. It wasn't until the 1970s that critical theory began to significantly influence professional programs, specifically law and education and it's only since the late 1990s that it took on an "institutional embodiment" among schools of management (Zald, 2002).

As it stands, CMS is aimed primarily at management in the corporate or for-profit world. CMS outlines an approach to management that attempts to interrogate and subvert its two traditional roles: monitoring and compliance. Its chief purpose is to realize the emancipatory potential of leadership positions while at the same time recognize and explore managers' complicity in the oppression of others. It is a view of management that insists on psychological and social transformation—both of the managers themselves and of the mission of the agencies, institutions, or businesses that employ them (Dehler, 2009).

Although CMS has primarily been applied to for-profit companies, it is an unfortunate reality that there is an acute need for a similar analytical approach in the not-for-profit sector. Perhaps surprisingly, the distinction between for-profit and not-for-profit has been blurring. Publicly funded agencies are incorporating business practices and mandates. Pietroni (1995) speaks to this when she writes,

> it seems to me that those who have identified these key characteristics of our contemporary culture point to the following problematic features of the professional world of social work and of disciplines allied to it, highlighted by the introduction of market mechanisms [including]: the commodification of care through needs assessment, care packaging and care management [and] the emphasis on audit, information and databases especially to serve the welfare exchange market structures around the purchaser-provider split (p. 46)

Furthermore, the oft-cited panacea for insufficient resources—public-private partnerships—have usually integrated accountability practices currently used in the for-profit sector. It might even be argued that non-profits have incorporated these practices with even greater zeal than the corporate sector because of the pressure to justify the spending of public funds. However, how these technologies have affected the quality of service delivery is an open question. For example, Capponi in the Kitty Lundy Memorial Lectures (http://www.yorku.ca/laps/lundy/) argues that users of psychiatric services must be allowed to exercise autonomy—permitted the freedom to take risks and make mistakes; and yet at the same time program performance is judged by rigidly defined outcomes. Thus, despite Capponi's vision of "best practice" models of service delivery that allow for highly individualized and idiosyncratic goals and measures, service delivery models that lack performance standards are accused of demonstrating exiguous evidence. No standardized goals must mean a lack of standardized outcomes also.

Much of this shift in management function is apparent in the new vernacular with which non-profit managers are expected to be familiar (http://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/apr/25/top-10-worst-management-speak?view=mobile). Phrases like "accountability framework", "critical path", or even the often used "strategic planning" are prime examples. It's important to note that I myself am troubled by management jargon, borrowed from the business world, which has become a normalized part of the environment of non-profits. As Ehrenreich states, "everywhere you go, you are likely to encounter the same corporate jargon of 'incentivising,' 'value added, 'and 'going forward'; the same chains of command; the same arrays of desks and cubicles' the same neutral, functionalist disregards for aesthetics; the same reliance on motivation and manufactured team spirit" (2009,

p. 127). Part of my concern is outlined in the thoughts and knowledge that have been explored by CMS colleagues; but it is also worth noting that it is simply a language I don’t speak fluently. Is the discomfort with technocratic jargon then actually impeding the critical agenda of managers or is it simply an idiosyncratic inability to adapt (my) thinking and incorporate a new way of speaking (Spicer, 2017)? Although this study obviously does not address the author’s personal needs, it will more broadly provide those in similar circumstances the tools to discard (or incorporate) language and procedures that situate their work in ways that allow for thoughtful consideration of their use. The study’s results provide post-secondary educators guidance in how one might best nurture their students and equip them with those tools.

Significantly, despite the pressures to institute business practices, the challenges of the public sector are rarely acknowledged—and in those few cases where non-profit examples are cited, they’re not in any way identified as special cases, i.e., even though comparable managerial techniques may be at work this doesn’t not mean that identical analytic methods are appropriate . In summary, the gap between the two approaches to governance is narrowing, but analysis has not kept pace (Wuenschel, 2005) and the need for further study of how CMS might be applied to the problem of managing non-profits is pressing. The pursuit of profits at the expense of all other considerations is a stereotype of modern managers yet it does serve as an “ideal” model for organizational, bureaucratic, and legislative policy. The steadfast commitment to profit over people, or, more relevant to non-profits, the privileging of output over human relations and social justice considerations, has, over time, become so severe it has taken on a Dickensian quality.

Management has traditionally entailed some level of power and control over the labour of others. When managers are tasked to discipline or ensure a level of performance from their staff, there is, by necessity, some degree of coercion. It therefore implies that a critical system is inherently contradictory. This tension is partially addressed by examining the foundations upon which managers depend on their authority to govern behaviour or, in other words, how the power of the manager is justified. Arendt (2006) sees authority as “something liable to compel [people] without using external means of violence” (p. 107). In her discussion of Plato, she distinguishes between two historical arguments for coercion without violence, i.e., authority. First, compliance is justified through the demonstration of expert knowledge and second through the assertion that the hierarchy between those who command and those who obey is a result of the relationship between two different categories of being, e.g., shepherd and sheep. Plato, for instance, contends a hierarchy of “theory” over “action” which models the relationship between supervisor and staff: management are those who “think” and their staff are those who “do”. It is my contention that the traditional manager draws on both these justifications to exercise authority. With regard to the demonstration of expertise, leaders are expected to exhibit competence and knowledge at a macro level. In other words, they are responsible for seeing the larger picture and how each staff person’s actions contribute (or fail to contribute) to the goals of the program or agency. It is authority that originates in expert knowledge which has the most potential for praxis because, as Arendt’s (2006) criticism of Plato’s argument for authority highlights, the relationship between expert and non-expert mirrors the relationship between young and old and therefore is “educational in essence” and “happens between people who are potentially equals” (p. 118). In other words, this form of authority is derived from someone’s expertise, but that knowledge can be transferred to subordinates. As she points out, however, authority which is derived from education is often a mask for what, in reality, is a relationship of domination.

As for categories of being, it is the nature of the market to be able to de-humanize those who are economically or socially subordinate and, in this way, psychologically absolve ourselves of culpability. One example exists in the social Darwinism that is implicit in the idea of the meritocracy, i.e., people in poverty are simply incapable or unwilling to help themselves out of their financial situation. Thus, those who are left behind in capitalism’s wake were of “lesser quality” in some largely undifferentiated way, which is echoed in the vague ideas of leadership expressed by Ford, Harding and Learmonth’s participants (2008). This de-humanization legitimizes the existing hierarchy and is justified as natural inequity in competence at living. Those people who have been marginalized by the socio-economic system are characterized as too lazy or incompetent to compete and are therefore blamed for their problems. In contrast, the critical manager sidesteps her authority by re-imagining it as something that is distributed in a manner described by Arendt as a pyramid. In her analogy, the pyramid represents existing hierarchy, but at the same time authority filters down to the layers below. I would argue that critical managers imagine the pyramid as a shape whose slopes are not so steep, e.g., organizations with flattened structures. The degree of authority between leaders and those who are led is not substantially different in these models. To be sure, one group is above and the other is below-without this, the word manager loses all meaning; however, authority is more evenly distributed between top and bottom. Despite this, authority is still ultimately derived from the aforementioned mechanisms: expertise and categories of being. The latter we find unsavoury in its implications for the relatively new idea of human rights, i.e., the idea that some people are “more equal” than others is considered unethical. The former, although still rife with the possibility of exploitative relationships, presents the possibility of the creation of a relationship founded on the modern idea of the potential in every person to feel and exercise mastery or empowerment in his or her vocation; indeed we see this in the responses of many participants as they argue that leadership is something that all staff can, and often do, exhibit—not just managers. Arendt’s (Arendt & Kohn, 2006) approach is, to some extent, echoed by Jones and Joss (1995) who argue for a two-tiered model of “expert managers” who employ managerial techniques in managing “authority relations”. The first is the Managerial Expert Professional who demonstrates expert knowledge in the performance functions of her/is staff. The second is the “technical operative professional” who creates pre-defined boundaries in the control of work. In other words, these social workers are more akin to HR managers who create performance standards intended to ensure accountability.

In a slightly different analysis, Weber’s bureaucratic model is based on the notion that leaders are ascribed authority based on the rule of law, rather than charisma or tradition (Wren & Bedeian, 2009). Power, thus, resides in the position rather than the individual who occupies it and in this way, bureaucracy for Weber is a decidedly fairer form of administration than alternatives he observed which were often based on class position or nepotism (Wren & Bedeian, 2009). Despite its more rational allocation of power and privilege, however, bureaucracy can come at a cost. Rules and regulations become ends in themselves and rather than people using their own judgement and principles to guide action, leaders and other personnel, may inappropriately impose the potentially rigid structures of bureaucracy. In this way, bureaucracies can be deeply alienating in that they rationalize hierarchy, which becomes associated with power and status. Both the mission of the organization and the larger set of values in which we hope it is embedded, can become lost when this happens.

Regardless, the purpose of authority must also be reconsidered for the critical leader. As is the case with many disciplines that are re-examined through a critical lens, the practice of management becomes dispersed the way a prism splits light into many components. One of those components is the goal of social justice. That managers can function in this capacity is new, innovative, and deeply contested. If it is reconceptualized with this new goal it requires the manager to expand her theory and practice such that the tension between new and existing goals is recognized and elaborated on. Indeed Brookfield (2005) writes “the desire to reconfigure the workplace as a site for the exercise of human creativity are the meeting points for critical theory and pragmatism” (p. 17). The critical manager must risk the consideration of theory and practice that extends beyond the mission of the program or organization to encompass broader and arguably more urgent matters. Related to this concern is the valid question, is it not possible to work within a traditional framework and still serve socially transformative ends. Can the milieu of accountability not also act as a catalyst for social change?

Critical management education.

The second component of this paper, and the more pedagogical in nature, is guided by the question: what approaches might post-secondary critical management educators employ to provide helpful guidance to their students? What might be effective strategies to incorporate CME into administration curricula? Can we assume the role of expert teacher in a management class without teaching supervision as an oppressive disciplinary practice? Is it possible to escape the Orwellian paradox of liberation, i.e., critical management education, through control, i.e., banking model education (Freire, 1993)? An analogy might be found in the activist traditions of the 1980s. So called prefigurative movements argued that it wasn’t enough to want to change the world—one had to model the changes we wished to see in society. Kauffman (2017) writes that prefigurative movements “weren’t just seeking to create change through their protest activity; they sought to model, or prefigure, the world they hoped to create through the manner in which they organized. Prefigurative movements dedicated themselves to ‘forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old’” (p. 74). Similarly, we may ask if it’s necessary to reconsider the structure of the classroom if we hope to teach effectively and authentically teach the practice of social justice agency.

The issues are further confounded by the implication that teaching a technology of management practice will often lead to dehumanizing, alienating mechanisms of control, thereby hindering social justice for workers who are being managed by someone so trained. Perhaps educators need to teach using emancipatory methods, where the training of skills is de-emphasized in favour of working from a more flexible, holistic, postmodern approach. This ensures they avoid prescriptive techniques that exacerbate the oppression of workers. What I am really saying is that there are in fact two synchronous missions: to educate managers using teaching strategies that use social justice ideals, and to educate in how to practice and theorize management critically. The pedagogy of CME, in this way, must be dictated by its content. This is particularly important for the professional programs as, in addition to fulfilling the broader goals of the university education, they must serve the educational requirements of the discipline.

CME functions to provide the background knowledge and perspective necessary to lead management students to think in a critical way about their work. The paradox we see in CMS where managers are expected to function in disciplinary ways but achieve critical objectives may be replicated in the education system. Professors and course instructors are teaching in universities and colleges that have pre-existing structures like grading schemes and classes that reproduce normalized mechanisms of ranking and marginalization (Brookfield, 2005; Coronado, 2016). Nevertheless, CME has tried to develop teaching approaches that model and impart the knowledge, sentiments, and values that CMS espouses. CME is the offspring of CMS. It therefore theorizes pedagogy and content that focuses on the values, principles, and world-view of CMS with the aim of nurturing management students in its precepts. If the goals of CMS are to be successful it will be because critical management educators have successfully communicated the complexity and subtlety of relationships that their students, these future managers, are about to enter into with workers, employers, the surrounding community, and the natural environment (Dehler, 2009). Barnett (1997) divides critical education into three components: critical self-reflection, critical reason and critical action; or, in other words, knowledge, self, world, which he argues encompasses aspects of the “critical being” that education can, and should, nurture. Building on this, Dehler (2009) developed an undergraduate course that, in collaboration with students, explored the impact of globalization and encouraged students to consider the classroom as a space for their voice and the development of social change. Dehler (2009) writes of CME as a philosophy of teaching that complicates notions of the student as passive receptacles into which knowledge is poured, i.e., what Freire (1993) called banking education. His value laden approach to teaching materialized in his course: In the Age of Wal-Mart: Globalization and Social Justice in the New Organizational Era. With these theories in mind, Dehler’s class both explored the deleterious effects of management practice on the environment, worker rights, and global justice more broadly and provided a venue for them to develop an action-oriented project. Undergraduate students deconstructed the growing influence of trans-national corporations and their impact on local and global economies. For instance, they examined the downward pressure on wages as a result of the outsourcing of labour. Dehler emphasized the role of globalization in the growing disparities of wealth and power and employed Socratic and Freirian teaching strategies where problems were posed and the class was encouraged to discuss the nature of the problems without the teacher imposing his expertise on the students (Freire, 1993). The course used the model of moving through “thinking critically and reflecting critically before landing more solidly on acting critically” (p. 33) by assigning reaction papers, learning journals, and critical action projects. One student wrote a letter writing campaign, raising awareness of global warming; another participated in a “guerilla theatre” event which brought attention to the impact of genetically modified crops.

As described above, Dehler drew on Barnett’s (1997) model for the provision of critical PSE and its principle responsibility being the development of critical beings. This, Barnett argues, has been given short shrift at the post-secondary level as universities and colleges have placed a misguided emphasis on critical thinking. Supporting Barnett, Chomsky (2000) writes that the university’s central function is its “subversive role” where the university has a commitment “not just to truth but also to humane values” (p. 34). In this way, Chomsky acknowledges the dual nature of knowledge, i.e., its objective truth and its contribution to public good. It is the contested nature of knowledge and its subversive value that furthers student learning and engagement. Furthermore, Aronowitz (2008) argues that higher education as a public good has two obligations: as “a decommodified resource for the people *and* [emphasis added] an ethically legitimate institution that does not submit to the business imperative” (p. 76). Thus, in order to fulfill one of PSE’s core mandates of facilitating engaged citizenship and providing a site for active learning, consideration of the dual nature of knowledge is vital in the development of courses and the delivery of content.

Mingers’ (2000) creation of an undergraduate management course was another attempt to impart a critical approach to PSE. His course drew on a range of scholars including Foucault and Habermas and defined four different facets of criticality “skepticism toward rhetoric, tradition, authority, and objectivity” (p. 220). Thus, Mingers evokes a version of “critical” that, while drawing on source material that reflects this paper’s approach to the term, more closely resembles the word as it’s used in developing opposing or alternative understandings of normalized practices. He builds on Habermas's (1984) theory of communicative action, which focuses on speech acts, by extending it to acts which would be considered strategic rather than communicative, i.e., trying to achieve certain ends rather than convey information. Hence, the four aspects of a critical approach mentioned above are geared toward an analysis and deconstruction of strategy in management (Levy et al., 2003). The course used many case studies which students could closely critique using the aforementioned framework. Like Dehler (2009), class participation was a predominant feature of the class however, unlike Dehler, there was no "action" element built into the course. Mingers considered the course a qualified success in that although many of the students began to question management practices through a probing analysis of who wins or loses in the process, students rarely applied that questioning stance to the course itself. It is little wonder that students are blind to the power inherent in hierarchical organizational structures given that educators themselves inconsistently apply their analyses of power to their own work in PSE (e.g., Spencer, 2013). As Levy, Alvesson and Willmott (2003) write, "it is far less gratifying to imagine oneself as a low-level manager working on mundane operational issues. Similar motives may guide *academics* interested in researching and teaching in the field" [emphasis added] (p. 98). Mingers acknowledges that this bias toward passive acceptance of course content is an inherent feature of management courses that are touted as avenues for the development of marketable skills, while at the same time encouraging students to subvert the very systems upon which the profession claims its standing.

In reflecting on the work of Mingers (2000), Dehler (2009), and other educators who are trying to incorporate critical pedagogy into their management courses, Choo (2007) asked, "to what extent critical management education is possible in a formal Business School educational setting or is it just retaining a rhetorical language of radicalism" (p. 487). To answer this, Choo interviewed 24 post-secondary management educators—all of whom had experience in CME. Whereas Dehler and Mingers examined data on the courses as experienced by students, Choo focused on the teachers' perspective. In addition to the aforementioned interviews, he also used other sources of data such as assignments, course outlines, and student handbooks for the purposes of triangulation.

Several themes emerged. First, the development of students' management competencies was seen as paramount and, to accomplish this end, educators were more comfortable sticking to traditional management techniques. There was also an understanding of "critical" that more closely matched the idea of "critical thinking" rather than the emphasis on emancipation that CME espouses. In addition, educators seemed reluctant to embark on an approach to education that was not seen as legitimate and was therefore unlikely to attract the resources garnered by traditional management. This idea of legitimacy also manifested itself in terms of the accountability of preparing students for "job readiness" that was demanded of them. Instructors posited that CME would not be welcome because it is so profoundly impractical. Finally, participants argued that the administration and structure of post-secondary institutions worked against the kind of social action that CME demands—which is not unlike the concerns echoed in Minger's (2000) study. Choo reaffirms the goals of CME as laudable and he encourages educators to continue with the project; but he also cautions that it is likely to remain on the margins barring some radical transformation in how PSE is delivered.

There is also a large body of literature on adult education that has often been considered the exclusive domain of primary and secondary school for adults. What seems obvious but isn't widely acknowledged is that PSE is also adult education. Brookfield (1994) performed a phenomenological analysis of the critical reflections of 311 adult educators, including those who worked in colleges and universities. His data consisted of learning journals, personal conversations, classroom discussion, and participant autobiographical material all asking those who identified as working from a critical perspective to reflect on the experience of educating adults. Five themes emerged: impostership, cultural suicide, lost innocence, roadrunning [sic], and community. Impostership spoke to the feeling experienced by adult educators that they had not earned the right to critical reflection. In other words, they thought that their ideals and their actions were incongruent and as a result, felt like "sell outs". Furthermore, they maintained that they were not sufficiently talented to warrant being looked to as experts by their students. Cultural suicide referred to the idea that the process of critical reflection alienated many of them from their peers and, as a result, left feelings of profound isolation. The loss of innocence was spoken of by the participants as they grew to recognize the myth of the meritocracy, i.e., hard work was not as closely related to success as they had been led to believe. Although a critical pedagogical paradigm is essentially transformative in nature, participants did not see the process as linear. The concept of liberation was something that they, and their students, circled around in the same vein as the running-chasing, almost catching, and then running-chasing again cycle that happened in the roadrunner cartoons. They did, however, also sense that they were part of a community of like-minded peers, islands among an ocean of more traditional educators, who shared similar values and a notion of "us against the world" was one source of comfort.

Brookfield (1994) concluded by arguing that education from a critical perspective is not easy and it is important to cultivate opportunities for peer support in what can be a deeply marginalized approach to education. This is consistent with the findings of Dehler's (2009), Mingers (2000), and Choo (2007) who discussed the isolation of those who choose to teach with a critical stance due, in part, to the lack of understanding and support from their departments, faculties, research units, and other administrative structures.

The centrality of “useful knowledge” to traditional management

Barnett (1997) argues that critical thinking is the most basic level of the progress toward the development of critical beings and what education truly requires is movement away from the necrophilic (to use Freire’s term) drive toward instrumentalism and toward an exploration of how students can think about social transformation through their own radicalized analysis of the knowledge they gain, self -reflection, and finally critical action. This is very much in parallel with much of Freire’s writing on the crucial marriage of theory and practice, (i.e., praxis); and also echoes much of the literature on critical management studies (and education). Horkheimer (1972) echoes this concern when he writes: “to the bourgeois consumer under liberalism knowledge meant knowledge that was useful in some circumstance or other, no matter what kind of knowledge might be in question” (p. 222). This debate around practical knowledge (e.g., L. Perriton, 2007) is mirrored in the pedagogy of professional disciplines in that students often comment on their desire for their professors to tell them what to do and how to do it. They often crave direction on how to practice whereas educators are often wary of providing such prescriptive technologies. Although Dehler (2009) resists the urge to provide answers and takes a stance that contrasts “teaching to” and “doing with” for “being with”, the temptation to give students the answers is high. To fight this inclination allows and encourages student growth by creating space for the uncertainty that is important for deep learning, i.e. learning that is engaged with the material in a meaningful and considered way.

The longing to provide concrete answers is a temptation with which I sympathize. As a student who went on to work in the social services it is far too easy to be lulled into traditional mechanisms of management by their formulaic quality. Because it is antithetical to offer up rules of action on how to address challenges that will be faced in the supervision of staff or the planning of programs, bewilderment can ensue. Ironically it is that sense of uncertainty and doubt with which one must get comfortable—even cultivate. This ambiguity is well represented by the idea of crisis that Felman (1992) develops. As she puts it, regarding her class's encounter with testimony: "texts that testify do not simply report facts but, in different ways, encounter—and make us encounter—strangeness" (p. 7). It is the de-settling process of encountering the strange that facilitates questioning and closely examining what are taken-for-granted actions and ideas that are vital to the critical method. Hence, as we plan our classes and assignments, critical management, education, and practice must engender a crisis and, more significantly, develop the students' capacity to embrace crises in their work as managers. But if we return to Freire's idea that mechanism is a form of death, how do we teach students to foster crisis in their own practice without providing a recipe? The importance of uncertainty in the practice of management is discussed in more detail as it is referenced specifically by a participant (Mary).

Thus, with our understanding that a critical perspective presents an alternative to dominant approaches to social service administration, is a recognition that this theoretical position is more recently being applied to teaching social service administrative practice and being considered as a model for its practice. It is rooted in a history of critical thought that has been offered as an antidote to all streams of humanities and social sciences that apply reductionist, positivist, and quantified research, i.e., research with poor ecological validity to their analysis and practice. Some administrators may have benefitted from critical instruction; others not. There is value in hearing about the challenges that administrators face as they prioritize the values of social justice over other considerations; i.e., to witness the attempts to practice from a critical perspective in a context of social service provision that is increasingly under pressure to deliver services in ways that reflect neoliberalist conceptions of social service administration. How these administrators might imagine their work when social justice is posited as a potential contradiction with many decisions and workplace demands can tell us much about the challenges and opportunities of administration that resists the encroachment of management strategies that simply replicate existing forms of domination and injustice.

Furthermore, the application of critical pedagogy in teaching administration presents its own unique challenges. One reason is that it’s unusual. It has become far more standard to take standard business models for management and apply them to the human services; but we don’t know how appropriate that content and those methods are when used for these purposes. Other challenges have also been discussed, e.g., resistance from administration or sometimes the students themselves. It is of great value to learn what faculty see as the priorities for critical education, where the gaps are, and what strategies they use to successfully prepare students who to work from this perspective. One way to enhance our understanding of how managers practice when considering social justice values and what preparation may have assisted them in this work is accomplished is by asking them. Similarly, the tensions and hurdles faced by educators when teaching to this subject matter, from this perspective are best understood by asking those educators about their experiences.

We have, thus far, discussed the importance of CMS and CME to support the work of managers whose values might lead them to work from a critical perspective. However, none of this directly address non-profit management either in terms of models for work performativity or with regard to what pedagogical strategies might be productively employed by educators that would provide guidance and support to students when they leave the confines of PSE into the, most often, non-critical world which is currently dominant in the non-profit sector. Although the expectations for for-profit and non-profit management have converged, there are good reasons for resistance to this encroachment. As discussed above by Franklin (1999), the discourse of technical rationality is dehumanizing and is ill suited to human(e) services. By definition, those administrators who subscribe to critical principles find capitalist ideology woven into the service delivery for marginalized populations, especially problematic. Furthermore, there is no research of this kind in Canada where considerable neoliberal pressures have been brought to bear on post-secondary institutions (e.g., Fisher, Rubenson, Jones, & Shanahan, 2009) and, as a result, more radical approaches, like CME, have come under threat (Giroux, 2014). Therefore, a clearer picture of the state of CME in Canada is needed.

Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology

Design Theoretical Framework

In considering how to empirically answer the above questions the first form of data considered was the interview. Experienced social service administrators have not been asked about their experiences and challenges of trying to work from and within social justice principles while embedded in a neoliberal model of service delivery; nor, have they been asked what educational experiences might have helped them navigate this terrain.

Similarly, we don’t know what measures social service educators have taken in order to prepare administrators for the aforementioned challenges in the field. The simplest method to shed light on these issues was to simply ask administrators and educators. Various forms of “asking” were considered. For example, focus groups can be an effective method of garnering thoughts and opinions from respondents and gain some of their power from the ability of respondents to synergistically consider, and respond to, their peers (Gibbs, 1997). However, there are drawbacks; chief among them, is that the issue under study is sensitive, i.e., confidential. If, for example, a manager feels ethically misaligned with her employer, she may not wish this information to be revealed in a semi-public forum like a focus group. Similarly, educators, even tenured ones, may not wish to see concerns they have with their employers, made public knowledge. As such, it was felt that the interview was the most appropriate method for data collection.

Of course, Alvesson and Deetz (2000) are extremely careful to examine the role of the interview in critical research. They highlight the need to consider all empirical material (they advocate against the term “data” for its claim to objectivity) as local and emergent. That is, that the material generated in an interview is not a reflection of the objective reality of the interviewee; rather it is a co-constructed narrative that depends on the subjectivities of the participants, the inter-subjectivities between them, and profoundly mediated and socially constructed interpretations of the objective world. Only in the most trivial of data can we find that the language of the interview wholly and truthfully represents objective phenomena. Thus, in preparing for, conducting, and interpreting interviews, the researcher was attentive to alternative narratives and understandings and sensitive to sociopolitical and organizational context (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000), relationships of power and authority, educational hierarchy and privilege, and a host of other social structures, orders, and relationships, who are metaphorically, invisible "participants" in the interview. For example, one of the participants was a middle manager (most others were executive directors) and worked in a university setting where educational qualifications, and the power and hierarchy that were associated with them, were a major consideration in her responses. In educational parlance, this is the "hidden curriculum" of the interview performance. It is the task of the researcher to recognize the fluid and subjective ontological nature of the product and provide analysis and synthesis in the research that provides one (of many) perspective(s) on its meaning. Rather than uncovering the hidden truth in the text of the interview, the researcher recognizes, even lauds, its quasi-fictional nature. Because interview data is a representation of the language use of the participants, and language is so often functional, i.e., rather than any particular truth claims, it is intended to produce a particular effect, e.g., competence; it is again crucial to highlight the constraints the utterers are under. In one sense, this is just another "dimension" of the text to consider, i.e., the purpose of the respondents' utterances—other than their surface denotations.

Another theoretical consideration regarding methodology, specifically around question wording, is the distinction to be made between espoused-theory, or what is sometimes called "beliefs" in the literature (Pajares, 1992), and theory-in-action (Argyris & Schön, 1974; Savaya & Gardner, 2012). In consideration of this, drawing on the work of Schön (1983), particular attention was paid to how managers engage in an informal process of reflection-in-action or double loop learning whereby participants incorporate new understanding and perspectives that lead to a questioning of previously unquestioned assumptions; or as Pietroni (1995) writes of double loop learning: "a double feedback loop of action, reflection and learning. Practice is carried out in the first space, reflection in the second, and reflection and practice in the third" (p. 43). Unlike single loop learning where new knowledge merely leads to problem solving—a technocratic cycle of knowledge production, double loop learning necessitates a paradigm shift in the mind of the knower (Brockbank, 1998). This model theorizes how managers might weave Habermas's practical communication into the discursive practice of relating between and among stakeholders. Incorporating communicative acts that call attention to conflicting interpretations of how to "manage", might facilitate reflexivity among managers. Schön's (1987) work also sheds light on the educational practices of course instructors who teach future non-profit managers. Using his model brings a heightened awareness of the process of incorporating the theoretical and philosophical implications of a critical perspective into the work of non-profits. It provides a framework for how educators and managers might negotiate the tensions, contradictions, and paradoxes that are inherent to working in the current climate of organizational efficiency and the demands that accompany it. For example, asking questions that specifically elicit reflection on practice, "Has being a manager changed your thinking about how to work with people in any way?" precipitates the process of double loop learning. It potentially prompts a reexamination of previously unquestioned assumptions about the role of the manager. In addition to the questions which elicited interviewees to examine their assumptions about management, there were other instances where some aspect of the interview protocol drew on Schön’s model, for example, the preamble on the critical approach. I would also argue that the nature of the questions themselves taps into the idea of practical communication. In asking about who the stakeholders are, I was not asking a neutral question. As per Habermas’s ideas of communication being strategic, I was implying the complexity of the concept. Simply by asking an interviewee to define or elaborate on a concept, I problematize it—make it complicated. In this way, what was once simple and unquestioned because difficult and uncertain, which is a subtle but inherent part of the interview.

This conscious reflexion on espoused theory may prompt a change in theory-in-action thereby leading to a demonstrable difference in how the role of manager is enacted (Schön, 1983). Although questions have been pre-formulated, they were thought of as a starting place and open for clarification, revision, and alterations both significant and insignificant. An attempt to impose false objectivity on the process—which reflexivity can sometimes suggest (Cavanaugh & Prasad, 1996)— by comparing respondent answers on a predefined list of questions was less important than a thick description in terms of the three facets of critical research discussed below.

In addition to the work of Schön, the study considers the response data in light of the critical research paradigm as outlined by Alvesson and Deetz (2000). They encourage the critical researcher to explore three theoretical aspects of research: insight, critique, and transformative re-definition. Insight is the careful examination of data with a view to opening up discursive spaces by making what appears obvious and certain, ambiguous. It strategically analyzes, not only the underlying meaning of texts, but the mechanisms by which particular meanings and interpretations are constructed. Thus, this aspect of method is intentionally “meta” in that both the data and the mode by which it is “read” is reconsidered and its formation delineated. Insight furthermore demands the contextualization of knowledge, such that analysis of material is never done without a close inspection of historical conditions which gave rise to it. CMS was envisioned and now exists in a culture of austerity. As CMS applies to for-profit enterprises, the focus has been on a recognition of the damage done by unbridled capitalism. In the context of social services, CMS considers the decline of the welfare state (Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, 2017). This ever-present focus on austerity should be, and was, considered in the analysis.

With regards to CME, a greater understanding of the personal, institutional, and paradigmatic conflicts that universities exemplify is required. The culture and history of universities produce the current climate and norms and therefore create its own opportunities and challenges. What blockages, and openings, might be open for interpretation and exploration? The pedagogical practices of CME were contrasted with the wishes, desires, difficulties, and dreams of managers themselves which emphasize the interdependence of the two research questions. As discussed above, the challenges they express were revealed in discussions with them as they struggled with their role as managers and the contradictions it engenders; yet interviews are not neutral units of knowledge but instead are locally mediated by the desire to achieve certain co-constructed strategic objectives (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). The interviewee may wish to appear competent, helpful, or loyal to the organization. S/he may want to demonstrate to the interviewer or even to herself that she is committed to the values of social justice or other ideals. The interviewer is also complicit in the creation of interview text and, for example, implicit assumptions in questions that cite such notions as “leadership” call forth a large body of expectations and understandings that though, contestable, are largely unchallenged. Therefore, to provide the necessary background to the interviews, publicly available texts on the university programs and agencies, e.g., mission statements, were considered. For example, the University of Toronto MSW's specialization in Human Services Management and Leadership states "specifically, students will gain competencies in human services leadership, navigating financial and service delivery systems, engaging effectively in partnerships within the nonprofit sector and across sectors with for-profit and government organizations, strategic planning, financial and human resources management, and assessing social outcomes and social impact through program evaluation" (http://socialwork.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/1-page_HSML.pdf). Whereas, McMaster University's MSW specialization in Critical Leadership in Social Services and Communities "offers the opportunity to develop your capacity for leading in justice-focused ways, and to connect with people with similar commitments and goals" (https://socialwork.mcmaster.ca/documents/mcmaster-msw-critical-leadership.pdf). The differences in the conceptualization of leadership could not be clearer. University of Toronto mentions finances not once, but twice. It frames its learning in terms of "competencies", a term which has been linked to managerialism and a neoliberal approach to the profession (Dominelli, 1996); while McMaster emphasizes the potential for social justice in leadership.

Next, Alvesson and Deetz's conception of critique involves the incorporation of the more critical aspects of data analysis (2000). Where insight might be considered constructivist in its attention to ambiguous and unsaid meanings and how they are produced, critique integrates power and its effects on the production of knowledge. Regarding the managers themselves, we might think about how management both utilizes and is subjected to organizational power and current management practices. Organizations are often hierarchical by nature, as is the management role; yet this is never a variation of sovereign power where it flows simply and unidirectionally from the top down. Relationships of power within an organization are considerably more complex than that. Moreover, agencies themselves are situated in a non-profit milieu which carries with it relationships of power which often hegemonically support dominant interests. Educators are also in a position where they are, more than ever, under neoliberal pressures to produce results that cater to and satisfy larger structures like the “knowledge economy” and more micro elements like students are reconstituted as customers. Levin and Greenwood refer to this “academic Taylorism” (2011). PSE that buys in to this position on teaching and learning frequently utilize pedagogical methods that establish and augment relationships of power. Although, Foucault argued that power, though dangerous, functions in multiple, often conflicting, ways to create knowledge (Allen, 2012), the critical perspective that Alvesson and Deetz call on researchers to acknowledge is that both sovereign and disciplinary power often reinscribe dominant, hegemonic, understandings of the world and it is the purpose of critique to map out the relationships of power and how it affects the interview text and its mechanism of production. Both the content of the interview and the interview process itself are subject to critique. For example, interviews may indicate that educators who take a critical approach attempt to subvert power in their classroom by reconfiguring the class. Most often, all the students look to the instructor as the source of knowledge, which creates passivity in the students and feelings of expertise in the instructor. A simple change in seating arrangement can subvert this relationship (and yet introduce other forms of disciplinary control) (Brookfield, 2005). Managers who have experienced this pedagogical strategy may actually have found it to be alienating and confusing in that the instructor is seen as abdicating useful power in the classroom (Raab, 1997). A critique approach (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000) traces these webs of power that the interview data might point to and moreover carefully deconstructs how the interview process itself replicates these relationships. In order to account for this complexity, the researcher specifically probed for examples of teaching techniques that attempt to address issues of power in the classroom (see below for pre-set interview questions). Follow-up questions examined ways in which these strategies did, and/or did not, create a classroom environment that encouraged egalitarianism.

Aside from interviews being strategic, as discussed, in regard to “insight” above, “critique”, underscores the research process as something that is driven by needs that benefit and disadvantage both participants and broader structures. It is very much in my interest as the researcher, to produce accounts that are coherent and fit within familiar theoretical narratives. In many ways, the research process is one of exchange where the participant volunteers her/his time and knowledge in return for understanding and validation on the part of the researcher. This speaks to more than just underlying meaning and therefore builds on the insight approach discussed above.

Last, Alvesson and Deetz (2000) urge critical researchers to consider what alternatives might be imagined to the current ways of thinking about management and education. This has often been thought of as a weak point in the critical approach. Indeed, the critical goal of destroying false consciousness, i.e., the illusion that the current system is the best, and only, way to organize socioeconomic structures, and the postmodern response of providing an unknowable, unnameable future has proven for many, entirely unsatisfactory. It is the researcher’s hope that alternative existences might be imagined without falling into what Foucault saw as a utopian trap which always ended up reproducing the injustices it sought to eliminate. Alvesson and Deetz’s “transformative re-definition” harkens back to Freire’s discussion of praxis whereby theory without action is mere intellectualizing and practice without theory is naïve and scattered. This research attempts to elaborate on a framework for critical educators and managers who wish to attend to, uncover, and hopefully subvert oppressive relationships both at the larger structural level and in day-to-day micro interactions. It will provide some guidance in order to navigate the current maze of contradictions to fulfill the larger purpose of social justice and at the same time strenuously avoid a cookbook approach that outlines a technology of practice (which would definitely fall under the concerns expressed by Foucault that utopian projects are doomed to repeat the injustices they claim to subvert). It can be quite difficult (impossible?) to articulate a clear process. Without trying to manualize a particular teaching strategy, in a sense, this research aims to develop a pragmatic, “action” element that is sadly missing from the great majority of critical literature.

Methodology

Sampling.

Considering the above theoretical considerations and the intention of addressing the research questions, six PSE educators who teach non-profit administration were interviewed and asked a series of questions intended to investigate how one might best use PSE to prepare students for a career in management (see Appendix A). This criteria lends itself particularly well to sequential sampling technique known as theoretical sampling which involves the verification of the presence of certain features which are previously marked by theory as salient (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Specifically, educators initially were selected through an examination of course titles, found on university websites, that mention critical (or social justice oriented) approaches to non-profit administration. Some educators were also located by accessing personal contacts of the researcher.

Although it was initially hoped that educators might be specifically identified as “critical” such that the challenges of working from that particular perspective might be explored, the pool of potential respondents was limited. Challenges lay around how to target for this specific identifier, and how to confirm that they practiced education critically. It became necessary to sequentially sample any PSE educator that taught non-profit administration. Instructors primarily came from Social Work programs in Ontario though one respondent was appointed to a business program in Nova Scotia. The educators were selected for focusing on non-profit administration and were found by searching websites in schools of social work, with a focus on Ontario, for courses in administration. Course Directors (or in cases where course directors were not listed, School Directors) were contacted by email where the study goals were outlined and a request for participation was made. All but one interview, which was done by phone due to the distance of the participant, was conducted in-person. The problem of some educators using less critical teaching approaches was partially addressed by describing a critical perspective at the beginning and subsequently gearing the interviews toward yielding a detailed picture of the variety of teaching tools and techniques that these educators use to develop their ideas, further the university’s mission outlined above, and specifically, prepare students for a career in management that not only accomplishes the narrow ends of an agency’s core mission but advances ethical and social causes both internal and external to their workplace. Because the dominant approach to management education is largely evidence-based and instrumental, special attention was paid to asking questions that focused on discussing material that problematizes normative notions of education as a mechanical endeavor.

The sample of managers was drawn from a convenience sample of social service agencies in the Greater Toronto Area. As a former manager in the sector, I was able to reach out to my contact list by describing the study and requesting participation. Seven managers expressed an interest in participating. As above with the educator group, this purposive sampling strategy was “theoretical sampling” which is sequential in nature, i.e., the sample was not selected all at once but rather evolved as the study did according to where the theory suggested fruitful data was to be found. Agencies were selected on several criteria. For example, one of the first managers to be interviewed was Mohan—an agency chosen based on reputation (some agencies in the sector are well known for their progressive politics and values-based service provision). Moss was also chosen for this reason, i.e., the agency he works for is well known for its progressive politics and incorporates advocacy for social change into much of what it does. Another agency was later considered because of its influence in the sector (some agencies, though not known as particularly progressive, are large, comparatively well-funded, and have considerable clout—some argue that the reason for this is precisely because they are *not* progressive; nevertheless, insight into the particular intricacies of more mainstream organizations is beneficial in providing a more complete picture of social service management). In this way, the potential contributions of the participants were considered as part of the sampling strategy.

Note that a “critical” approach is quite rarefied jargon and many managers (and some educators) may have been working from such a perspective but not have the words to name it as such. For this reason, it was ascertained, through the interviews, what theoretical orientation the managers work from. Of course, social service managers are able to speak to the challenges they face in the field and how their education prepared them (or not), which is one reason the interview format was chosen. As above, focus groups were also considered but rejected for the reasons already specified. Managers within each agency were interviewed and permission was also sought to observe them in action, e.g., during team meetings, though all participants declined. They were asked a series of questions in a semi-structured (to allow the interviewer and the respondents to skip questions answered already, and further develop relevant strands of conversation) interview format designed to elicit their thoughts on the role of management and its potential for the implementation of a social justice agenda (see Appendix A).

Moreover, the critical approach was explained to them (see Appendix B). Given the ample evidence to indicate the adoption of instrumental reasoning (as distinguished from practical reasoning) (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000) in the non-profit world (e.g., Eakin, 2007), it was assumed that managers who questioned the fundamental assumptions implicit in that approach, may demonstrate greater tension regarding the performance of their role. Although several managers verbally endorsed a critical approach to the work, based on an analysis of the interview data, there were managers who worked from a variety of management perspectives. For example, in considering his responses, Max seemed to work from a managerial perspective (as was expected given the philosophy of the agency) whereas a manager like Mohan worked more closely from a critical paradigm. This was highlighted in the description of the data and also touched on in a discussion of the themes that were identified. Furthermore, the considerably illusive and slippery notions of taken-for-granted terminology like “management” “leadership” and “practice” were interrogated through the interview process. Managers were also offered sets of specific examples from which to respond (see Appendix A). The purpose of this was to differentiate, from interview data, which was likely to uncover managers’ *ideals* of critical practice, from the *reality* of management practice. Ideal practice contrasted with its reality was also a theme that was discussed among many of the educators. For example, the questions related to challenges faced from the university and the resistance exhibited by students both drew out a number of examples where educators were forced to compromise on what they considered best pedagogical practice. This disjunction between *ideal* practice and *de facto* practice had a thematic expression in the questions as *Tension*.

Responses were collected from research participants/agencies between July, 2014 and October, 2016 and ranged in length from 45 to 100 minutes. Over the two years that the interviews took place there were some changes in the field. For example, McMaster began their specialized Master's program in critical leadership which appears to acknowledge and try to address the gap that exists between the education students were being provided and the education they needed. However, much also remained unchanged. Many of the challenges expressed by the first managers interviewed were repeated by those interviewed later.

Data Analysis

Responses were digitally audio recorded, listened to for general impressions, and then transcribed using the Verbal Ink transcription service (https://verbalink.com/). Transcripts were initially scanned for themes. Although the researcher has no pre-existing categories, as expounded upon above, I was not a blank slate. As already described, I have experience as a manager and struggled with many of these same issues; furthermore, as an MSW graduate I did not feel especially well prepared. Furthering the cause of social justice while at the same time acknowledging the pragmatic challenges of furthering these causes is what I have struggled with as long as I've been involved with progressive causes in my teens. These experiences doubtlessly coloured my interpretation of the data. All the transcripts were carefully read through commonalities were identified and named; then, for further analysis, responses were grouped according to interview questions and other common themes were identified (or existing themes elaborated upon) that came from the seeing the data in a different grouping. Finally, their responses were separated back into all the identified themes and representative quotes were pulled.

Description of Managers.

The following information was collected from all managers: job title, educational background, agency’s target population or mandate, size of organization, the number of years in their current position, and the age of the organization. Based on this data, managers are extremely heterogeneous in terms of the kinds of training they’ve received. This makes it difficult to map a clear relationship between social work pedagogy and management experiences. Many managers are not social workers, and this could be interpreted as a failure of professional, regulatory, bodies to make social work a legitimate profession. Obviously, a BSW or MSW is not seen as necessary to manage a social service agency. Many of the EDs for major social services have no social work background whatsoever. Mohan (who is one of the more critical) has a degree in theatre.

Participant One

Mohan[5] has been the Executive Director (ED) of an anti-poverty agency in Toronto since 1999. The agency is medium size and has approximately 80 staff and has been in existence since 1980. Mohan’s educational background is in theatre and came to management through his managerial experience in the restaurant industry and through his leadership position in a union—he was president. He has an undergraduate degree in theatre.

---

[5] All names are pseudonyms. Educator names begin with E. Manager names begin with M. Participant genders are maintained.

Participant Two

Mary is a middle manager—she has five staff who report to her—at a large university in Southern Ontario. She has been engaged in this work for eight years, prior to which she worked in a health care setting. She has a Master's degree in social work.

Participant Three

Moss was the ED at an agency in Toronto that serves youth (he vacated the position in the spring of 2016—after his interview). He worked as a founding member and Executive Director for six years and was hired immediately following the completion of his degree. The organization is focused on mentoring youth in the hope they will further their education. The organization is now seven years old and has roughly 1200 volunteers and roughly eight staff, which vary seasonally, depending on the school calendar. He has an undergraduate degree in English with Latin American and Caribbean Studies.

Participant Four

Meredith is the ED at a medium size agency that provides supportive housing for consumer/survivors in downtown Toronto. At the time of writing, she has served in this role for 29 years. She also was hired right out of university. The agency has two managers, which report to her directly, and 15 frontline staff. She has a degree in applied science with a major in family studies.

Participant Five

Mabel has, for the last seven years, been the ED for the regional chapter of a medium size social service agency in Southern Ontario that serves people who have experiences with the criminal justice system. Prior to her current work, she was a researcher in a health care setting. She has eight staff that report to her. The agency provides a wide variety of services for adults and youth including a Partner Assault Response (PAR) program, employment supports and community aftercare. She has an undergraduate degree as well as a Master’s and Doctoral degree in psychology.

Participant Six

Mac, at the time of interview (now retired), was the ED for a medium size social service agency providing supportive housing for consumer/survivors. Support at the agency can take a variety of forms, from 24-hour high support to case management. The agency also provides an employment program, peer support, and addictions supportive housing. Mac served as ED from 2004-2017 and had five middle managers reporting to him. Though he began his career in mental health service provision, immediately prior to his hire he had worked in the private sector. He has an undergraduate degree in psychology.

Participant Seven

Max is the ED for large multi-service agency that provides a wide variety of support options for consumer/survivors in Toronto. Such services include housing, case management, employment support, family support, and services for those involved with the criminal justice system. The agency has over 250 employees and eleven different locations across the city, though it is the five senior managers that report to him. He has served in this capacity since 1979 but the agency has been in existence since 1953. Prior to his current position he was involved in direct service provision. He has an MSW and a Master’s in Management.

Description of Educators.

In order to understand the context of their interview responses, all educators were asked: their rank/status at their institution, the size of their institution, their research focus, and for a brief description of their department or faculty. All respondents, either currently or in the past, taught an administration course.

Participant One

Ena is an Assistant Professor in a school of social work at a mid-size university in Southern Ontario. Ena is an educator who clearly fits the model of critical as defined above. As detailed below, she focusses very heavily on social justice in the practice of management and in her pedagogical practices. The school outlines social work in a way that is reflective of the "critical" approach to practice defined in the model already discussed. Indeed, two of their MSW graduate programs are titled "M.S.W. Critical Analysis" and "M.S.W. Critical Leadership in Social Services and Communities".

Participant Two

Eve is a Professor in a small university in the Maritimes. She received her doctorate from [name of institution] in organizational behaviour and has written extensively on management and governance, especially as it pertains to non-profits. She writes from a feminist perspective and examines how gender is related to organizational dynamics. She is tenured at a business school that offers an MBA, an executive MBA, and a PhD in Management. The school has identified three key priorities. First, the incorporation of a global perspective and its challenges. Second, engagement with community partners. Third, an emphasis on innovation and development. Of all the interviewees, she approaches the topic from the most "business" oriented perspective.

Participant Three

Elaine is a Professor and is unlike some of the other participants in that she identifies as an educator but also as a manager as she held an administrative position at a large university in southern Ontario in her program, social work. In this way, Elaine was able to speak from both perspectives. Moreover, her research focuses on how neoliberal models have been applied to social service agencies which is very relevant to the interview questions. Elaine also, stated that she took a critical perspective toward both education and management and recommended several resources. Like her, her program emphasizes social inequalities, acknowledges historical injustices and the harm they cause, and examines the decidedly mixed record of accomplishment of social worker interventions.

Participant Four

Enid is an Assistant Professor at a small Southern Ontario university and teaches a course in Organizational Behaviour. Her research focuses on qualitative analysis of the experiences of vulnerable people in healthcare settings. Her program provides a generalist education and takes an ecological approach to social work, i.e., the ability to provide a wide range of services to meet the varying needs of service users.

Participant Five

Elmer is currently a Professor at a large university in southern Ontario. He has extensive teaching and administrative experience as well as a background in community development and his research focusses on the experiences and history of black residents of rural southern United States. His past community work was with a wide variety of populations including ex-offenders and female survivors of domestic violence. Most importantly, some of his research, including his doctoral dissertation, examined curriculum development for social service leadership. Elmer's program takes a critical approach to social work in that it considers how the impact of social and economic systems are constructed as individual problems. It furthermore considers how social workers have been positioned as agents of change *and* agents of social control.

Participant Six

Emma is currently an Associate Professor at a mid-sized university in Southern Ontario. She also served as Director of the department for two years. Prior to her faculty appointment, she worked in clinical practice for almost three decades, specifically with trauma survivors. She has several publications and presentations on radical social work, feminism, education and practice with such historically marginalized populations as women, LGBTQ people, and seniors. Her program takes and anti-oppressive approach and emphasizes social justice and social action.

Chapter Four: Manager Themes

The management data was captured well in six different themes. The first, “Social Justice is Equality of Opportunity”, emerged as a result of being asked to define social justice. The second theme to arise was how managerial constraints can inhibit the actions of managers which they saw as enhancing social justice in the workplace. Managers suggested that a rigid application of rules made it difficult for them to consider the unique needs and circumstances of each of the staff that reported to them. Third, was the emphasis that many respondents placed on working non-formulaically, i.e., managers felt that requirements to mechanically follow processes were least likely to further notions of social justice because they fail to consider the nuances of the problems they face. The fourth theme was the idea the critical management required them to consider the needs of many stakeholders, some of whom may not be captured by the mission statement of the agency. Fifth, was the important role that general education courses played in their preparation for their workplace role. And finally, managers spoke about how important it was that their education reflected the complexity of work in the field. Education often had the potential to be reductionist and those approaches did not prove helpful in practice. Each theme is discussed in detail below.

Social Justice is Equality of Opportunity

In order to get an accurate picture of CM, it was necessary to gain a better understanding of participants’ understanding of what it meant to be “just”, as this is an intrinsic part of CM. As discussed above, all participants were read a working definition of the word “critical” because, as also already discussed, the word has importance but is also vague. Thus, in order to ensure a common understanding, the definition was used. However, it was decided that social justice would be defined by the data rather than *a priori*. The reason for this was that, it would allow for an opportunity for respondents to flesh out their connection between their values and their practice. Surprisingly, many respondents were surprised at being asked. Respondents almost invariably used words like fairness and access to resources, e.g., Meredith responded that it referred to “having…principles and some thoughts about what is fair to people in the community, and how to make things equitable for them”. Mac, similarly, spoke of “equity and fairness”; but later elaborated by suggesting that social justice was something that not everyone had a right to. He argued that service users have an unequivocal right to justice; but when it came to staff, it depended on their meeting their obligations to clients:

> If you look at it from a justice point of view—you know our justice system is to mete out punishments for bad behaviour, right? So, social justice is not meting out punishment. It’s trying to give everybody an even break or give everyone an opportunity to be successful and do what they can do best. That just by being a human being, you deserve that. And that’s all true; but…living in a socially just world presupposes that we all live socially just lives. And it then becomes how do you define that, and how do you define when someone may not be being socially just anymore.

They also spoke explicitly of access to opportunities. Mohan, for example, spoke of a

> never-ending demand that we look for measures that deal with equity, fairness and accessibility, et cetera. The et cetera can be—there's probably something that we haven't thought of as of yet that will probably be put on the human rights lens which will then be asked for from a social justice point of view—that now must be one of the things that we take into consideration. So social justice really means that it's an ever-evolving understanding of how we live together and work

> together. So, you think of 50 years ago nobody talked about same-sex rights and now it's kind of a given… as we evolve this, that social justice piece is it then becomes the floor under which nothing should fall through. That means that over time it's—that floor keeps rising.

Similarly, Max stated that "social justice would mean that people get to live their dreams without regard to their social condition".

Mary discussed the idea in ways that were much more specific to her particular context, but when asked to broaden it out, she stated that the concept was context specific. Mary used to be a frontline worker. She argues that the concept of social justice "means something different than when you're occupying a management role…I just felt I had more opportunity to have moments of feeling like I was doing good and I was involved in social justice, whereas when you're in a management role, you're kind of stuck sometimes". When pressed further, she agreed that it was more the implementation of social justice that changed, rather than its definition and adds that the dilemmas faced by middle-managers are particularly thorny because

> you're sandwiched between staff and upper management, so even though there's things that you think are just, and are causes that you want to take up, or moments of advocacy, you're stuck because you have a hat of understanding what upper management expects of you, but you also remember those times where you were frontline, and you want to make change that impact people directly, so you're stuck.

For Moss, social justice was a recognition that:

> there are inequities. There are injustices. There are imbalances of opportunity and power surrounding us every single place you go. I think that social justice for me

> is an attempt to correct that, to address that, to disturb that, to also construct spaces that where those barriers are either undermined or counteracted or where people are protected from the violence that those inequities and injustices inflict on people's lives.

In addition to the above, Max also provided a perspective that corresponded closely to Moss's:

> it's not just how you, at an individual level, give people opportunities and remove barriers that exist to help them live their hopes and dreams; it's what needs to change socially, or what needs to change in the healthcare system to make it easier for the people who don't have the individualized opportunities that we're able to give them…the systemic piece of social justice is to say, 'there isn't enough'…so, social justice is in acknowledging what the disadvantage is and doing what we can individually and collectively to overcome that.

Rather than define social justice in the abstract, Mabel preferred to frame it within their philosophy of service. She described her service users as having "pretty complex and perhaps systemic kind[s] of issues in their lives, that have shaped and constrained who they are". A social justice informed response to the problems her services users present, involves "not looking at it from the standpoint of blame… [but instead] service provision that's client centered, strength based, restorative justice, biopsychosocial models…and to me, that really does fit with the principles and practices of social justice". Interestingly, she also spontaneously added that staff would also be considered from this standpoint:

> there is no reason why my own staff and our own organization would be any different…for example, if one in four families are going to, at some point, have to deal with mental health and addiction issues; that impacts on how we work with

> people…and has implications [on] who we are too. And whether or not, at any given time, I’m going to have one or two staff who are off on a medical leave…the genesis of that may be related to a mental health issue. So it’s taking that understanding of those social factors and social justice and keeping them in mind in terms of how I approach my work and my leadership of the organization.

Managerial Constraints Limit Social Justice

The researcher hoped to uncover what conflicts might exist between how a manager might *wish* to operate, and how managers are often *required* to go about their duties. Moss, at first, interpreted the questions regarding constraints more in terms of fulfilling the mission. After a clarifying question, he stated a number of processes that demonstrated considerable latitude in how he worked with staff. It’s important to keep in mind that Moss is the ED working in a non-unionized environment. This may provide him with more latitude regarding how he functions as a manager—constraints due to unionization, were expressed as a limit to the implementation of a social justice agenda by other participants. Moss concluded the interview with this comment:

> I think that when you look at my education and other experiences really make it clear that how we're doing things is not working. So, I don't really take anything as *the* way to do things. That allows that critical lens to be kind of ever present. Is there really a way to do a budget? Is there really a way that HR is supposed to happen? Is there really a way that—right now they're saying there's new thing of unlimited vacation.

He explains:

> The best practice was you're this level and you worked these years, so you built up this level of vacation. There's this other approach like, "No, there's unlimited

> vacation and people don't abuse it." You think, "Oh I'm going to take 365 days this year." You know what I mean? That doesn't happen… So, let's look at what is it we're trying to do, what is it we're about, what is it we're trying to accomplish and find ways, the best ways for us to get there.

Possibly, only an Executive Director in a non-unionized environment would be able to implement HR strategies so creatively. In many ways, he has a workplace environment that exhibits many of the features, wished for by other managers, i.e., he is not constrained by another layer of management nor is he bound by the details of a collective agreement. Though one might imagine that it could be potentially disastrous for workers, many managers, including Moss, contended that workplaces can be well served with fewer managerial constraints. He argues that

> creating a flexible environment where you pull out people's strengths, people who have ownership and leadership of what they're doing. People are asked to go above and beyond what's on paper and in order to sustain that type of commitment you have to be flexible with people's lives as well. If I'm going to ask or the need is something that's beyond what's on the job description and you're going to be sponsoring that then we also have to be flexible as an organization to be able to go beyond what the contract says. You know what I mean? In terms of how many days you're allowed to be off or the time, the hours that you're working and deadlines and all that kind of stuff. So, managing that also I would say is a big challenge.

Later in the interview, Moss refers to this again when he remarks, “if we were less flexible and more demanding in terms of just certain output maybe we wouldn't have as many staff…we would lose them.”

Mac made an interesting counterpoint to Moss and Mary in the sense that, while he saw the union at his agency impose constraints on the work, e.g.,

> I think there would be times where I may have acted more quickly, or maybe not within a total social justice framework, because if you have an employee you really think is screwing up or really doing bad things to your clients, or not nice things, or certainly not enhancing the client's experience, you'd probably want to act—but you have to drag that out in order to treat the employee fairly and give them an opportunity to change.

He also acknowledged that that constraint actually bolstered social justice by forcing management to allow staff to the opportunity to improve their performance:

> [we] give them an opportunity to meet some of the standards that you set forth. Provide them with new or enhanced training…so that person is getting social justice [by] getting the opportunity to meet the requirements of the job. I think you always want to try and help…you have to do whatever you can to allow them to come…away from the "dark side", as it were.

Contrary to the sentiments expressed by other managers, Mac later elaborated saying unionization made them "better managers" by forcing them to abide by a formal mechanism in addressing issues, i.e., a process for progressive discipline:

> As a manager you feel better; and you establish what the range of activity for an individual is. And then they get to, in a social justice kind of way, decide. If I continue this, I'm probably going to get fired because they will be able to fire me because I have a verbal warning and a written warning. The next thing is a suspension and then I'm out the door. Maybe I ought to just tighten up.

As several of the managers noted, the difference between middle managers and senior ones, obviously differs in terms of the scope of responsibilities. Moss comments:

> you have a vision, you have accountabilities and now it's about the execution of that. Really for us it's that simple. What it takes now to ensure that people are supported in delivering on that, that the experience of people who are part of what we're doing is in line with what it should be, that barriers are being addressed, challenges are being overcome, opportunities are being seized—all of that kind of stuff is what the management role has to deliver on. So organizationally I do that and then on the day-to-day the program manager does that.

Meredith didn’t see many constraints on leadership that is based in social justice values. She mostly viewed “constraints” as anything that impedes her ability to fulfill the mission of the agency. I might argue that this actually indicated that she might not have been working for the “critical perspective” as defined in this study. I suggest this because part of the notion of working critically is the idea of working at multiple levels, for a multiplicity of stakeholders (which is why this is explicitly mentioned in the questions). Meredith was focused quite exclusively on the stated mission of the agency and left out considerations like the variety of possible stakeholders or the duty toward broader systemic change. The evidence of her position vis-à-vis critical practice lies more in what she *didn’t* say rather than what she *did*, in deference to the kinds of unspoken reading-between-the-lines analytical approach discussed above.

Max, in the context of constraints, spoke of the agency as, “about as lean as you can get” and went on to speak positively toward much of what Ena derides:

> I think we’re an efficient organization. That’s not to say we couldn’t find some waste. I mean we’ve got [*name of middle manager*]. He’s got a Black belt in

> Lean[6] and we do Lean exercises through the organization to root out waste or help us understand the root cause analysis of a problem that occurred.

If the agency *does* work critically, what are the circumstances that allow for this? If it *doesn't*, why doesn't it? Mohan feels that he and his agency do work within the critical perspective as described. He stated that he's "been asked whether <*agency name*> is a social justice organization. My response has been, 'we try to be. We aspire to be'" though he did say the organization might move back and forth on a justice continuum based on "other forces". That said, he and the organization were willing to take principled stances to maintain their values. He remarked, "the real piece is where do you draw the line. That's something that—it's a sign that—so in Greece or in parts of Europe where there's been the austerity kind of mandate has come in, sometimes you may have to actually draw the line and say, 'I'm not going back and I'm going to fight to stay right here'". That said, Mohan is acutely aware of the constraints he's under. Mohan spoke of these constraints in terms of the relationships between his management staff and the sorts of people who worked on the frontline at his organization. He commented that his staff are a

> workforce who probably have experienced trauma and injustice or have witnessed it enough that it's—so people are very—so the people who come to [name of agency] and work here are not people who in fact have had nice, easy lives and believe that the world is a rose-colored place and that everything works. The very nature of that means that there are people come with all kinds of experiences that may prevent them from really being clear about how to take up their authority and

---

[6] For a description of this certification, see http://seec.schulich.yorku.ca/program/masters-certificate-in-lean-six-sigma-black-belt/. For an entertaining and enlightening critique, see Spicer (2017).

> how to be responsible for other reasons, because they don't trust power, they don't trust authority, they don't trust structures. So therefore, they're not going to trust <*agency name*>.

Mohan further argues that the people drawn to frontline work in his particular social service agency are also current, or former, service users and have difficulty dealing with authority. As a result, he argues, the task of managing becomes that much more challenging. The problem with many prescribed management tactics is that they deal in "types". He states,

> Of course, the thing is this methodology that we have is—doesn't come with ten easy steps and the Rotman School of Business [at the University of Toronto] doesn't sort of say, 'do this now and here's how' so Rotman is actually out there also teaching management. It's teaching that there are five types of people. Or maybe it's three, Larry, Curly and Moe. Whatever it is. But they're telling you that here are the types and here's how you get them to do what you want.

He later states,

> It's a projected and prescribed kind of thing. It takes very little—so there's very little there about, 'what's my role in this? What am I doing? How am I either creating a good environment or a bad environment? Am I willing to look at that and am I willing to hear it?'

However, what's key to ask those social workers that take a typical career path, i.e., beginning in frontline work and moving up into middle management, is "how do social workers who were trained and have invested a considerable degree of their identity into fighting authority, become the authority. Mohan was asked about how those challenging, occasionally adversarial, employees adjusted when they were promoted into managerial positions. He responded,

> that the difficulty is that people will continue to then maybe mistrust their coworkers or the staff who are working for them. They may mistrust the people above them. But they also know that they're part of it so they feel conflicted. So then what comes of that is turmoil and conflict that's also built into their role and to what they do. They start to second-guess themselves. There are a lot of folks who end up in management who start to mistrust and think that they're imposters–and don't trust their instincts anymore. In fact, all of that second-guessing takes away the very things that they were good at before. Right? So that's also part of how good supervisory relationship can help mitigate that in some ways. So good training and a good supervisory relationship will hopefully mitigate that in some way.

Much later, Mohan remarks on the constraints in terms of resources, i.e., funding:

> But no, these are—we'll decide to allocate all kinds of funding to certain things and to not others. That's actually not a limited resource. That's just a managed resource. So, management, hence the dichotomy and challenge in managing and being a manager is that we're being managed, that the system is being managed and that the choices we make are being managed. That provides some challenges to the floor which is the social justice floor.

Again, this theme emerged that true critical leadership was stymied by institutional constraints. Somewhat contrary to expectations, Mary, as others, felt that more power in the hands of managers would result in greater social justice. She states,

> I don't think you can be a leader if you don't have full power over how things are done in an institution. Being a leader means that you are constantly looking

> outside the box and you don't have to contend with thinking about union requirements, restrictions, or you don't have to think about the university's policies, procedures, et cetera, et cetera. A true leader doesn't think about any of those things, it doesn't matter. They think about an idea or a project and they know there's no obstacles, but I feel like in the current climate that I'm in, there are obstacles and landmines that I always have to navigate.

On the one hand it’s policies, procedures, union rules that constrain leadership, but on the other it’s the relationship between faculty and staff in the university setting that impedes ideals of leadership. The very fact that there’s a distinction to be made between two groups of employees—faculty and staff—touches on the distinctions that are made in this workplace environment. This distinction comes with a considerable power differential which Mary feels makes it difficult to be the kind of administrator she’d like to be. She states,

> The landmine of saying something or doing something that faculty is not going to approve of or that is against their practices and philosophy of practice, or whatever. Allowing staff to do something, for example, working from home, but the institution doesn't support that. There’re always little landmines that you have to figure out how to avoid, so a leader I don't think has to worry about that.

My interpretation of her response is that she envied the degree of autonomy that faculty, and academic administrators, have over the way they realize their job descriptions.

That said, Mary clearly identified the major constraint as institutional. She felt that despite the “freedom for [her] to exercise [her] leadership”, “the major constraint is the bigger organization I work for”. She elaborated:

> The constraint is the upper management, so the institution that I work for in terms of having power but also not being able to maybe recognize positions for what they're worth, or being able to say, "Yes, you can work from home. I have no problem with it. I don't really care," but this institution cares. Working with the constraints of a unionized staff, so that's something that even though there's things that I really would be happy to support staff doing, they are in a unionized setting, so that's one constraint. So, the bigger institution and central policies that affect staff, the union environment, but at a unit level, I think the constraint, it's not obvious in writing. It's not policies or anything, but it's this feeling you have that you know even though you have power when it comes to staff and administrative processes, you don't really have power when it comes to your voice being as strong as academic leaders.

For Mabel, any tensions she experiences are a direct result of the fiscal constraints she is under:

> it’s not because the leadership isn’t trying to get that stuff…it’s because this is where we’re at. That’s where the tension comes for me—between the *ideal* and the *real* [is] time and economic constraints…the tension is between the economics and the time and the kinds of resources. There’s a lot more that’s expected of using terms of administrative accountability, with management. And so the work that I have had mushroomed considerably, and many organizations of this size and complexity would have a larger management scheme with specialized skills that have said, ‘you know, we’re trying to cover it all with the really small team that we have’…that’s where the tensions really comes from.

Like Mohan, Mabel spoke to some of the constraints of working from a critical perspective. Specifically, she cited “economic…funding…accountability systems and structures” as hampering her capacity for critical management practice; and yet, that said, she felt that there were elements to her approach that she considered critical. One example she gave was how her agency was currently going through a scheduled mandatory review. Reviewing job descriptions was a part of this process. She could have said, “we’ve updated the job descriptions. Here they are.” Instead, she opted for a more collaborative decision-making process where all entire leadership team was able to provide input into the process. As a result, the process was “further ahead, since I’ve gotten them on board. We work these now, having used their input”.

Mac had an interesting response in that he identified his social justice work as a manager as trying to avoid putting subordinates into moral quandaries: “[the way] I work is [by] treating people fairly; having them develop their skills and express their interests in an open kind of way, so that they’re not asked to do anything that they don’t think is [the] right thing to do”. So, in some sense, part of social justice management was the delegation of work that took into account the values of the staff.

Although Max argued that his agency did work within a critical perspective, he was equivocal about the effectiveness of what he saw as that approach:

> Critical analysis tends to be a white-hat/black-hat scenario, which I think some of the schools of social work have tended to, “the world’s bad and it’s all about redistribution of resources.” I think if you live in that world, you set people up to be frustrated. So, I would argue the challenge is recognizing that, yes, there are extremes. If Donald Trump wants to make a donation, I’ll take it; but the reality is, “how do I leverage the communitarian spirit of corporations? How can I

> interest people in creating value for their employee group, or for us?”…so, my critical analysis is—the notion that individuals and corporations can solve all these problems and we don’t need government; and we can just get government out of the way—to me, that’s dumb. At the same time, I recognize that government has some learning and some things they could do better.

Moss commented on the practical aspects of management as well as the importance of networking as something that his education failed to provide for him. Again, Moss’s case study was an interesting one and somewhat unusual for this group of participants because of his senior position; because of the nature of the organization which often employed former (or potential) service users; and because of the flexibility inherent in not being in a unionized environment.

Mac spoke, not of the relationships with subordinates, but of resistance to pressures from funders to work in a way that makes the work of the agency look good “on paper”:

> there’s always this pressure from [name of funder] to maximize—you know, *discharge people*—my values wouldn’t be that. My values would be that we would maintain some form of contact that, unless the person out-and-out said, “you know what? I’m just totally fine. Thanks a lot. You’ve gotten me over the big hump and I’m great.” That’s a different thing. But, if they’re saying, “oh, I really like seeing you—even if it’s just once every two or three months.” And yet there’s a rule that we need to discharge after a certain point. We may have to do that but not feel particularly good about it.

Mary goes back to the barriers she mentioned earlier. She specifically mentions the barriers of working in management in an academic setting. When pressed for an example, Mary again referred to her lack of power:

> I guess the biggest one being surrounded by faculty who are all PhD. and I have an MSW. I consider that a barrier to the credibility of what I say, or I guess the power of what I'm proposing. It feels like the program that I lead is like that sister that nobody wants to hang out with; if you're not a PhD. or you're not a researcher, you don't get that same kind of respect.

She adds,

> I think it's not that people don't take me seriously. I think that I've always been mindful of how I am perceived, so sometimes I hold back what I really want to say to present myself in a way that I'm not rocking any boats here. But, over time, you want to start rocking boats because there are things that you just are not comfortable sitting down and just taking, and for me, that's been resources that my program has in terms of…our students having meaningful opportunities. I felt like that was something I was unprepared to stay quiet about,

Mary feels hamstrung by the hierarchy of the academic workplace. In the example she provides, the autonomy that is often lacking in middle management positions, not just universities, is interfering with her ability to realize the vision she has of a great program. In this case though, the question one might ask is, is it interfering with some social justice agenda? Much like other social services, what is meant by critical management, doesn’t just involve the delivery of a service that users find helpful—it’s much more than that. In her example, she draws this distinction between leading and management where leaders are unencumbered by any considerations other than carrying out their vision. This again draws on the mythology of the leader as hero which Mohan brings up and which is discussed extensively by Ford, Harding, and Learmonth (2008).

Mabel was unusual in her emphasis on how changes, in the context of publicly funded agencies, placed such constraints on her that it altered her relationship with staff. She spoke of the increased demand for accountability data which put her in a position to work within a very rigidly defined framework:

> You feel disempowered because they were hired at a time—and in a context where—they had a lot of latitude. And now, because of the system…we are getting asked questions that we were never asked before…and so one of the challenges then…when we look at things from a critical approach around power…and ways that I interact with staff [is] driven by the economic and political context and appropriate structures and systems around accountability.

Clearly, for Mabel, part of the management role now meant enforcing a level of accountability that had not been required in the past. This changes the relationship in ways that resemble a production model. Staff with latitude might be fairly compared with craftspeople who had responsibility for how a product was created and delivered. Accountability always involved measurement which necessitates a certain mindset about the work, e.g., how many service-users were seen and for how long. These kinds of measures are by nature reductionist and therefore antithetical to the more artisanal approach to social services of which Mabel laments the loss. She elaborates on this point when she remarks:

> I'm aware that there's a sense—an underpinning—of feeling like they have less power and control compared to what they used to [have]. When they were first hired. Especially if they were hired back when the agency was really small, and people were Jacks and Jills of all trades. You played to your strength—you pitched in. The organizations have evolved, right?

Though some managers support these changes to the socioeconomic circumstance, many do not. Either way, it is often management who are blamed for the results.

Importance of Working Non-Formulaically

Mary, Mac, and Mohan had not really explored any formalized management strategies. They seemed to work from more intuitive level. Mary practiced from what might be called “the golden rule of management”, e.g., she commented, “I lead my team or manage is the way that I wish someone manages me”. Social work is a discipline that encourages productive group dynamics and collaboration. Unlike many of the other managers, Mary is a social worker so it’s not surprising that she tries to work from a collaborative framework. What was surprising is how many of the managers also worked with a similar style. That said, Mary’s response reflected some inconsistency:

> engaging them in decision making, making them feel like their opinion is heard. I think that there are strengths to that approach because people feel like this program is theirs and not just my voice being the only voice that we're listening to. But there are times where I wonder if it's better to have an approach where you make decisions and people follow them because it's a little bit clearer what is expected, as opposed to asking them to figure it out amongst themselves.

This theme of feeling stuck came up several times for Mary. When asked if she was able to work within a critical perspective, she responded, “I think I still can”; however, she went on to make an important qualification. She stated that she was very much trained from a critical perspective and felt it gave her thinking more nuance, i.e., though she felt she had very black and white thinking, her training led her to question that style. However, this also means you

> second-guess and think about every kind of perspective before you come to come kind of decision about a program…you're expected to show leadership and make decisions—make decisions that push the program ahead; but if you're constantly looking at other perspectives of things, and thinking about why are people doing what they do and how they do it, you feel stuck sometimes. So, I think I have been able to keep that critical perspective alive here, but I think that's also because of where I work. I work in an organization that promotes that, that fosters that, that supports that at the unit level, but I can't really control what happens outside of the unit.

It is here that we see the contradictions and tensions in the critical approach that fostered a collaborative style. While on the one hand, Mary's values guided her toward collaboration, she also had bitter experiences that made her less collaborative.

> It has some drawbacks. I have experienced it having drawbacks. So, although I went into that example feeling like, 'You know what? This is a gift we were given of an additional hire. It's one-year long. What do we want to do with it? Let me ask the staff what they feel we should do with it.' Now, what I've learned is it might have been easier to just say, 'This is your workload,' and it be obvious; as opposed to them having to figure it out amongst themselves, because it has created rifts in my program.

For Mary, it seems that her collaboration resulted in "rifts" (her word), within the team. As a result, she's less inclined to engage in collaboration, i.e., power sharing, in the future. Furthermore, she is now engaging in more "policing" (again, her word) of her staff. In this case, the constraints on more critical approaches to management seemed to have originated out of idiosyncratic group dynamics rather than a wholehearted resistance to a critical management style.

As stated above, Mac was not familiar with any formalized management strategies. He simply tried to create an environment where staff were able to take ownership of their work:

> I just tend to want people to have an impact on where they work and have a sense that they own what they're doing; that they're not being told what to do every minute of the day…I try to manage in a way that allows or encourages that.

Like Mohan and Mary, Mabel employs an

> eclectic mix of different sorts of approaches, tools, and resources that I come across. Sometimes I come across them because I was in grad school; or maybe my last job, where there was training that was spent on management developments; and other times I come across them because there's a certain issue or thing that I'm thinking through. I might think, "is there something online?" And I go looking for stuff or I look it up in the published research…[but] is there just one? No.

However, Mabel did, rather than a management strategy, speak to a philosophical orientation—service leadership. She remarked:

> I will say that I think that probably that sort of notion (of service leadership)—there is some literature on the concept—that really rings true. And again, it's the critical approach that I was saying that I try to embody or enact in how I execute the job. I'm here to lead the organization…serving all the stakeholders…the staff, everybody…I take the lens of, "what is the impact or what is this going to mean to this particular stakeholder group?" And depending on the question or decisions

> we made, there are certain ones that take priority over others. Like, we don't exist to create jobs. At the same time, obviously, I'm going to be doing my due diligence as a CEO. I'm going [to] be looking at what is the job impact here, for a lot of decisions. Our driver is, we're here to serve the community and meet a community need.

Moss stated that he does review sources that deal with managerial strategies but only skims them. Furthermore, in doing so he usually found that rather than learning something new and implementing it, it provided a name for something he was already doing. Much like Mary, Moss didn't initially set out with the goal of management as a career. He states,

> I skim a lot of whether it's like Stanford, non-profit, publications, Harvard Business Review, Fast Company. I would say those are the three main sources that I look at a lot just through like Twitter and whatever. For example, when they talk about non-hierarchal management practices and balancing people's need to be supported and to have like clear direction and a vision but also people having ownership of what they do and that was – those kinds of things didn't necessarily, "Oh yeah, I like that idea. Let me try and manifest that." It was more like I'll read some of those things and it will be like, "Oh okay, that's my approach."

He later comments:

> I wouldn't say that there's a management book or particular theories of management that I follow. It's more so I see things that resonate with some of what we do and from time to time it might be like, "Oh we do 60 percent of that. That's interesting. I didn't think about that other 40 percent in that way and it's cool that other people are doing things this way or thinking of these things this

> way. Maybe I can learn from that other 40 percent that I hadn't been thinking about."

Meredith also could not think of any established, formalized methods of management that she employed. She cited learning from experience and through peer learning circles as her primary source of guidance. She describes her peer learning:

> We try to just talk about critical things that are going on in our agency, and so I see their approach to things or I see how they do things differently, so I'm always wide open to learning new ways of managing…I have my own mentors in the field, too, so I'll go to them and [ask], "How do I manage this particular situation"

Managers were asked if, as they entered the role, there had been a change in thinking about how to work with people. As discussed above, critical management isn't so much a list of things you do or don't do, but instead it is an approach or way of relating to the job that is values based and considers people and issues that may lie outside the mission of the organization. It was hoped that critical managers would reflect this in their responses. Mabel had asked for a written copy of the questions in advance, and had trouble with a question which had "think like a manager" in quotes: "I think it's problematic because for me it implies that the immediate thinking and work of a manager is to manage; and as I said earlier, there are many times where a really effective manager is somebody who knows when to lead and when to manage and when to bridge between. So sometimes "thinking like a manager" is mistaken for being a leader. It seems as if Mabel's problem with the question lay in implied presumption that managing was the principal responsibility of managers when one could argue that it's leadership.

Mabel felt that, if there was a change in thinking, it wasn't a significant one because experience in the role made her

> realize that all the skills that I already had in group facilitation and community development [were] still applicable, even when you’re a manager of people. Because you’re often leveraging those skills and capacities just on a micro-scale. So, I don’t think it was so much that it changed, but at some point, I [thought] “Oh, what do I do here?” and realized, “no, I’ll just use the same sorts of skills”

Mac also argued that there hadn’t been much change. He stated that the importance of listening and collaboration that he values so highly in the role, had always been a necessary skill, even when he was working in a completely different sector:

> You know even when I was working with sales people, I spent a lot of time listening. Even when I was a salesman, if you listen to the client they’ll tell you what they want. They’ll tell you so don’t jump in, “oh, we’re going to do this for you. We’re going to do that for you”, because half of that stuff they may not care about. But, if you talk to them and you find out what they really want…you know you’ve got to hear what they want. It’s that—trying to be a listener first

Though Mary initially stated that being a manager had not changed how she works with people, on reflection, she changed that response. Here, again her sense of isolation came up. She stated:

> So, I do feel it has changed the way I work with people in that respect in that I feel like I'm a little bit more, I don't know if the word is independent, I would say more alone. So, although I have a team, I feel like I'm sometimes alone.

What’s important to note is that those changes have come at great cost. She describes this when she remarks,

> But has it changed how I work with people? Well, I could compare it to my previous life, my previous work life where I wasn't a manager. I didn't feel like there were certain things I couldn't say to people. When I came here, I felt probably the loneliest I've ever felt in my life in a work atmosphere, because where I used to work, I was frontline, and I had relationships, or I was able to talk to nursing. I worked in a hospital. I was able to talk to anybody I wanted to about whatever I wanted to.

One thing that is consistently taught to social workers in critical programs is the capacity to sit with uncertainty. Less certainty is seen as a strength in critical practice because it leaves one open to alternative perspectives—especially those of the service users. As Henkel (1995) writes,

> a key issue raised here is that of the balance to be struck between certainty and uncertainty, openness and closure, continuity and disjunction. It is particularly relevant to the social work profession, because of its location at a number of margins in modern society (p. 77)

It also reduces the likelihood of imposing ethnocentric solutions to social problems. A very dramatic example of this might be the non-consensual removal of children from indigenous families for adoption by, usually white, families—the, so called, 60s scoop (Hunka, Odele, Rajotte, Kinew, & Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 2012). There were many politicians, bureaucrats, *and social workers*, who felt certain that forced assimilation was a policy which would result in a net good for indigenous people (Blackstock, 2009). Obviously, the racism that lay at the root of this assumption was unquestioned and facilitated the implementation of an attempt at cultural genocide. This is an extreme example to make a point. Social workers need to maintain vigilance in their critical perspective. To neglect this, risks practicing in a way that, no matter how well intentioned, may cause harm to those who they purport to serve (Pozatek, 1994). However, despite the benefits that may come to social justice when social workers cultivate comfort with uncertainty, Mary did not seem to feel good about the uncertainty that she experienced. She stated that “maybe, overtime, I’m more confident, but I’m also more unsure, too; because of things that come up and instances that come up where I second guess how I do things”.

For Moss, the biggest change was his realization of the amount of talent that is wasted on people relegated to roles that limited their potential. He provided the following example:

> I mean I was doing a [frontline] job with [agency name] working in community centers. I love doing it but there was a point where I got worse at doing my job over time because there wasn't any room for growth and it was so limited in terms of: these are the shifts, these are the hours, this is the role, there's no budget, blah, blah, blah. Right? That experience was really eye-opening to me and I remember really thinking about how incredible it is that some of the greatest talent for working with young people in the city works at some point for City of Toronto Parks and Rec, summer programs, afterschool programs, community centers. What I saw was that it's a very precarious type of employment situation where it's really odd hours as well in terms of being able to hold down, say, another job. There's not a lot of room for growth at all.

The unfortunate irony of this example is that it was the limitations imposed by a regimented work life, often designed to protect the worker, that led to his dissatisfaction and conclusion that his creativity was being stifled. When he entered the ED role he was able to cultivate creativity and demonstrate the flexibility he believed missing in his frontline work. For example,

> if people come forward with an idea like there's got to be a really good reason why I say no; otherwise it's a yes. If we need resources to do something, "Okay, let's find the resources. Let's try to figure this out." If people are showing that they want to take different steps and all that then again, there's got to be a really great reason why it's a no. Otherwise it's a yes." So that kind of approach I think is from my experience and is key to the question that you're asking right now.

It is here we see Meredith’s more traditional (less critical) approach to management. She responds to the questions that suggest that part of the managerial role is monitoring and correcting staff performance. She states,

> [The management role] has taught me to…be more comfortable with giving people feedback that’s not really positive. I tend to see the positive in everybody, but I also have to identify, “This is the weak link here. We need to work on this. This is what I expect from you.” Sometimes that tends to be a bit hard for me. Before, I would kind of just let things slide and say, “Oh, OK. That’s OK”; but now, I’m noticing that I’m more comfortable being able to point those shorts of things out—set out what the expectations are—and to monitor…to check in to see that they’re achieving what I expect them to achieve.

To be clear, Meredith has not stated anything particularly surprising. Part of the management role, as stated above, is to fulfill the primary mandate of the agency in a way that recognizes the responsibility they have for administration of the public resources required to perform that function. In short, a manager maintains efficiency. Without monitoring, it’s impossible to gauge the efficiency of the agency's operations. Furthermore, monitoring may not always be about punishing. It can, and is, used to reward the good work of staff; as Blanchard and Johnson (1982) call it—catching them doing something right. What the critical approach is, is that awareness of the potential for harm that comes with practices like monitoring. It is *equivocation* that underscores critical practice (e.g., Parton, 1998).

Meredith stated that she found her degree in Applied Science, with a major in Family Studies provided her with "foundational" information in mental health. None of her education, though, involved any kind of "management or leadership". She just "learned along the way". In fact, colleagues have dissuaded her from pursuing management education, asking, "why would you take that? You've been doing nonprofit management for all these years". Later in the interview she laments, "maybe I missed out on something significant". She also considers that it can be "interesting to go back to school after you've been doing the work…you can help the class and the professor to know whether the materials that they're teaching are relevant". For Meredith, the relevance of education to the workplace is enhanced by the experience of the classroom—which can come from the students as well as the instructor.

Mabel spoke to some of the transferable skills her program provided her, specifically, the "advanced study courses and some role playing about an evaluation…I think that the background in psychology is probably a big asset to any kind of position that you land, in where largely what you're having to do is work with people…and be a leader"

***Critical* Managers Need to Go Beyond the Mission of the Agency**

Critical management might entail a consideration of stakeholders that goes beyond the mission of the organization. As discussed above, it's difficult to imagine a critical manager in the social service for whom the only consideration is the service user. Mohan's response represented a very clear articulation of a critical approach to an organization. That is, that the values of the organization apply to *everyone*—not just the service users. He reiterates the agency's mission statement which highlights the agency as a place where people can begin their lives anew, and he further explains "it's applicable at all levels of the organization".

Like Mohan, Mary felt that the concept of stakeholders was, and is, very broad.

> I think our staff are our stakeholders. The community that we send students into are our stakeholders. Our students are our stakeholders. The profession and the integrity, of the profession itself, I feel that is a stakeholder, although that's an entity without a face, I guess. But I feel we have a social or a conscious obligation to all of these things that our students might touch, if that makes any sense.

Moss clearly includes staff as one of the stakeholders. First, he explicitly states that "everybody we work with and are connected to"; but more importantly, like in Mohan's organization, staff are often members of the community that are being served in the mission. This is stated under Values on the organization website, "Youth are involved in our governance, as well as planning, adjusting, and delivering programming" (agency website); as well as their graduation model which involves incorporating graduates of the program into later service delivery: "This is reflected in our programming, in which Mentees become Mentors-in-training, then become Mentors, who go on to play a variety of roles within our organizations (as tutors, co-op students and board members), eventually making contributions to the broader community" (agency website). When the line between service user and staff member is blurred, it's clear that *both* must be stakeholders. Mac also listed a wide range of stakeholders including funders, taxpayers, service user, and staff. He went so far as to say that "next to clients [staff are] the next most important group".

Although Mabel did consider stakeholders very liberally: “So, clients; our Board of Directors; our staff; our students our volunteers; our community partner agencies; our donors; our government funders; our other funders; the broader community and residents of the geographical catchment area that we serve—they’re all collectively our stakeholders”, she was also careful to make a distinction between the relationship one might have with a service user and that one might have with a staff member. She sees the staff expectation of equivalent treatment as inappropriate and a potential infringement on management rights:

> It becomes easy—and I’ve been in this situation—where somebody had been very quick to invoke that…when they’re trying to deflect from a problem—like poor performance or something; and they’re kind of pushing back and using the “but we’re social services. We’re supposed to be good at this.” And, “why aren’t you giving me more?” In other words, “Why aren’t you being more like a social worker with me and giving me the benefit of the doubt or allowing me to do X”…you know this kind of thinking, which actually isn’t appropriate…starts to be used as a power tactic on the part of an employee to push back on what is supposed to be a legitimate purview of the rights of management to run an organization effectively.

Thus, though staff were stakeholders, all stakeholders were not entitled to the same considerations and treatment. It does come back to the research question, in a sense, because it’s hard to tell how social services agencies are structured any differently than for-profit agencies. Of course, the *missions* are different; but are the *means* the same?

Social Service Management is Neglected in Higher Education; but Preparation Comes Through General Education

Mary states what is often reflected in the literature, i.e., social work education often neglects anything other than direct practice:

> I was trained to be a social worker working in direct practice. I felt that that's what I took away, mainly because that's what I came in wanting it to be, but I didn't leave these two programs thinking, "Oh my god, I'm ready to hit the ground running and be a manager in an NGO." Not at all.

Mary never intended on going into management and never took an administration course that was offered in her MSW program. One might have hoped that even through more general social work education and development some of the required skills for management in the social services might be addressed. Unfortunately, Mary argues that there was very little in terms of perspectives on management that her program helped her develop. When pressed she stated,

> I would say dealing with conflict, maybe, again, I would come back to developing rapport or communicating with people, some of those things I can say I'm tapping into what I learned and what I used to do as a social worker in the field. But that's it in terms of getting prepared from an educational institute.

She even goes so far as to suggest that what she's doing isn't quite social work (again, speaking to the point that social work education does not consider alternative forms of practice, like management). She states that there are “elements” of social work in managing and goes on to provide examples: “being involved with change”, or “obtain[ing] resources and hav[ing] a different relationship with partners in the community”. She states, “like you wear a double hat, I feel”. In other words, the management of relationships aside, management is not social work.

Finally, Mary, much like Emma and Mohan, felt that it was vitally important to offer practicum opportunities for budding managers and part of the utility of that strategy, according to Mary, is simply to get students thinking about management as a potential career path. She states,

> when I was working on my major research paper, I would have focused on social administration, or I don't know. If the program doesn't offer it to you, I could have done more to tease that out for myself in terms of the assignments that I write and the major research paper. But that wasn't even in my mind because I think that, as a student, you don't think that's where you will end up. I think that as a student, you're really looking at the first couple of years of your life, what do you want to do, and even with students in placement who are preparing for the field, they have a very narrow image. Essentially, their first step into the field, they want it to be direct practice. They're not thinking about the positions where they can go into a leadership role.

As stated above, many programs simply don’t consider how likely it is that a large percentage of their graduates will, at some point in their careers, enter a managerial role. Moss also stresses this point when he touts the importance of developing managerial competence in the general education curriculum.

Consistent with her other responses, Meredith did not think it was her degree that helped her think like a manager: “I don’t know where I got that ability, because I don’t think it was family studies [or] nutrition courses…I’m not sure where I got those skills from”.

Moss did not feel as though he learned any of the skills he needed for his job in university. Rather, he learned them intuitively on the job. As stated above, when he took any kind of training, it often simply confirmed what he was already doing, rather than teaching him anything new:

> I was at a United Way presentation about it. I was like, "That is 95 percent exactly what we do," and none of us had ever heard of this framework. But then it was like—so we kind of intuitively been doing those things. So, I think it was more intuitive responses to the challenge that I was presented with and how I figured that out became my management style.

That said, he does think that the possibility exists of teaching strategies for managing an organization in a critical way and feels much of that could come through general education courses and be useful to almost anyone:

> management, leadership, project management, people management, collaboration and team building, all that kind of stuff. That stuff was built into it as well, but it was built into it in a way where it was more about collaboration, about leadership, about social change and issues and that kind of thing. So, I think along that lines it would be valuable as a Gen Ed because I don't see anyone coming out of whether you want to be an entrepreneur, you want to work in a restaurant, you want to be a CEO, you want to run a non-profit, you want to be a coach. No matter what you want to do, I think management, leadership, collaboration is really important.

Mabel was not taught administrative skills in her program however her former workplace did: “they were a large enough [organization] that they had their own development department…and I think it was helpful at that juncture in my career development because…it was really relevant to what I needed to know”. Other than a few mental health related “foundational” skills, Mabel didn’t feel she got a great deal of education from her degrees that was directly applicable to the management role, she did receive some from her previous employer. It was there that she did feel that she gained a perspective on the difference between leadership and management:

> I do know I first started to think about the difference between management and leadership when I was in that leadership development program that <*previous employer*> was running…before that, I didn't really think about, "what do I think the difference is and how are they different? What does that mean for how I do work? Am I leading or am I managing? And did it offer you critical approaches for management?" One of my independent studies was on power and relationships; but again, it's largely focused on family relationships and that sort of thing—as opposed to what it was like in the workforce.

She could list far more critical learning incidents in her work life, than those in her undergraduate degree.

Unlike some other participants, Meredith did not identify much of value in her degree. It's paradoxical, but in keeping with the theme, that Meredith had a degree that was much more closely related to social service management than some other participants, e.g., Mohan or Moss and harkens back to how Moss spoke of the value of general education. It's not always the subject matter that finds utility in the work world, but rather some of the broader impacts of PSE (Bok, 2006). It's also important to keep in mind that it was "a long time ago" when Meredith was last in school. Even if there had been crucial learning, its salience may have dwindled in comparison to the decades of work experience she has had. She also stated that there "wasn't anything on management".

Pedagogy Should Reflect the Complexity of the Work Environment

Mohan argues that the capacity of PSE to prepare students for social service administration largely depends on the pedagogy employed. That, of course, is good news for our purposes. If some pedagogical strategies can be more effectively employed to get the kinds of results were hoping for, then this again speaks to the utility of this research. Mohan argues strongly in favour of experiential learning. He states,

> well education, of course, that depends on the pedagogy because if the premise is that you can go to a classroom and understand the work and then understand how to manage the work without actually having some experience of the work, I am less inclined to believe so. But if the educational experience is one that is also predicated on experiential learning that you can then refer to, to understand how to do the work – so the classic example is you're a BSW and you want to be an MSW but maybe you also want to get management skills. Is it in effect that you need some real-world experience to refer to and you need some places to test it.

He elaborates,

> You actually need a chance to kind of lead, maybe manage or places that will provide some of that as well as some of the theoretical knowledge that's required because there's a ton that's required. So, you need to actually <inaudible> some of that other stuff as well to help you do this well. So, I obviously do not believe that you can just go through school, do all the levels and come out and be able to manage. I don't believe that it's actually possible because you have no real-world experience what the context is like compared to the theories of management. Because theories of management are much more about all of this stuff which is

> about being in power relationships with people and negotiating the power and having to actually check what your own projections are. It's very complicated. I don't believe that you can recreate that in the classroom setting appropriately enough.

Thus, Mohan’s thoughts clearly echo some of those expressed by educators. Given the complexities of working with people in challenging environments—workplaces that demand much of staff in terms of time, energy, and commitment, trying to provide the tools required to help staff stay true to the mission of the agency is challenging if students are just reading about it. That is even more true if managers are trying to do this in ways that echo the mission even within the organizational culture. As was pointed out, however, unless the program is specifically geared toward social service administration, there seem to be very few opportunities to “practice” this art. He states, “I think that education is absolutely part of the—I think it's actually necessary and required. I have yet to find a course that does it or a curriculum that does it well because, in fact, it's hand in hand with the real-world experience. So that's what—so you asked earlier, ‘Are there courses?’ No, it's missing. Is it possible? Absolutely”. Without that practice, Mohan argues, new managers don’t have the “pieces to refer to, to understand the theory, where you are, and your learning—and then apply it”.

He also returns to his earlier theme about the importance of classrooms preparing learners for the challenges of working with others. He states,

> So, from a pedagogical kind of reference point and frame, what do you do or how do you change things so that people have to work with each other with all of their foibles and proclivities, all of that stuff. It's all stuff that gets in the way. It's not the work. It's all that. But we work with people. Hence, that's what you work with.

> So, it's funny, because I actually see, well maybe my education actually allowed me—it gave me more opportunity than I would have thought…so, it demanded group dynamic work. That’s what we’re doing, right? It’s group dynamics.

Interestingly, he further states that the ideas that people have about leadership often get in the way of their being good leaders. In particular, very early in the interview, he references the mythology of leadership and in doing so, comes to similar conclusions that were posited by Ford, Harding, and Learmonth (2008) who explained how managers often worked from notions of the leader as “hero”. Mohan stated, “they may want to take on a management role. For a variety of reasons that are held as perhaps fantasies as opposed to clearly what the system may want”. He went on, “there are fantasies about leaders and the difficulty with that is if there’s the perfect leader, the strong leader”. The connection to the “the hero” was explicitly mentioned to Mohan and he responded,

> Yeah. Nice set up, right? We understand that’s a classical setup. It’s been written about for thousands of years. So, let’s learn from our forbearers that, in fact, a lot of that—that’s a mythology…that is that, well, you should just be able to tell people what to do and they should do it and then life is simple. Once you realize that that’s an illusion, you then realize; ‘no, my role here is in fact persuasion and to listen to people about what might be getting in the way of things getting done.

Mohan spoke of the importance of failing as a source of growth in managerial skill. The problem, as Mohan sees it, is that school doesn’t provide enough opportunities for failure. Mohan states,

> That's where school is a challenge, of course, right. Because school is not made about failing. School is actually about passing. It's about, "What's your GPA?" We

> have a funny thing. We have built [passing] into our educational system—an expectation…how do you fail well? How do you build that into a learning environment? I don't know. It's a quandary—so as somebody who's going to be in the educational environment, I ask that question because that's actually a key part of what we do.

Interestingly, Mohan does not comment on his education leading to the principles he values. Instead, he speaks of growing up in a milieu of activism. He states,

> I'm of an age that I grew up when we believed in a social safety net and I think when we also believed that no one was left behind. So, I ended up being the president of a local. I ended up—I guess when I was a kid I was involved in sit-ins and Stop the Spadina Expressway. So, I grew up in the '60s and '70s—our environment was very rich with expanding that envelope. I'm a product of a cultural context.

Mary expresses her thoughts that preparing students for the ethical challenges of management is an immense challenge—and does so by stating her own challenges, despite being educated as a social worker in a very social justice-oriented program. She states,

> Every day, I feel like it's a struggle being an ethical, just manager. How would these conversations exist in the classroom? When you think about manager and you think about the human resource sector, I assume the way they teach is very much prescriptive. But, working in an NGO, working in social services, it's a very different kind of manager that you have to be.

She continues,

> I think it's needed, but I think it would involve a lot of really, really deep conversations and discussions and critiquing the existing model of what a manager is and how to be a manager. I think you could critique that. I think there's space for our students to learn this. I think because of the way that I am, I mean I would love for all of my managers to have put this much thought and stress over how to react to certain things that come to you, because it means you actually give a shit.

It’s here that Mary returns to the theme of uncertainty discussed above. She makes the point that she feels social workers are more likely to listen to the staff that report to them and would also recognize the ethical challenges of the position. She states,

> I would hope that they would struggle just like I do. I think I want to keep struggling for the rest of my time here at [name of agency] because I think that that means I'm actually giving a shit about people and the way they do work, and this program and the way we work.

It therefore appears that she’s arguing that the tensions she experiences as a manager trying to work in a critical way, are healthy and she agrees with this, to some extent. She states,

> It's healthy. Healthy but I would say also not healthy because I'm constantly on edge because of this workplace, but healthy in that I'm actually caring enough about it to think about how we can interact with each other differently, what I can say differently, how I can do things differently, how I can be better at what I do. I think that's what I would consider like I was taught about reflection, and always thinking about what you do and how you do it and why you did it, and how you grew up and maybe how that informed what you did. The color of your skin and

> how you live in the world, and how you handle yourself in the world. All these things are things we think about as critical social workers, so I want to be that kind of a critical manager, a reflective manager, a reflexive manager.

Meredith was glad to provide a list of skills she would have liked to see in her education. These include “the HR component…working with a Board of Directors…governance…what your organizational chart looks like; how to do strategic planning; how to operationalize that strategic plan; how to do budget forecasting; how to evaluate programs; how to ensure tenants are satisfied”. There’s nothing that reflects a critical perspective in this list. If this, and skills like it, was all we provided social work students, what kind of managers would students develop into?

The only manager interviewed who had formal management training in addition to an MSW, was Max, who had taken a management program at McGill University. The program was based on the work of Mitzberg. Max described it as a modular approach on the art and science of management. So, I think if there’s anything that has influenced me, it’s that”. Max provided further detail:

> the first couple of weeks that—we went into five modules over a year and a half—was, “who are you as a leader?” That was interesting because I had a social work education, but I wasn’t a clinician. So, it was kind of interesting to spend a couple of weeks thinking about, “Well what are the theories of leadership? How do leaders work? What’s the difference between leading and managing? How do you empower people…so, I would say that experience over a year and a half shaped my thinking as a leader. It was recognizing that I have a lot of indirect influence, but not a lot of direct influence. So, how do you lead by letting go as

> opposed to controlling? That's what I think I've been able to do here. I think if you talk to any one of my managers who works with me they would say they feel empowered to do their job. I don't tell them what to do. I mean we have things that we have to do for the LHINs [Local Health Integration Networks] and the government and stuff. So, it's how are we going to meet our objectives, but those objectives are fairly high level.

In Max's situation, his training seemed to emphasize the importance of allowing his staff sufficient autonomy to do their jobs and feel a sense of ownership over their work. The desire to avoid micromanaging was something that also came up for Mac, below and Moss, above.

Max spoke of two other strategies that he employs. First, was a

> conceptual framework of pattern analysis, empowering people to lead. The thing that's come out of the quality agenda. Try small scale change first, before you screw up everything. So, plan, do, study, act. Try it out, see if it works. If it does, go with it, scale it. I've really come to the conclusion that in its own way, what we've been doing in [the sector] for the last four years has been small scale change. Now the challenge is how do you scale it up?

The other approach he cited as an influence is consideration of "what's the evidence on the ground, either leading edge stuff...or established evidence. So…it's being open to evidence and innovation as well".

Unlike Mohan, Mary did not feel that her education prepared her for the challenges she faces in her role, though it's important to point out that the ways in which she feels her education failed her, were not the ethical challenges she identified; but rather what we might call procedural skills. She states,

> It prepared me to be a social worker, and I use some of those skills in the way I manage this program, as you've heard me say, ensuring people's voices are heard, ensuring that I'm transparent. These are all skills that I learned, or that are in me because of my social work background. That is some of what I'm tapping into, so I would say it prepared me in that respect. But, in terms of knowing how to navigate issues with collective agreement and unions and dealing with grievances, none of that was talked about in my program. It didn't prepare me for any of that.

She argues that management requires one to separate sets of skills:

> There's a human resource side, with all the policies, the procedures, the HR hat, and then there's the being a good leader, a good manager, ensuring that you're one with your team. I see these two arms of it, and maybe my social work education prepared me for how to interact and develop rapport and be one with the team, but I don't think it prepared me for these administrative processes.

So, from a social justice perspective, could that be called a successful educational experience? From Mary’s standpoint, it doesn’t seem so; but her very awareness of the tensions she faces, seem to speak to exactly the kind of manager that critical programs help to develop.

Not unlike Mohan, Moss’s degree was in the arts—specifically, English with Latin American and Caribbean Studies—though he also did a Diploma in Social Innovation. Also, like Mohan but to some degree unlike Mary, who did both undergraduate and graduate training in social work, Moss found his degree valuable for his current role, despite the fact that, while he was a student, he had no intention of going into non-profit management. Specifically, again, much like Mohan, he saw the value of his education in how it gave him the ability to “switch lenses”. Moss sees this in three ways. First, it aids in the ability to recognize patterns, which is valuable in leading an organization. Moss states,

> As you switch those lenses you see similarities, you see patterns, you see differences as well. That's been helpful in the work I do which requires me to switch lenses quite often. So that training and that thinking was really valuable to me.

Secondly, he found his degree helped him develop his communication skills:

> I didn't know what an RFP or an EOI or—you know? I didn't know what any of these things were. It's easier to learn that than it is to learn to communicate an idea to make a compelling argument to strip away the extras and get to the essence of the message and story. That stuff is harder to learn, and I think my education and an education can really help with those things.

Finally, and closest to Mohan’s idea of being able to “[put] yourself in someone else’s shoes”, was what Moss called “developing your perspective”. Where he saw PSE as valuable for “develop[ing] your perspective on the world and on life and on people and society and issues. If you don’t take time to do that, it’s not going to magically just be there. Right?” Though he feels that there is a gap in terms of education that helps develop very specific types of skills, e.g., budget management, that gap is common among many programs where it might be useful; however, Moss argues that they don’t get a balanced education—they often “don’t get that other side, the empathy that literature provides or taking time to really understand a wide array of world views”. He later states “there’s a lot of work around the way that literature is powerful on developing the skills of empathy”.

Like others, though Meredith felt that education had value, it was “the practical, on-the-job experience that really gets you understanding what’s it’s like to work in a nonprofit”. She makes a distinction between theory and practice and it’s not until social work students do their placement and they encounter the work that they get “that aha experience”.

Mabel argues that the critical approach really isn’t necessary: “I don’t know how well our education system is preparing managers for that kind of critical thought, and I do think it’s possible, but I’m also not sure that it’s necessary”.

Although Mac did not receive this in his education, he speculated that one could learn to be a critical manager at university if there was a lot of emphasis on groups. Mac felt that a valuable skill for managers was the ability to listen:

> you’ve got to hear what people are saying. If you don’t listen to your staff or hear what they’re saying…but I don’t know how much they work with that to help people listen to all the other people in the group. I mean to me, that’s what it’s trying to teach that in your job-life, you’re going to be working with other people. And you have to develop the skills that allow you to be seen as a productive member of that group. Otherwise, you’re going to get isolated and staff aren’t going to want to work with you. But I don’t know how much active working with that idea is done at university.

Interestingly, and he later stated, that, studying philosophy (despite its lack of group work) might be good preparation for management:

> that aspect [regarding social justice] of philosophy would be a great way to get at good management; because I think someone that can wrestle with those issues and come up with a socially just, but clear, response to it [a just response to those who

> are behaving in unjust ways]—not a rubber stamp, but actually put forward a rationale argument.

Though he did later qualify his response: “but, if they’re in the social field or the helping field, it’s much more likely that they’ll do fine because they’re not going…to ask their staff to do something that they wouldn’t do themselves”.

Finally, much like Moss, Mac argued that he found a generalist education most valuable because of the flexible, critical thinking that it developed. He lamented the fact that higher education has drifted toward skills development:

> we’re streaming people. People are going to school to get a job. And so, all the jobs are in computers, ‘I’d better take computer science’. If engineers are getting work, ‘I’d better be an engineer’. It’s all goal driven, as opposed to education driven. So, what you could be talking about here is having a manager’s course. Is that then the same as any other goal driven course?

However, he did state that programs in management have the potential to provide a more generalist education: “you don’t just get an MBA to manage—you’re better at finance or you’re better at economics”.

Though many managers find ways to include their values, e.g., Mohan’s acknowledgement of the need to actively seek accountability measures that reflected critical perspectives, they face a variety of challenges. Perhaps surprising to some, it was only rarely that managers cited specific managerial strategies or techniques that they had learned as being especially helpful. For those managers who did not study social work in university, there are no shortage of continuing education opportunities for management training, (e.g., the aforementioned six-sigma black belt training); yet what was cited far more often were general education courses which gave manager the ability to imagine a variety of standpoints and possibilities. Though not stated by any respondents, this may even relate to their desire for training that would acknowledge the complexity and non-technocratic approach to critical management. This bears directly on what educators prioritize when trying to prepare critical managers for the work world which is discussed below.

Chapter Five: Educator Themes

The educators who were interviewed, as mentioned above, all have experience in teaching administrative courses. This research hoped to tap into that experience and better understand what strategies educators believed effective in preparing students interested in examining and redressing social injustice, i.e., acting as an agent of change, while in working administrative positions. They spoke of both successes and challenges but most of the data fit into five themes. First, the importance of recognizing and acknowledging power in the workplace. While the fact that managers have power may be obvious, the power within organizations is often hidden in social service agencies. It's almost as if it is assumed that if the mission of the agency alludes to egalitarianism, the internal workings of the agency must also be egalitarian—which is often not the case. The second theme that educators spoke of was the importance of problematizing, not simplifying. The essence of this theme lies in the idea that mainstream management education often normalizes what Coronado (2016), above, speaks of as "untested feasibilities". In other words, workplace conditions we may be consider as "obvious" and "necessary", like hierarchical structures, may have alternatives. Critical education organizes its pedagogy around unpacking assumptions of normality. Third, educators spoke of the importance of discussing values in class. As we train students for frontline social service work, we sometimes fail to consider that workers, particularly as they move through their career path, may not always be in positions where an unambiguous ethical stance is possible. Fourth, educators spoke of the resistance that they often face to critical education. Sometimes this comes from students who are uncomfortable with the critical approach, as discussed by Brookfield (2005) above; sometimes it comes from the university administration; and, sometimes it comes from colleagues. Finally, educators spoke of the importance of emphasizing non- mechanistic or non-formulaic ways of working. That management was a tricky business and there really were no easy answers to the questions that would come up for their students as they entered administrative roles.

Critical Pedagogy Acknowledges Power in the Workplace

In considering how critical management can be taught it's useful to consider traditional strategies for teaching management. Elmer speaks to this eloquently when he remarks:

> Well you can teach management and not raise any questions about authority, not raise any questions about power imbalance—you can teach it. In many business schools, that's how they teach it. However, in critical management, those things have to be integrated within the context of the class. You have the content about diversity, content about unjust situations—you have to have that content in there, and you have to be teaching people not to be totally accepting of Directors, but also recognize you've got to eat. So, you don't fight every battle. And you may let that one go in order to deal for another one that's just more threatening to what you're trying to do.

That said, Elmer contended that one of the principal challenges of teaching from a critical perspective is nailing down a common definition of "critical". He remarks, "It's not like you've got a bunch of students who have no understanding of critical. It's much easier to teach them [Elmer later refers to the 'unlearning' many students with managerial experience must do] …but when you've got students coming from a whole bunch of different people talking about critical [approaches], and it's the pass [sic] buzzword in the environment, then you've got a real challenge". Elmer speaks of the above-mentioned ambiguity around the concept, even among established scholars in the field. Of course, social service administration is hardly the only field that has disputes around definitions. I would argue, however, that it does, seem unique in its blindness to the term's fuzziness, e.g., the literature rarely goes to the trouble of defining the term. Having said that though, he seems to argue from a position that there's no pedagogy that is particularly poorly (or well) suited for this content. He's not against using, e.g., multiple-choice tests if they further the learning objectives. Indeed, he notes, "my pedagogy is not directed by my theory of how I teach, but where—who I'm teaching".

Elaine saw the "critical act" as that of *naming things*—both as an educator and as an administrator. For Elaine, management guidance comes through the pedagogical strategy of "making sense of something that just seemed either disorderly, or instinctive, or personal". Teaching involved working together to identify patterns of resistance to encroaching neoliberalism[7] in the social services, including education. It also involves being able to name patterns of oppression within organizations or, in other words, staying attuned "to organizational landscapes…and…power relationships within them". Elaine speaks of the

> naming of masculinity of [the] organizational world; naming how exclusions happen; naming the inherent unease, like the cost of being in a meeting and thinking—or leaving and thinking, 'I'm not quite sure I liked the way I talked. Or should have I said more? Should I have shut up? Should I this or should I that? So, this constant kind of reflecting; it felt like one long improvisation…like I started to name those dynamics

---

[7] Although the utility of the term is contested, Harvey (2007) defines neoliberalism as "a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (p. 2).

Ironically, though the ability to articulate injustice was crucial to critical education, the ability to name pedagogical strategies was quite elusive to Elaine. She states that, “I’ve taught here for 25 years; but I don’t name how I’m teaching. It sounds so hapless, I know”. That said, she was able to elucidate a critical component to “good” teaching and learning—relationship. She speaks of, “establishing a classroom culture…where I communicate enthusiasm for what we’re doing and hopefulness for what we’re doing. When people are, in whatever ways that happen, can feel safe to venture ideas or a process or disagree…and I become less the focus of discussion and there’s more cross-conversation”. This suggests, that Elaine takes a constructivist approach to teaching and learning, i.e., that learning is a social process that happens through development of relationships and the meaning that learners make from content (Phillips, 2014).

Elmer advocates flexibility that is sensitive to the learning needs of the students. Rather than argue for an especially critical approach to pedagogy, i.e., some teaching strategy that lends itself particularly well to a critical perspective, he suggests that it is the experience level of the students that is the most salient factor in deciding on a teaching approach. He states that students that need a very structured learning environment are often those with very little field experience; whereas those with a great deal of social service management experience can learn in more self-directed environments. However, he states that, ironically, it is those with lots of management experience that often have the most unlearning to do, as they’ve often been inculcated with very poor managerial practices and they simply end up justifying them.

Eve, rather than speaking about specific strategies for critical management pedagogy, elaborated on approaches to teaching in a less hierarchical way. She spoke of the necessity to demonstrate flexibility with when, and how, to guide the classroom. She moves “up and down that continuum” of providing direction and content on the one hand, to turning the class over to the students and allowing them to consider and resolve complex questions, on the other. When she does step in, she tries to ask, “provocative questions—to problematize, to reveal discourses and deconstructive issues—to help them figure out how to do that”. Most importantly, she begins every course with a discussion around group norms. Though there’s nothing particularly unusual about this, what relates it to a social justice agenda is that this discussion involves “gender issues and other oppression[s]”. It explicitly attempts to reveal how to “navigate…inequality of power between faculty, students, and between students”. She elaborates by asking, “how do you adjust different power dynamics and pedagogical context”. Thus, for Eve, power, diversity, and privilege are required discussion points for any class if you hope to “get the group to move to where [you] think it should move”. Emma echoed the importance of highlighting gender and its impact on classroom dynamics. She related a story of being told by a male student that her strategies for navigating organizations in ways that stay true to social work values, were “manipulative”. Her response was to make it a learning opportunity for the students and discuss the differing experiences of men and women in organizations and how women are forced to strategize in order to avoid negative experiences, e.g., sexual harassment and devaluation; and maximize the chances of positive experiences, e.g., promotion or pay equity. Though she did not state this explicitly, it’s clear that this gendered understanding of workplaces is necessary for a more critical understanding of management in the social services.

Eve also believes there’s a role for the instruction of *skills*; which meets student expectations that they graduate with enhanced employability. Eve added that the university’s responsibility to develop students’ critical thinking skills such that they will be informed global citizens, was also important. Skills, citizenship, and critical thinking all fall within long established traditions of the goals of higher education (e.g., Bok, 2006). Although Eve demonstrates a commitment to more generic higher education aims and practices, she follows up with approaches that more easily fit within a critical tradition. In this vein, she states that managers need to be taught to be “shit disturbers”. “They have to ask those hard questions. They have to think out of the box. They have to embrace risk. They have to understand difference”. What makes Eve’s approach to thinking about management truly critical is her nod to uncertainty and tension. As others stated, critical managers are forced to negotiate conflicting roles and expectations. Traditional literature often approaches the practice of management as a mechanistic or formulaic discipline. Eve categorically states that those approaches are going to undermine “success” (whatever that may mean). Speaking to this point she states, “management is no longer about control. I’ll tell you, it goes back to that first question of holding those tensions”. While that may be true, it does appear that universities are still running very mainstream programs that teach management practices designed to elicit control.

Both Eve and Enid choose to discuss the shortcomings of managerial or social work education in terms of what is lacking with respect to skill development. Some educators who come from a more theoretically oriented perspective saw the question “In what way does management education fail to prepare students for non-profit leadership?” as an invitation to discuss the challenges of furthering social justice (and the, personal, identity work that goes with this), as the essence of the question. Eve and Enid saw this as a question about curriculum rather than a question about a more fundamental challenge facing this vocation.

Ena argued that we currently do a very poor job of preparing students for administrative roles. She talks about teaching students to channel their energy strategically but instead, what we’re teaching is “loyalty”. In other words, Ena argues that we need to be taught skills that managers can use to subvert systems that simply sustain existing inequality; but instead we’re often taught how to be a “good” worker. First, she discusses a key learning that has been lost in social work curricula and that is the ways in which “organizations create greater degrees of diffused power”. In an example, she details the relationships within organizations between management and unions and how those have often been characterized as adversarial but that there are other, more collaborative, possibilities. So, courses that contain material on labour relationships would be a useful tool for students who are interested in administrative roles.

She also speaks of preparing students to resist the kinds of “Kool-Aid” that staff are invited to drink when they become managers. With this, she refers to standardized change management strategies that have been sold to non-profits, e.g., requirements for senior management positions to have membership with the Association of Change Management Professionals. This, she argues, is the antithesis of critical management as it entirely fails to account for any values at all. Ena suggests that taking these prescriptions up in the classroom is a requirement for critical education. She argues for the importance of making students aware of these strategies and discussing how managers might be able to maneuver in ways that comply with the agency requirements (while at the same time not abandoning one’s values). In other words, there may not be an obvious antidote to managerialism, but we can, and should, discuss workplace expectations in the classroom, with the goal of providing a space for students to consider strategies to work subversively within them. She argues, “if you turned the classroom over to students and you say, ‘OK, so you have this Taylorism approach that somebody wants you to use. You want to propose an alternative model. You have to use these values from social work. How would you get to the same outcome but take a different route?’”. Moreover, she comments that, in addition to considering some of the extant uncritical management styles and practices, we should as educators provide opportunities for students to examine other, more values based approaches, e.g., feminist leadership or worker co-ops. These demonstrate to students that there are alternatives to managerialism. Indeed, Enid explicitly stated that leadership for social workers is “just not a parody of what an MBA would be studying”. Thus, there were perceived qualitative differences between business leaders and leaders in the social services. Elmer goes so far as to say, that students who have gone through business degrees don’t make good social service managers. He remarks, “if they’re not talking about the issues around social justice—it doesn’t matter where you go…you’ve got to build it into the curriculum. You’ve got to build in social justice, critical thinking, in there”.

Education Should Problematize Not Simplify

Contrary to the manager respondent Mary, Ena states that most students want to land a job that is in management but resist complicating it, i.e., they conceptualize the role without considering the compromises they may be forced to make. There are, however, some students who can incorporate social work values within the spaces that are available in their agencies. Ena calls this “hold[ing] the breach open”. Interestingly, Eve similarly frames this challenge—not as a manager in a social service agency but as an administrator in a university. She gave an example of a training she was facilitating between Executive Directors (EDs) and “high potential” managers where the EDs “spoke with such passion and conviction that they inspired both the high potential managers and me”. She adds,

> So here I am in this role, trying to figure out—universities are non-profit—how you manage in that, and it’s a constant dance between holding the system and trying to transform the system. It’s a paradoxical role of enforcing conformity and encouraging nonconformity. I see myself sitting in the middle of competing tensions and trying to hold the tension between transformation and stability;

> between abundance and scarcity; between change and resistance to change. So, managers are not managing organizations in my mind anymore. They're managing pitch and they're managing contradiction. They're managing conflict. They're managing meaning making [e.g., how to resolve contradictions between the managerial roles that they perform and their own identity] that is destructive and constructive.

Eve spoke of the opportunity to give students a language to interpret their experiences. She states, "we can't engage in meaning making unless we have some words—and words that have some shared definitions…there's a role for education to teach words, language, metaphors—you know, complexity and the meaning structures". However, much of the pedagogical goals she expressed were individualized: the opportunity for students to enhance knowledge, the provision of experiential learning opportunities, a focus on the personal growth and development of students. This runs rather contrary to some of the more critical social work literature that attempts to resist the framing of education in terms of enhancing personal capacity and toward the development of a critical consciousness, i.e., the ability for students to see both frontline and managerial problems from a more macro lens, i.e., a more systemic framework. She did however, state that without the development of language, managers "can't hold uncertainty. They can't embrace complexity. They can't open space for dialogue and disagreement…they can't confront inequality and privilege in a way that allows for new understandings to emerge". This ability to accept, and even embrace uncertainty, is a capacity that has been emphasized among critical front-line practitioners. Managers can, according to Eve, also benefit from it. Elaine thought of those tensions as especially salient for middle managers who are "both representing policies or dictates, some of which you may agree with, and some of which you may not agree with at all".

Importantly though, and as discussed in Aronson and Smith (2011), this tension between espoused theory and theory-in-use can have tremendous psychological cost. As Ena states, "you end up doing a lot more work than if you just adhere to the rules and do what they tell you to do the way that they tell you to do it. And so it means you give your time, your energy, your brain power, your emotional labour in a way that maybe some other managers don't. And so it takes from your own life. It takes from your own time to do other things." Furthermore, staff that do try to maintain holding the breach open, begin to shift their priorities as they hit various life milestones. Then they "decide what they can control…and they let the rest go…they generally comply and then do this other stuff off to the side". The other thing they do, Ena responds, is they do a lot of extra work at the agency but that work just maintains the status quo. It, furthermore, sets a standard of work in the agency that, though it might help the agency, crowds out the space to do other, more social justice focused work. Interestingly, while Baines (2011) applauds this work as "unpaid overtime to meet the needs of clients and communities" (p. 45). Ena, argues that much of this unrecognized labour is work that does not further any systemic change and is therefore quite uncritical. It's this fact that we fail to discuss in PSE.

As educators, we need to practice what we preach; so, if we speak to the idea that the practice of social work is as much about process as it is about outcome, we need to reflect that in our teaching. Ena spoke to teaching positions she's held where there was an expectation that you're doing a final exam and that it would be multiple choice, which she argues is antithetical to critical pedagogy (quite unlike Elmer) and therefore also runs contrary to teaching students to practice social work in a critical way[8]. So, “if you want people to learn to be *critical* managers then you have to turn the classroom over to the students and the students have to be responsible for much more of the work that happens in the room”. Ena spoke to the desire to teach from inductive, problem-based, learning approaches that employ case studies. In this way, students are able to apply social work theory to practice situations. This reflects an adult education model where “students have a greater degree of control over the learning process in the classroom”. In a broader sense, Emma spoke of the institutional practices of education that effectively blocked more critical, power sharing types of education. For example, she spoke of a “traditional institution that insists on having marks. I’d rather have pass/fail, for example”. Elaine also spoke of the importance of using case studies to work through the complexity of doing management in a critical way. She discussed,

> spinning out…here’s the situation; what’s possible? [T]hey’d have to be fairly complicated situations with the context defined, dynamics defined. How would you proceed with this…here’s what I think I’d do. And play those out and think about naming what people are doing. Because, I think again, if we think that people in the direct practice as well, develop skills at finding spaces and resisting things…I think people in management positions do that and could do that more or could to it more wittingly if we were better at naming… the skill part of it…I could imagine playing out some scenarios thinking how people might actually act, because you do have to act.

---

[8] For further discussion on this distinction see Reynolds (1999a)

Ena also spoke of the necessity to encourage students to question practice decisions, i.e., to constantly make practice issues, from something that might appear simple, into something complicated—practice decisions that can often have surprising and unanticipated consequences. With what one might think of the opposite of discursive closure—a kind of discursive opening—Ena saw the critical educator's responsibility to "always be questioning; to raise more and more complex layered questions about everything that they're doing". This pedagogical strategy is more likely to result in social service administrators that do not wholeheartedly buy into administrative processes or management rubrics but rather are constantly forced to re-evaluate their management practices in light of their values and larger social justice goals.

Ena states that providing student opportunities for *critical reflection* (e.g., Reynolds, 1998), developing that skill, and emphasizing its importance is crucial to the development of critical managers . Leaders who take time to consider the *why* of what they do are more likely to incorporate social justice ethics, and less likely to acculturate to the trend toward a business ethos applied to the social services. Henkel (1995) describes this process as falling "prey to the power of the systems world so that they embed language, norms and cultures in their practice that have little to do with the 'lifeworld': managerial imperatives of economy, efficiency, measurement, outcome, performance; legal mechanisms of control and exclusion" (p. 80). Students who consciously make efforts to consistently consider, "where was I; where am I; how did I get here", are practicing the critical reflexivity necessary for social work that highlights systemic oppression. When we see a failure to reflect, we see what Elaine describes as "slippage". She states, "it's very easy to see how you can slide from drawing people into an understanding of what's constraining or what's problematic or why we're trying to do it 'this way' versus talk about it. There's an easy slide into *justifying* it". Among critical social work practitioners, *skills* are often critiqued as formulaic. However, as Ena remarks, this does depend on what one thinks of as practical skills. She remarks, “if you’re going to be very rigid about what that ‘skill’ means, and how you measure and define skill, then that can be really problematic, [for example] most managers need to have some good communication skills. What “good” means, depends on a lot of different things. So, including some kind of listening, reflecting, thinking about body language, non-verbal communication—those kinds of things—in courses, I think is important”. Many of the skills that are currently taught in social work programs could be adapted to emphasize social justice and systemic discrimination. For example, Ena discusses the process of documentation and “how you summarize something. How do you paraphrase something? That might be—like for the purpose of recording notes and critically thinking about what happens when you write something down in a file. And the anticipated and unanticipated places that that knowledge might go and how it might be interpreted would be something that would be useful for folks who are in management because they could then guide their workers around what you include and exclude and how you write things which often is what gets us into trouble”. But again, when teaching skills, we need to be cautious about slipping into standardized models of practices.

Critical pedagogy has traditionally resisted teaching skills—the argument being that skills are often used as a substitute for thinking. They encourage a cookbook approach to a task which is inherently complex and local. Each problem needs to be considered on a case-by-case basis and viewed with an anti-oppressive lens, i.e., a mindset that considers structural inequalities and acts to resist them. Elmer had similar views to Enid, with respect to the importance of some skills. He saw considerable overlap between the skills of good social service management and those of a skilled clinician. He states, “that’s what makes me a good manager. I never lost my clinical perspective—my micro perspective. Relationship—the key things in a micro perspective—relationship. If you can't relate to your client, the client doesn't feel good about it, you won't go anywhere.". However, it's difficult to say if a manager that is proficient in relationship building, is necessarily any more critical. Elmer only states that this represents "good" management; but it's entirely possible for there to be very good managers (good relaters), who aren't particularly well focused on social justice. He elaborates on this point when he comments that *thinking* managers *are critical* managers; whereas much of management training is quite mechanistic. The difference, he argues, is that critical managers are "questioning authority".

Like Elmer and Enid, Ena points out that by developing "a relationship with the worker so that they're invested in the work that they do in the organization, they care more about clients. They care more about the outcome. They feel cared about". Yet, Ena was reluctant to label the espoused value as "caring". Rather, she preferred the term "strategic caring". This phrase better reflected the idea that supervisory relationships have to be about more than good feelings. They must strategize for good intentions that maximize the potential of the social worker, for more *than utilitarian ends*. In other words, maximizing productivity for workers was only a leadership value in so far as it provided an opportunity for workers to actualize their well-being so they could also do the same for their clients; or facilitate staff's ability to meet their personal objectives, *in addition to* the objectives of the organization. Ena told a story, which exemplified this point, of a manager who saw something in a worker that wasn't well reflected in their current role and assisted them in finding another position in the organization that highlighted that skill. So "managers" simply thought of workers as pieces in a system whose behaviour should be shaped to make the system more efficient— "either you fit, or you don't. There's only one way to do it, this is the way; you do it and if you don’t do it that way then you have not succeeded at the work—then you’ve failed and then you need to be eliminated in some way”; whereas “leaders” saw their organizations as being comprised of complex beings whose needs could be met in a variety of ways that would serve the goals of the agency and larger goals around social change.

Importance of Discussing Values, Ethics, and of Broad Consultation

The values of the agency are to try and “put ourselves out of business”. Indeed, when Ena was first asked “what values should management practice reflect”, she discussed those of the agency. This is quite indicative of the state of the field in social work; that being, the focus has very much been on social justice at the level of frontline work. So much so, that the default line of thought immediately falls to social justice being a “front-line value”. Indeed, as Baines (2011) points out, “many social justice-oriented social workers tend to avoid managerial positions” (p. 18). After, asking Ena to specify values of the management/leadership role she specified, “to try and help workers”. Eve even suggests that “the real source of power is the authenticity that comes from being in touch with our own values. I think it’s the only source of power that you cannot squander”.

Ena argues that leaders are those that engage with frontline staff in ways that “[encourage] them to actualize or maximize some aspect of themselves that is a quality that other people could benefit from”. It is an “orientation where you’re bringing a set of values and beliefs about the goodness of people, the importance of a cause, the importance of values to the interaction”. Furthermore, leaders consider broader goals than the maximization of utility, i.e., efficiency. They “question the information…or the instructions [they’re] given” such that the social justice values espoused are brought to bear on all stakeholders, including the workers. In some respects, the values that frontline workers carry with them in their work with clients should be mirrored by supervisors with their staff. She even specifies that thinking like a manager is not much different than being a social worker, a perspective with which Enid heartily agrees when she states that

> if we teach people how to be good social workers to begin with, I think many different people could become managers and have capabilities of becoming managers. So, I think become a thoughtful, strongly community-focused social worker and then management is kind of a skill that's very related to our roles as social workers in the community.

She later expands on this point: "it comes down to being a good social worker—providing people with those broad-based generic skills, and critical thinking, and being open, staying flexible, staying wary, reflective practitioner and being transparent and honest. Honesty, transparency, being trustworthy".

Both she and Elmer also focused on the importance of managers following the social work code of ethics. Enid remarked, "Following our code of ethics, if all managers followed social work code of ethics, I think that would be a really good thing". Elmer similarly stated, "I start everyone in my class with a code of ethics. Every class I teach each session starts with that. And then you read in my syllabus that I will judge your papers on how it fits with the code of ethics. So, you don't listen to me the first session and throw the code out the window. I expect to see it throughout".

In Emma's response to the question to how it can be taught she spoke of providing "information about theory around different styles of leadership and management", and also

> using the participants' own experiences or experiential case studies or whatever you use—videotapes or whatever—have people have the opportunity to talk about real experiences…and then…for them to think about, reflect, write about and try some new management techniques and styles and have an opportunity to practice them and most courses miss on that piece, right? So, they might have "here are the styles of management," blah-blah-blah but they wouldn't have the opportunity for people to go out and actually try different styles.

While discussing critical approaches to management, though, Emma drifts into critical frontline work. For example, when being asked about preparing students to work in highly corporatized workplaces, she responds with the importance of vision for, what sounds like frontline workers. She states:

> it's not that *I've helped 300 people that all have the same problem* or whatever. It's that I have the vision about the kind of planet I want to live on. I have a vision about the kind of care that people deserve. I have a vision about changing relationships—yeah, so we teach them "how do you survive if you come in with a leftist point of view" and what are the strategies not only in terms of how you work with colleagues and *how you work with service users* but overall, like, what are the strategies? How do you mobilize people to make—change? How do you consciousness-raise about social justice? How do you link people together to work on common causes?

This exemplifies part of the problem that social work education is often faced with, as outlined already. It often forgets or neglects the challenges of doing social justice work for social workers in middle and upper management positions. Even for educators who train social service administrators, thoughts often drift to work with service users rather than colleagues and staff.

Eve’s perspective was not dissimilar to that of Elmer: “some issues may be that it’s such in conflict with your personal values that you walk away; and I’ve done that before…[it] became a matter of conscience for me, that I could not work with a manager and a board that was so opposed to the values that I stood for, and I walked. I said, ‘later’”.

Elaine felt that this was easier said than done—that that managers who were in spaces of contradiction, i.e., when their values dictated a course of action that the agency did not follow, led to a psychological cost. Elaine refers to this as “identity work”; that these managers were fractured by the choices they had to make. They had to be strategic, “choosing your moment or choosing which of the set of possibilities to try and move forward. Deciding when you can resist and when you can’t, especially growth agendas [something that Enid spoke specifically to, also] or accountability arrangements or something like that. When would it backfire to protest too much”. She continues by describing the process of critical management as “people in those positions who’ve got more savvy analytically about finding spaces, bobbing and weaving, and having a critical eye to what’s happening”.

Elaine defined the differences between for-profit and non-profit as a discussion in terms of how constraints are defined. For-profits define constraints in terms of their impact on profit, whereas for non-profits the constraints were defined in terms of resources. She argued that though managers are expected to work within these constraints, critical managers should be transparent about their values (similar to the stance that Eve articulated), and their

> analysis of the conditions—you know, like the next budget cut or a policy change, or something like that. Be clear about why that’s happening. You may not like it,

> but don’t just impose it. And then if that goes well, it means that whether they’re social workers or admin staff or faculty colleagues or something like that, they have an analysis of what happening to us all.

Elmer very much agrees with this approach when he comments,

> sometimes especially when you get directives from your manager that you know are unjust; but you don't have any choice. Ideally, I try to lay it out to the people I’m working with. And, I’m always usually up front about, ‘Hey, I don’t even believe this crap anyway, but we’ve got to do it’. And I’m saying, ‘I’m caught like you are’ So you won’t find me taking somebody else’s orders and then forcing people in an unjust way. I would say, ‘we’ve got to do it, but I don’t like it either. But we’ve got to do it’

It seems clear that for Elmer, critical management is a task that is broad in its scope and differs from more traditional management in its acknowledgment of power while at the same time trying to minimize that power by incorporating democratic decision making at every opportunity.

Where Eve and Ena agreed was in the idea that managers working from and within values entailed working with contradiction. Eve states this explicitly: “it’s when we do it unconsciously or we do it mindlessly that we lose sense of self in the sense of integrity and the sense of personal grounding. And standing as a manager in the middle of all those contradictions—you have to stand on something.” Interestingly enough, Enid saw no contradictions—“I don’t see contradiction at all. I think, to me, it just comes back to the obligations that we have, and those obligations should be veered to, again, the needs of the community”.

Finally, in referring to ethics, Ena highlighted the difference between corporate ethics and those of an ideal critical non-profit, i.e., one that had not taken on neoliberal modes of staff supervision. She argued that corporations [and, by extension, managers] took on a very simplistic and reductionist way of measuring employee performance. Everything was counted, e.g., number of clients served. The nuances of how well they were served, i.e., the importance of *process*, which *leaders* did consider, were largely ignored in for-profit endeavors (interestingly, it was exactly this kind of countable, clearly defined accountability that Emma saw as a potential mechanism for reducing power differences between managers and their staff). Elmer also touches on this notion when he argues that in the for-profit world, there is a “clearer standard of what success is”; whereas in the social services “it’s impossible to quantify”. Elaine added that, for her, there was a division between a “primary commitment to the corporation—to the organization’s interests, as opposed to an examination of those interests or questioning of who’s not well served by them”. Despite, Elaine’s experience as a university administrator she did not equate corporate ethics with governance in a university; whereas Emma *did* when she addressed the “corporatizations of universities where, I think in some ways, ethics are going out the door so that they can not only be adequately resourced but perhaps think of profit instead of thinking of this as infrastructure in a society that creates citizens”. She elaborates by arguing what many others have (e.g., Giroux, 2014; Heller, 2016) and what is suggested above; that non-profits, and in this case universities, have begun to prioritize financial responsibilities at the expense of their responsibilities to develop engaged citizens that will work for social change (Cole, 2011; Giroux, 2014). Emma speaks extensively on this: “it’s not based on the bottom line and ending up in the black. It’s not managing in an academic institution. It is really in my view about preparing students for what I call praxis, acting to make change on the world—Freire, right”.

When educators were asked “who *are* the stakeholders”, the point was to reveal possible conflicts between the demands of management to accomplish a task *efficiently*, and the benefits of employment for staff, e.g., a job that pays well *and* provides meaning. Interestingly, Elmer hints at this when he states that “everybody has a stake—the people we serve, even the custodial staff have a stake”. Emma is quite explicit in that she put “students first…so, community, students; then I would say staff, colleagues; and then, of course, the other disciplines and of course the environment”. When Emma spoke of tensions she did not, for example, discuss the fiscal constraints that can influence how educators define stakeholders. Instead she spoke of the tensions between stakeholders that may arise because of conflicting goals. For example, the reading list for a course that addresses Indigenous civil rights would be very different than one that highlights workers’ rights through economic development, i.e., the two are often at odds with one another. Eve included an even broader definition of stakeholders than anticipated. She suggested that stakeholders could include “the public”. Perhaps this is unsurprising considering it is publicly funded agencies that are under discussion. Although they are publicly funded entities, employees are rarely considered stakeholders. In fact, many social service organizations bar staff from board representation because it is perceived as a conflict of interest, i.e., board decisions could be made that would personally benefit staff. This implies that the interests of the staff are at odds with the mission of the agency—which is strange given that staff and the board often have similar goals. Enid also expressed a broad definition of stakeholders to include “the environment, the community, its employees”. In this way, they both saw a significant difference between traditional managers who may not demonstrate that obligation to “show leadership in their overall community”, and critical managers who include their staff among those who are entitled to be considered part of a mandate for equity.

Expect Resistance to Critical Pedagogy

Much of the resistance to this teaching method, perhaps surprisingly, does not come from administration but rather from students. Ena speaks of students who explicitly stated their desire for her to “get up there at the front of that classroom and flip those PowerPoint slides, ‘cause that’s what we paid for”. In other words, students preferred Freire’s (1993) banking model of teaching. Students saw having to do the work of teaching themselves as an abrogation of the instructor’s responsibility to teach *them*. Emma also speaks of students strongly preferring traditional modalities of teaching, that don’t really reflect egalitarian values. Speaking about students, Emma states that

> there’s so much resistance, like I told you about the students not wanting to sit in a circle. Every classroom in this university is set up for traditional lectures so if I go in my class, all the desks are in a row like this so every class I have to ask the students to move these big, heavy desks in a circle and they all groan and moan and they shouldn’t have to do it and at the end of class we have to put it back the way it’s supposed to be and I know from working at [institution name] sometimes I used to leave it in a circle and I’d get complaints from the teacher teaching after me and the complaint would be, “[participant name], you have to put the desks back” and I said, “Well, who’s to say the line is the right way?”

She also speaks of university requirements to provide students with grades as a process that encourages competition and therefore runs contrary to much of what critical social work values. Given the philosophical orientation of critical programs, their content, and given the type of students they attract, one might expect that students would be the first to resist ranking and its concomitant effects. Yet, this does not appear to be the case. Emma comments:

> It’s not consistent with what I believe but the university demands it, right? And students demand it. I’ve tried approaches where I’ve gotten—I’ve changed—the course outline and the methods and the—to match a more kind of adult-education style and students want the marks, too. Students want to know they’re better than someone else. They say that want it because they want to apply to Master’s but rarely do they apply to Master’s. They actually want to be categorized as an A or a B or a C. It does something for them, right? So, there’s tremendous resistance not to give them that.

Surprisingly, it’s the banking approach to teaching that Elmer advocates. He describes his “critical” approach as based in content—that what he teaches is more important than how he teaches. His classes are very “teacher-focused as opposed to student-focused…but, I’m willing to dismantle and decrease that control as we get through the content and make it work in that way”. Eve also experienced resistance from students who simply disliked her acknowledgement and exploration of systemic relationships of power, e.g., “keep your feminist shit to yourself”; to which she responds with efforts to “open students up…try different techniques…go home in tears and…pick myself up and try it in a different way”. She describes student transformation, as a result of these efforts, in detail. She states that students “would go through a process of anger and hostility that inequality exists because they didn’t believe it. They thought it was a meritocracy. And then they go into depression, and then they go through anger and kind of wanting to fight to strategies and empowerment; and to me, that’s real education”. That said, unlike others, Eve also acknowledged that some of the resistance came from her. That it was, in fact, some students were more “politically aware” than she was; which was a result of her “own privileges as a white middle class old woman”. Hence, for Eve at least, one way to teach from a critical perspective is to open oneself up to the critiques presented by students of colour, female students, people with disabilities, and other students who are members of historically disadvantaged groups.

Ena also spoke of resistance from students who liked the idea of being the sort of manager who had power over people. In those cases, trying to teach critical administrative strategies would be fruitless. She spoke of the further danger of this hierarchical, top-down, approach to management which is that it often models the worker-client relationship. This too, can happen through relationships in the classroom. Instructors that are inflexible and hierarchical with their students emulate, and ultimately produce, authoritarian managers. This might, in part, come from the inferiority complex that Ena speaks of as endemic in the profession, as social workers are constantly trying to justify their worth. Incorporating more legitimized methods of management is a way of being seen as “viable power holders”.

Elaine, instead, spoke of the resistance she experienced from students that came from the realization of their complicity in the subjugation of others. Elaine, remarks “they saw their power—such as it was, as a practitioner—as a good thing and with a fairly innocent notion, despite the critique that might come with our BSW program, a fairly innocent view of them in the world trying to make it a better place”. This suggests that part of critical education, equally applicable to both frontline social workers and managers, is the taking away of the feeling of innocence felt by students (Rossiter, 2001). The difference is that social service administrators may not realize the more critical potential of their position, whereas frontline workers are taught to find those spaces, despite their complicity.

Eve's usually felt resistance from students when,

> I don't facilitate a conversation in a way that's inclusive…well, you know, if you start to look at class and you start to look at overlapping identities and sexual orientation, there's very few, narrowly defined, privileged white men anymore. And usually, when I get resistance, it's because I've been insensitive, and I've stereotyped. But it might be in the place of openness and grace and I think I don't get much resistance.

Harkening back to Felman (1992), students thanked her for making them uncomfortable; and as Felman states, it is often this discomfort that triggers transformational learning. Enid also touches on this when she remarks that the key to critical education is "*trying* to get all bendy about thinking about these different paradigms, the concepts and the organizational theory through that very critical lens. Just trying to see it in multiple ways, like honestly trying to see it in stride and having some struggle and pulling out your hair a little bit".

However, one question is: can instructors, despite the resistance Ena experienced, support those managers who continue to hold open the breach? Ena states that:

> giving students an opportunity to play, to be creative with the process of thinking about how they might do [management], we have some potential that some of that will get brought forward. But if we just say we're just not going to even go there, we're not going to do that, and then we're never going to make any change. We're just going to be trying to always hold open the breach by working more overtime or, you know, not being managers.

Ena sees the liberatory potential of the management position, but it is certainly not easy or encouraged in the typical agency and given the teaching employed by many educators, that potential is even less likely to be realized. In discussing how to work with the resistance of others, Elaine spoke of using examples of her own implication. She further comments,

> one of the complicated layers in there sometimes could also be feeling stupid. How could I not have seen this? I welcomed risk assessment thing that we got—on with child welfare in the late 90s. I thought it was good. Now I see what a trap it was…we all wobble between consciousness and unconsciousness of how we're implicated. And the thing to do is just stay alert and find people to talk about it with and not be alone.

Fundamentally, Elmer argues that the key to critical management education lies, not in "trying to teach people to do the right thing", but rather teaching students "to have an understanding of some key principles and then apply them along the values of the profession…I think that many people teaching management don't teach from the values of the profession. That's key to me"

Interestingly, Emma brought up resistance very early on in the interview—and unprompted. She suggested that social justice in management/leadership was something that happened when administrators "walked the walk". She states that people speak a lot about social justice but often don't put their principles into practice. Those people who do not practice what they preach are members of a large group of unwilling

> participants to the democratization of the system. We presume that if managers are egalitarian and critical theorists and open to social justice then of course students and/or staff will go, 'oh, this is the better way' but what I have found is that it hasn't been true because with…teaching adults requires that in relationship the other person is willing to do more work in some ways. It's harder to be an

> adult learner than it is to be a child on the receiving of learning and I have found colleagues and students not necessarily open to egalitarian processes. I get pushback when I say, let's share this responsibility

Emma spoke about this congruency again when defining critical management. She states that it's about:

> looking at privilege in our own standpoints and trying to dismantle our own privilege…it is about recognizing those traditional power structures and not using types of power that we don't think are congruent with our values or ethics, trying to use ways of being and knowing and acting and teaching that reinforce social justice or critical values instead of, like, being a contradiction, you know, saying one thing and doing another, you know? Yeah, so just teaching people about things like being skeptical of grand narratives…

She went on to remark on resistance from students when she stated, "I'd rather use adult education techniques and not every student wants to develop their own course outline and develop their own course of learning and mark themselves and they'd rather have a traditional lecturer who just tells them what to think". In this example, her thoughts on resistance from students were much like Ena's. When specifically asked about the resistance to CME, Emma spoke of both resistance from students and from the rest of the university. Of the university, she comments:

> It's all rhetoric. It's like sure you could teach it but don't actually change a real process, sure you can teach it but, like, so I could teach a course here but that wouldn't stop the rest of the university from being power-over, not wanting to really hear from the bottom, not wanting to democratize or make the power

> structures flatter, not wanting to hear from grassroots or community, not valuing those things

The other challenge she spoke of was engendering buy-in from students and colleagues. Though these educators discussed their visions for social service leadership that furthered the values that are lauded by social work as a profession and went on to elaborate on how we might provide students strategies to enact those values as they moved into managerial roles, there were suggestions that educators may not always buy into this possibility. Emma argued that though education could teach students alternative ways of being in the world, our current socioeconomic structure is such that students and institutions resist it. In other words, students, agencies, managers, and educators all often support the status quo because of the individualism that capitalism fosters. She states:

> that's how we're socialized under capitalism, right, to compete and be individualistic. Everyone's on their own, "survival of the fittest", you know? Darwin—Darwinian theory, that's and can't often see their unconscious bias so, for example, they might give a lecture for five hours on egalitarianism and then go vote that way and not see the contradiction so, as a personal choice, I tried to make my behaviors in all areas—work, education, teaching, managing, relationships, grants—I really tried to congruent and make my values congruent with my behaviors and I don't do that perfectly obviously but yeah there's a lot of resistance to changing things, of course.

Thus, for those who wanted alternatives, the goals seemed to be much more modest. Emma spoke not only of making change in the world but also spoke of trying to teach methods of “survival in kind of conservative organizations”. Survival calls to mind some of the challenging “identity work” that Elaine touches on in her interview.

***Critical* Managers Demonstrate Leadership (and Followership), Avoiding Mechanistic Approaches**

Differing terminology in terms of what we call middle managers changes the perception of what they do, and perhaps more importantly, changes the perception of what they *should* be doing. This came up in Ford, Harding, and Learmonth (2008) where changed job titles (from “managers” to “administrators”) resulted in a shift in thinking about the role. Participants were asked to describe the difference between management and leadership. There are many words to describe supervisory roles and those differences may indicate differing interpretations of responsibility. Critical management in the social services, for most participants had much more in common with leadership than management. Ena stated that there is a distinction to be made between leading and managing. Managing, she argued, focusses on the technical aspects of the role. This is where the employee is expected to enforce standards and gauge, or track, costs. They [managers] are, “setting or enforcing some set of rules or expectations on the people that they’re responsible for because they’re responsible to another set of people who usually have more power within the organization…”. This bears further analysis because there’s no intrinsic value seen in the process of managing. It’s mostly seen as a tool to reinforce inequitable relationships of power. She, for example, spoke of the managerial tactic of promoting active union members into management positions in order to bolster management goals. Note that Ena argued that the choice of self-identifier, i.e., manager or leader, indicated their approach to the position. In other words, taking on the “Manager” label suggests that they’ve chosen to identify more closely with those aspects of the position that were, in many ways, antithetical to a critical perspective. Building on this, Emma argued that leadership was something that anyone could do and something that could enhance egalitarianism in the workplace. She states:

> everybody brings leadership skills to the table and that everybody can either share leadership or take turns leading various things or—so but they may not be in the management in any way unless you just interpret it as really loosely as managing or facilitating a process—so leadership is much broader than just being in charge of people. Management I think can be quite limited and it can be that kind of traditional I'm-the-boss-you-do-this-and-this, but I think a good manager has to be involved in how do you, like that whole democratization in the workplace and how do you dismantle power over?

This, again, was reflected in the Ford, Harding, and Learmonth's (2008) analysis of a U.K. public service organization.

Power was a theme that emerged with Emma, also. She spoke of a "struggle around power" and gave an example from her past administration roles where she might have "faculty and staff who are doing their work and are contributing and that's great; but then one of the challenges of course is if someone isn't contributing or they're not doing their work up to whatever's expected. Then how do you act to mentor, support, motivate them without being authoritarian and powering over and saying, "you're not doing your job". She went on to describe how one might, in a sense, abdicate this "powering over" and that was by being able to refer to more "behavioural, measurable, objective things that are expected in this role; 'here you met it on this date, great' or 'you did not, so let's come up with some remedial plan around how you're going to do it'. By being able to refer to "objective" standards managers give their power to standards. Of course, the process of how and when managers apply standards and the objectivity of those standards can and is often called into question. Power also often, perhaps ironically, meant the opportunity to work in more critical ways. For example, she discusses the inability to work with some employment groups in creative ways to address organizational needs because she *didn't* have power over them. This point was also made by the manager Mary, introduced above, who argued that, if she felt a staff member deserved a higher salary, her lack of power meant that she was not able to provide such a bonus.

Enid also acknowledged the role of power among managers but focused on the importance of transparency. She argued that "really being honest about power and really being clear about their own power and trying to disperse power as much as possible—see power for the tool that it is and [ask] 'how do you disperse [it] in a way that will help your organization meet its mandate'….so I think one main thing that managers really have to do for the short of it, is to really be clear about the power and use it very consciously and try to disperse as much as possible". This also echoed Emma's views on transparency which she cited as a crucial value for management practice. She stated,

> Oh yeah human respect of dignity, the beliefs that people are basically good and bring strength and resilience to a team that they can contribute in ways that are really valuable, inclusivity, awareness of marginalization and issues related to what voices are represented or not, honesty, transparency. I think being transparent is possible above decision making and so from here I try to make everything as open as I could. If the decision could be delegated to the team I did. If it couldn't be delegated and I had to make it I would explain why and that was usually a dictate from the above—the authorities above—me and the transparency

> and honesty and the belief that people could do more than they probably are aware of, you know? It’s important.

Eve took an approach like Ena toward management. She thought of management as the “action” component of leadership. Leadership involved having to:

> manage the board…setting strategic direction…deal with stakeholders…find resources…create the management context…navigate the vision…and integrating its parts…seeing the various levels of the system and holding the complexity to empower its manager to go and do their piece.

She went on to state, “it’s a shock absorbing job in that there’s so much uncertainty right now, that I think the leader has to, in some ways, absorb it and then translate it, so that people can feel empowered to move forward.” In contrast, management was simply about “taking a piece of it and running with it”. She argues that the main failing of universities is not talking enough about non-profits. Of course, Eve teaches in a school of business. In Social Work programs, non-profits are almost all that’s discussed—it’s a focus on management that is lacking. She also argues for more experiential, service learning—again, hardly surprising given the program to which she’s appointed. Similarly, Enid argued that we “don’t spend a lot of time, I don’t think, on what it is to be a part of an organization”. Emma also argued for more applied forms of learning where students “actually go out and do leadership, leadership practicums” along with the possibility of mentorship where “you have to find a mentor and do so many hours of peer-reviewed or mentor-reviewed work in administration or education…we need more application”.

Similarly, Elaine saw managers as “more like an organization person, even if they’re trying to be critical and attentive. Leadership, for me I suppose, implies adding something new to that or—this will sound pompous as well—but somehow staying closer to the normality of the whole thing rather than just the organization logistics and the activity of it”. Enid took a similar approach in that she deemed the management role as “very much focused on the operations of the organization—managing budgets and dealing with revenue and fundraising. Instead, Enid saw leadership as

> much broader than that in terms of being inspirational and encouraging and helping to provide an environment where people will feel that they can be creative and innovative and take some risks and try to do things differently or try to think of things differently, trying to broaden the options and then using different measuring sticks of value—being open to seeing things in a different way.

Ena also invokes the idea of Taylorism as being in keeping with managerialism, i.e., the “tendency to view all aspects of the social work endeavour as issues requiring pro-market, business-like management solutions, rather than non-market initiatives stressing social connection, equality, and a public service ethos” (Baines, 2011, p. 32). Taylorism refers to any process designed, using scientific principles, for maximum efficiency defined in terms of clearly operationalized goals (Stoller, 2015). In discussing Taylorism, Ena also argues that much of the efforts toward efficiency come from mistrust of the worker. She says, “and so I would see when we talk about management within those organizations those claims of goals that invoke things like you know Taylorism where we're structuring particular ways of doing things based on models of efficiency…we see workers or service users as people who have to be controlled and regulated or else they will in some way take advantage of the institution or the organization”. She further says that “oftentimes the restricted nature of the agencies is that this stuff just doesn’t…get recognized unless you do it exactly the way they want it done”. Interestingly, she argues that managers *can* engage in social justice actions, *if they are reflexive in their actions*, but it is not a priority. She argues that reflexivity is a requirement because of the long term, and possibly unintended, consequences that social service interventions may have on people—both workers and service users. I would suggest that reflexivity also demonstrates an approach to management/leadership that echoes many calls from the political left for practice that is less mechanistic—mechanism being seen as neither reflecting the complexity of the relationship dynamics that drive human services, nor demonstrating the requirement for a values-based management/leadership practice for which Ena advocates (D’Cruz, Gillingham, & Melendez, 2007). Though she doesn’t use the word reflexive, it is clear that Emma is discussing the same concept and its importance when she states:

> critical Management Education would need to do some of those same things around using perhaps experiential education around “who am I,” “what are my styles,” “what do I bring to the table, consciously or unconsciously and how does that affect relationships” and “do I believe in truly democratic, egalitarian processes and teamwork or do I believe more in a top-down or is there somewhere in the middle or when is it appropriate to use each style”

Eve’s approach to leadership had some similarities to Ena’s in that leaders embraced values; though for Eve, there was less emphasis on strategy. Leaders, for Eve,

> stepped into truth telling and telling a story that embraces the social justice agenda in an explicit way. It’s standing up and saying, ‘you know what? I’m a feminist and I don’t think that the world is a level playing field or that a meritocracy exists—that we’re informed by power and powerlessness.’ And having the courage to stand up in the face of that and say that explicitly—so,

> that's leadership. Management is really trying to inform everyday decisions about how that unfolds

Clearly, Ena emphasized the ability of managers to work in the cracks to achieve an end (strategic caring) whereas Eve saw leadership as an open declaration of intention. This somewhat echoes the writing of Perriton and Reynolds (2004) who argue that, even among CME practitioners, dominant, masculine, discourse goes largely unchallenged. Eve agrees that managers work within constraints but feels they have, at minimum, a duty to voice their concerns when demands are placed on them that contradict, what she refers to as "personal truth[s]". She explains:

> They [managers] can at least articulate their values. They can explicitly say, "I want you to know that you're asking me to do something that's not in alignment with my own personal values and I need to say that". And then you may have to anyways, as you're been told to. But I think at least know it to yourself, even if it's just writing in a journal or you're just saying to your partner or your friend, "I'm being asked to do something that's in opposition to my own values…"

Interestingly, in discussing the difference between leadership and management, Ena outlines the many ways workers who do not have administrative responsibilities are freer to lead the organization toward innovative practices that further the agencies liberatory mission. Indeed, this is not surprising because it is the observation of these contradictions and constraints that is being explored here. That said, Eve suggested that many of the tensions between values and practice are just as relevant for frontline workers as they are for managers. While that may be true, as stated elsewhere, the challenges of this nature which frontline workers face, are well acknowledged and are integrated into current training curricula; whereas this is not true of managers.

Participants were asked if non-profit agencies were becoming more like for-profit companies. If it was the case that they were, it would be little wonder that managers would be expected to buy into a production model—and the corresponding management approaches. Emma very much agreed with this analysis. In addition to her comments on the increasing corporatization of universities she spoke more broadly of non-profits as “less profit drive [but] that’s changing over time with fighting for the funds and grants and applications and my whole world now is around pluralism and trying to fight for the pieces of a shrinking pie but I think traditionally they’ve been more circular versus hierarchical. They’ve been more democratic…I think the model in the non-profit sector, they are getting squeezed out because of this fight for grants and applications and they’re spending much more time writing grants and applications every January to March than they are worried about quality of service or community wellbeing”. Emma clearly felt that competition for funding resources has led to more mainstream forms of management and bureaucracy which mimics those discourses found in the corporate world. In commenting on the competition for grants and other forms of funding, Emma states, “it’s forcing them in some ways to be—it’s coopting them to be—more like traditional institutions, answering to the stakeholders, to the government stakeholders who insist you jump through this and this and this hoop to get the funding required to do basic services that governments should be paying for anyway in my view”. In describing those traditional institutions, she states that they’re:

> similar to an IBM or a Main Street or Wall Street kind of corporation with you know a set hierarchy with very specific roles or duties and expectation. A lot of folks on bureaucracy systems processes instead of people with all the

> competitiveness and lack of transparency and power over it and what I would say is a very white, Western, masculine style of business, very much compared to the non-profit sector, which you might compare more to an indigenous style or a Feminist style of organizing, which is flatter in terms of power. There's more sharing of information. There's more transparency.

Interestingly Eve, did not think that was happening. Though she acknowledged some corporatization of non-profits is going on, she stated that "any board training I do, I still talk about mission drift and the role of mission and values". Surprisingly, and contrary to much of the literature on critical management that identified social service agencies as drifting toward business models for service delivery and accountability (Giroux, 2014), she went even further and argued that

> corporate leadership is changing to be more like non-profit [NB, Eve struggled to form this response] …there's a funny hybridity starting and I don't know where it ends—between what's a non-profit, what's a social enterprise, what's a cooperative, what's a corporation, what's a government. I don't even know if we know what's transforming right now…I don't know that corporate managers don't need to be as aware of values and stakeholders and feelings and missions and things, as non-profit managers.

She does hint at the idea that social services are, more than ever, expected to justify themselves in neoliberal terms. Social services are normally expected to cost money, not generate revenue. Citizens are expected to pay for these services because in a non-monetary sense, they are "worth it". However, when social services are expected to not only fulfill a social purpose but also make money, they are referred to as Social Purpose Enterprises[9] which exemplify the hybridity that Eve refers to. Eve refers to them when she states "there's a sliding between non-profit and all these other modes that are emerging right now. I don't—you know—there's a part of me that resists it. Like, 'take your social enterprise somewhere else, folks. I'm not interested." She, crucially, also states what is a focal point for critical management:

> We need to keep non-profits—at least some non-profits—in the model and they shouldn't have to go out and raise their own revenue taking on for-profit activities. And yet there's lots of people out there that are saying we should be doing that. But we're a slippery slope, the corporatization, in that. And the transformation of manager roles if you're running around trying to raise money—how are you dealing with your clients, right? And where are you creating space for these conversations about power and inequality, oppression, and social justice? It's hard to do when you're trying to come up with the bottom line.

Elmer argued that management skills were really "about leadership". Indeed, Elmer later remarks, much like the manager Moss, that management and leadership are "totally integrated. You can't separate leadership from management. You have to have the skills of a manager and the ability to lead". He does go on to clarify that though leadership involves, "working with people and vision" and management is about, "tasks—getting the job done", i.e., management and leadership are different, he insists that "you've got to work from an integrated perspective". Furthermore, he states that the roles involve "working to create an organization or structure that—from a critical perspective—is really making sure that we have a *just* work environment and that people have access to, say, me as a manager or a supervisor, and that there is a democratic process—as much as you can have in a manager situation".

---

[9] Social Purpose Enterprises are usually for-profit business that also serve a social purpose. A Toronto example would be A-Way Express, a courier company that prioritizes hiring people who have experienced the psychiatric system.

For Elmer, the management role was quite extensive and included the development of "a working team of people" that were "focused on the intent of the workplace"; those that "creat[e] social situations—opportunities for people to have interaction beyond just tasks". The role also included "being a good listener…and [the ability to] juggle your role in facilitating and building a team and the information that you have. Furthermore, managers should "be conscious of the power imbalance of certain people in certain positions…that's your role—to create a *just* working environment as if you're working on society, to create a *just* society environment". So for Elmer, the process of management, or Elmer's preferred term, *administration* (a term that participants in the study conducted by Ford and Harding (2008) also preferred) involves a process by which the social justice imperatives of the organization are reflected inside the organization itself.

The above five themes capture most of what educators spoke to in discussing their thoughts and experiences in teaching administration. What was most striking was the importance that educators attached to critical education. They were committed to their approaches and yet still freely acknowledged the challenges that they entailed. Educators pointed out the relevance of CME in the face of the paradoxes and possibilities that management roles embodied. As the above material is more descriptive than analytic, some analysis is warranted and provided below.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

Though the above text speaks to overall themes that both groups spoke to, it tries to not go to much beyond the data. What is attempted below is some level of interpretation, i.e., with an acknowledgement of the “hidden text” that is described above in how data is considered and specifically with regard to the research questions. What conclusions might we draw in response to what was stated? For managers, the data certainly suggested that the idea that practicing from a critical perspective was important but not without its challenges. They spoke to the importance of doing what was likely to work, i.e., the idea that despite the, sometimes contradictory, high level theorizing that went on, managers learned from experience and practiced in ways they saw worked—which also fed into their theories regarding critical management (also harkening back to Pietroni’s double loop learning). They also saw the importance of working with stakeholders in non-formulaic ways; or, in other words, ways that did not reproduce the worst aspects of bureaucracy. However, they often felt that their ability to respond to the individual circumstances of each challenge presented to them was constrained and, as a result, the possibilities for work that aligned with their social justice values were stymied.

Educators were also committed to critical education, but they saw much of what went on in traditional management training as an anathema to the goals of CME. While students and administration often requested course material that was useful, i.e., that had immediate and obvious applicability, educators argued that it was these recipes for critical practice that were least likely to prove helpful in the field. In part, because of these conflicting demands, educators did argue that the material currently taught did not well prepare students for careers outside of direct social service practice.

How do Managers Engage in Critical Practice

Practice as Pragmatic

First, there are no specific, codified, strategies that managers use to inform their practice. That’s not to say that there’s no strategy at all; but rather those strategies fit into a postmodern view of practice, i.e., while they have approaches to practice it’s difficult to firmly fit into an easily definable concrete framework, because none of the management participants espoused any particular formalized managerial strategy. The sense was that they practiced in ways that suited their personality and the particulars of the situations they encountered. They engaged in ways of relating to staff that conformed to their worldview—they didn’t parcel out management. Spicer, Alvesson and Kärreman (2009) speak to the idea of critical management as performative. While usually performativity has invoked notions of means-ends analysis and instrumentalism, Spicer et al. suggest that critical management must involve “active intervention into discourse and practice” (p. 543). An analysis of the data suggests that this is precisely what these managers are undertaking. Their challenges are clearly complex, and they are very aware of their difficulties. For instance, Moss is acutely aware of his responsibilities to his staff as stakeholders; Mac seems to try to strike a balance between the requirements of the agency and the physical and emotional needs of his staff; Mohan also acknowledges the emotional labour that is involved in working with vulnerable people. All the managers consider, and balance, competing interests in their work. Very rarely was the value of efficiency spoken of. Of course, two factors largely account for this. First, the questions were structured in such a way as to tease out management considerations, other than those of the bottom line. Thus, much of the attention to nuance that was garnered in the interview data was an artifact of the questions. Second, social services are intrinsically complex problems and lend themselves very poorly to Taylorist approaches.

Though, of course, that has not stopped people from trying to apply these strategies to human services. As Max stated, one of his staff is a six-sigma black belt which provides training for, “a thorough understanding of all aspects of the define, measure, analyze, improve, and control (DMAIC) mode” (https://p.widencdn.net/gsxhe4/41577-Cert-Factsheet-SSBB).

Although only one of the participants, Max, had a degree in management, they all spoke to management training opportunities in which they had participated. While it’s unknown the extent to which more education in management would impact this, the degree of heterogeneity suggests that critical management is less about the things one does, and more about the approach one takes. In other words, for these participants, managing with social justice principles was not a list of things people did or didn’t do. Critical management was about the ability to consider a multitude of factors and stakeholders in decision making. These managers did not try to achieve the consistency that books or seminars on management imply—they did what worked. This pragmatism is not particular to critical management. What is, is that the definition of what “worked” needed to be much broader than the typical outputs that are identified in social service agencies, e.g, number of clients served.

That said, many managers who did not do a social work degree appear better able to work flexibly than those that did. By the account of many educators and managers, social work degrees do not seem particularly helpful for working in management in the social services because they are actually quite rigid in terms of how they define the role of a critical social worker. For example, Mohan comments: “The real piece is that from an arts degree, you may in fact have to use your imagination about putting yourself in somebody else's shoes. There's a very important piece about that I think which is that we actually can consider the other person's point of view.” This echoes Moss’s comments: “I think that doing Latin American and Caribbean

Studies was really cool because it's like focusing on the same region but switching lenses. So, let's talk about the Caribbean through the lens of humanities and literature and geography and language and music. As you switch those lenses you see similarities, you see patterns, you see differences as well. That's been helpful in the work I do which requires me to switch lenses quite often. So that training and that thinking was really valuable to me.” In contrast to this, social work degrees, even when they have a management component, may not foster the kind of sociological imagination (C. W. Mills, 2000) that other disciplines foster. A better incorporation of this approach might be key in providing helpful management focused courses or programs. The other key aspect of Mohan’s education was that it taught him about working effectively with others. He speaks extensively on this theme. He states,

> as actors, it’s actually about negotiating…space and time and lines. That actually is part of the workplace, right? I have to negotiate all of the different things in my workplace. Maybe other educational settings provide those opportunities, but my gut is that if you're doing [Canadian Literature] or else like you're reading a line—you may be doing some debating but you're writing essays, you're kind of working alone probably a fair amount.

He goes on,

> I'm wondering if, in fact, that might be its own kind of illusion about preparing people for management because, in fact, we—a lot of the focus is on individual excellence and an individual thought. So only because you asked it do I now kind of say, ‘Well gee, maybe theater actually prepared me better because I had to work with a whole troupe of people and a bunch of egos’… So strangely enough, yes, theater probably prepared me better than some other disciplines only because

> it requires that you work with people. Managing is about working with people. I don't know how many people that I've talked to that said, ‘Life was fine until I had to work with somebody else, until I had to tell somebody else what to do.’

Mohan, echoes the pedagogical approach that many schools of social work take in that they heavily emphasize group work. Almost all social work courses have some group component, the understanding being that social workers almost always work in teams that will require those skills. Thus, like many assessment strategies, they’re not just there as tools to grade learning and ability. The process of assignment completion is part of the pedagogy. Moreover, stressing the importance of working with groups even further, group dynamics is often a required course.

Although their practice is pragmatic, critical managers seem to demonstrate some hesitancy toward their work. In a sense, though critical management is more in line with social justice goals than traditional management strategies—particularly for subordinates—it seems difficult to maintain and, in some respects, unhealthy for its practitioners. Participants like Mary clearly felt a tension between how to practice in the moment and how that practice might be considered from a more macro lens. A critical manager who might feel that their job description meant that they had to put the needs of the organization first, is saddled with also considering the larger context of any decision. What identities are at play? What other considerations might be left out of always putting the organization first? Is it possible that even organizations that serve marginalized people might contribute to marginalization in how they provide service? It is in asking these questions that critical managers distinguish themselves. Note that *how* managers negotiated these contradictions was part of the aforementioned pragmatism.

Constraints Paradoxically Inhibit Social Justice

One of the more interesting themes to come out of the interview data was the lamentation of the managers that it was their lack of power that actually led to greater injustices in the workplace, i.e., their desire to make exceptions for staff that were experiencing unusual circumstances was constrained in unionized workplaces, or by workplace standards. Participants spoke of wanting to humanize the practice of management, but policies and procedures put them in a position where they were forced to apply one standard to everyone, regardless of circumstance. This put them in positions of instead interpreting workplace interactions as complex problems which require flexible and considered responses, they felt forced to apply formulaic, mechanistic responses, e.g., performance management. This was especially true of middle managers who lacked discretionary power and, to some extent, had their professional judgement taken out of the equation.

This was also true of those managers whose constraints may have come from formal managerial strategies. In one sense, this plays into the Taylorist model. In an ironic twist, Taylorism which is intended to increase the efficiency of *workers* by reducing complex work into small parts and then standardizing it, has also been applied to *management*. This subtle work of navigating dialectic needs of different stakeholders requires excellent “soft skills”; however, the cult of management reduces this work to a series of preset maneuvers. This is one of the possible reasons that so few of the participants rely on management literature—their ecological validity is poor, or at least is perceived as such. This trend toward production techniques in management is a more recent development. In the past, managers were always encouraged to be creative whereas their staff were expected to comply with the imposition of rigidly defined Taylorist functions (Lewis, 1992).

Though there are differing interpretations of his work, Mills, Simmons, and Mills (2010) outline Weber’s conceptualization of an idealized bureaucracy which is a useful framework for an analysis of these results because it nicely contrasts how modern agencies are *supposed* to function from how critical agencies *could* function. They identified Weber’s six principles for modern bureaucratic function (A. J. Mills et al., 2010). First, bureaucracies are organized through a division of labour. The areas of competence and authority for staff are defined in their job description and are organized around efficiently accomplishing the mission of the organization. This speaks to the delineation of the function of management. All participants spoke of managers as specialized workers.

There are two schools of thought regarding this. As discussed above, the first, is that managers are frontline workers who have mastered the requirements of their work and management is, in a sense, an extension of that work. The expectation is that managers who have an intimate familiarity with the work of those who are managed will be able to teach and guide neophytes—as touched on by Arendt (2006) and Jones and Joss (1995). Furthermore, managers with considerable experience performing the roles of their team are able to empathize with the struggles of direct service work. Interestingly only one manager came close to this model—Mac. Though he had never been a frontline worker at the existing agency, he did speak of his work as a direct support worker. Some of the other managers did have experience in direct service and spoke about it, but it was often in a different sector than the one in which they were managing. For example, working with survivors of domestic violence and switching to managing a mobile crisis team. Mac’s perspective did not differ markedly from other participants which suggests that those managers who had not performed the duties of those who they managed were not disadvantaged by the fact. Obviously, however, given the sample size, more research would be needed to draw any definitive conclusions.

The other approach is that management is a specialized skill in and of itself. In other words, the skill set required for effective management does not overlap with the skills required for frontline work. It is this way of thinking about management that conforms more closely to Weber's model, as interpreted by Mills et al. (2010). Management and their staff perform two distinct specialized functions and, in this way, labour in the organization is divided. There are implications for education, given the preponderance of managers that seem to fit this model. As discussed above, the overwhelming majority of time spent in higher education for working in social services is focused on frontline work. Given the interviews that suggest that expertise in frontline work is neither necessary nor helpful for management, the notion that we have poorly prepared these students is reinforced. Specialized training would be appropriate; but given we are trying to prepare *critical* managers, the training that is on offer does not seem adequate; and, as stated above, rarely do managers actually use such training anyway. Educators seem to be suggesting that any and all opportunities should be taken to unsettle formulaic responses to real-world managerial problems while also providing voices to identities that are poorly represented in most organizational structures. For example, when Ena stresses the importance of case studies, this could reflect the need to train social worker in ways that illustrate and unpack how complex and difficult working with staff can be—although how they are used needs to be carefully considered (Coronado, 2016). Shulman (1993) discusses this notion of complex models of supervision in some detail in his work. Although his work emphasizes the importance of ecological validity and furthermore, highlights the need for specialized training for social work administrators, he neglects the identity work to which the study participants often referred.

Shulman also takes a very managerialist approach to social work administration, in the sense that values aren't really considered or questioned—only the strategies to successfully carry out management objectives. As a result, he does not address the particular challenges of a critical approach to social work. That said, the importance that pedagogical strategies address the complexity, and therefore ecological validity, of management work is the first pillar. Though there is an abundance of research on teaching and learning, including work on management and teaching management, the fact that so little of it seems helpful to working managers speaks to the importance of providing relevant scholarship. The second is that the work acknowledge and accustom students to the paradoxes inherent in critical management. To be clear, I'm not speaking of so called "useful" knowledge. Useful knowledge tends to be that which students feel is helpful at the time and can be quite formulaic in nature. As discussed above, all instructors know the experience of students desire to just be told what to do. Instead, I'm referring to knowledge that is actually useful in that it emphasizes the difficulties practitioners face and, rather than attempting to solve these problems, tries to cultivate strategies for exercising micro-moments of power (e.g., Moffatt, 1999). In other words, as discussed by Foucault (1995), power is negotiated between agents and is by no means unidirectional. There are always opportunities for managers, no matter how constrained, to disrupt relationships of domination. Indeed, some of the managers, e.g., Moss, touched on this; and again, Ena's focus on case studies attempts to address it by providing students opportunities to explore their options with scenarios that simulate these challenges.

Second of Mills et al.'s (2010) outline of Weber's principles, is that bureaucracies are hierarchical with clearly defined reporting lines and a chain of command. Obviously, this speaks to the function of the manager. Although, contrary to Weber, there are organizations that are flat, e.g., worker’s co-ops or collectives—which don’t have managers and therefore don’t require training for management. However, these kinds of organizations are unusual, though not unheard of, in the social services. Crossing fingers and hoping students end up in one of these organizations is not a viable option. None of the participants worked in an agency with a flattened structure.

Third, bureaucratic administration is done through written records. Handshake deals and oral agreements are inherently unbureaucratic. Paper and/or electronic records provide historical documentation, legitimacy, and clarity that other forms of communication do not. As such, it is only written records that are recognized as part of an idealized bureaucratic organizational administrative process. Though this aspect of Weber’s bureaucracy, according to Mills et al. (2010), does not play a significant part of critical management, it does speak to the formalized nature of organizational life. It also points toward what Mill’s et al. (2010) argues is Weber’s fourth feature which is that policies and procedures are written, formal, and are followed impartially. This avoids the potential for favouritism, nepotism, and other biases in the administration of the agency. As above regarding constraints, paperwork and policies are intended to reduce the kinds of injustices that were typical of 19th century organizations; but, the impersonal nature of policies can, at the same time, become barriers to people who have historically been left out of the system. Rules *may* be barriers to hiring and promotion, rather than vehicles for fairness. In fact, although Mills et al. (2010) interpret Weber as envisioning the idealized bureaucracy as a structure that enhanced the potential for both private and public enterprises to fulfill their missions in fair and equitable ways, others have found that organizational actors can slavishly follow rules without regard for their impact on the agency’s goals. Merton (1940) referred to this a “bureaucratic ritualism”; and there are indeed moments when rules may actually hamper the accomplishment of an agency’s mission. Mills et al. (2010) discuss how goals might be displaced in a university, such that some departments or faculties might measure success in ways that are more akin to those used in business, displacing the ostensible goals of quality research, teaching, and service to the community. The one manager who works in a university, Mary, hints at this when she discusses how university policies and procedures hamper her ability to exercise leadership—leadership which she contends would lead to a stronger program that better meets the mission of the university. Other leaders brought up similar comments in their organizations’ sectors which are discussed in the context of constraints, above.

Mills et al. (2010) write that Weber’s fifth and sixth features of the idealized bureaucracy are related to promotion. Specifically, that job appointments and promotions are based on the provision of credentials; and, promotion in a bureaucracy is decided based on merit, seniority, or both. Though hiring and promotion were not discussed with participants, this was a missed opportunity; because, of course, one key means by which managers can function as agents of change with regards to greater social justice is through hiring. The details on how participants might engage in this form of social action were, unfortunately, not discussed.

“Best Practices”[10] for Teaching Critical Management

Critical educators are sensitive to the nuances of practice. They are aware of the challenges inherent to managers, especially managers who are expected to exercise power in the name of organizational goals, while at the same time provide an environment that acknowledges the indignities of rigidity in the workplace and the personal trials that individual workers face. They are asked to be faithful to staff *and* to the impersonal organization—two loyalties which sometimes clash. Teaching students to manage that clash presents its own challenges. As Ena and Emma identified, sometimes that resistance comes from the students and as Eve touched on, sometimes that resistance comes from ourselves. That said, educators are clearly making efforts to provide education that contests the ideology of managerialism.

---

[10] I put “best practices” in quotes to highlight the fact that this notion of best practice is problematic and, contrary to the spirit of CME, assumes a simplistic one-size-fits-all approach. That said, I think the phrase has its uses.

Uselessness of Useful Courses

However, there is still a disjunction. Managers either don’t take management courses (critical or otherwise) in university (e.g., Meredith); don’t take them post-university (e.g., Mohan); or, when they take them, don’t find them all that “useful” (e.g., Moss). If managers are not taking these courses in university, it may suggest that universities have not done a particularly good job of preparing students for eventualities. In other words, social work students who only envision frontline work need to be steered toward administrative instruction that will likely serve them well mid-career. This is also true for other disciplines and this was borne out by the sample, which was predominantly represented by graduates of disciplines other than social work. For example, theatre students who would never anticipate anything other than acting may be well served by courses that provide instruction in how to lead a team. To some extent, the sample suggested that this happened even more effectively for non-social work students. For example, Moss and Mohan, both humanities graduates, seemed more comfortable with the anti-oppressive potential of their management role, than Max or Mary. One possible explanation for this was that the expectations were different. There are no expectations for how students can learn and engage in humanities courses. It is universally understood that, e.g., theatre, English, Caribbean Studies are all going to involve a measure of creativity, artistry, and uncertainty—exactly the skills that critical social service managers most often draw on.

Some of the respondents argued that the resistance to critical education is structural in nature, i.e., that universities best accommodate dominant forms of education which reinforce notions of ranking and hierarchy. If so, educators must find creative alternatives that students will accept, because their rationale has been clearly outlined.

Even those that have graduated should have the option to enroll in courses that address the realities of management practice. It could be argued that the most relevant kind of instruction is going to take a critical perspective. It is the formulaic, fashionable instruction of managerial techniques that is most on offer currently—and as discussed above, that rarely gets used. Despite students expressed wishes for obviously practical material, managers seem to be aware of the poor utility of this material. Paradoxically, it’s those courses that are framed by universities in such a way as to be useful that often end up being useless. It is because established management techniques, e.g., transformational leadership, cannot reflect the nuances of the practice of administration. It is for this reason that leadership techniques come in fashion and are slowly abandoned for the next shiny technique—none of them really work all that well, but we want them to—which is one reason that it is courses that offer easy solutions that are most often offered. As Ena states:

> So, I think if we're talking about critical management then you have to provide people with good information about the kinds of Kool-Aid that they'll be invited to drink when they become managers. So, you know if you look on the Ontario government website they're hiring for senior leadership in various social service sector positions. But you have to have “Five Ninja Three” training which is some

> kind of change management training that is provided by a consulting firm. And it's a fee for service thing.
>
> So, you get a certification in this standardized change management perspective in order to get hired by the government to work as a manager in a particular setting. So, you'd better bloody well know what “Three Ninja Five” is. And you'd better invite people to know—like to read about it and to know about it. But then to talk about—to deconstruct it, and to talk about how it—like what it's made of. So, what are the values? What are the underlying beliefs? What are the ethics? What does this thing contain?

Examining the interviews, I have come to see “useful courses” a bit like staring directly at faint stars. Those who enjoy stargazing know that faint stars are actually better seen by looking slightly to the side of them. The more educators try to directly model the world of work, the less likely they are to actually find utility in critical practice. This contradicts current educational theory that argues for “authentic” assessment, whereby the applicability of assignment in the real world is made obvious. One problem lies in the simplifying process that occurs in translating “real world” problems into course material. As we simplify not only are many of the nuances lost, e.g., the values that go into any decision—but the context is also lost. Like many experiments, much of the ecological validity is gone when management problems are boiled down to their basic elements to allow for analysis. This harkens back to the above discussion regarding Barnett’s (1997) notion of “critical beings”. As educators work toward developing the capacity to see how power is manifested both locally and socially; and the ability to analyze how we can act as agents of social justice, they must take every opportunity to complicate and problematize rather than simply. It is *this* that enhances the capacity of social service students to carefully consider the challenging situations in which they will find themselves—an ability that courses which appear on their face to be “useful”, rarely foster.

Translation of Education to Constraints of Practice

Another major disjunction, based on participant responses, seems to be educators’ poor understanding, and therefore preparation, for the extent of the constraints that managers are under. For managers, constraints were a common thread of discussion; whereas educators rarely discussed them. Those constraints cited by managers are a function of a myriad of factors, e.g., finances, collective bargaining agreements, time, interpersonal factors.

Obviously, to some degree, this is an artifact of the questions. Managers were asked specifically about constraints and educators were not. That said, it does not seem unreasonable that managerial constraints on the practice of critical management would be an issue that would be raised in the responses to the questions that were asked, e.g., how else could critical management be taught except when educators implicitly acknowledge the feasibility of the critical practice they’re espousing. Yet, the difficulties managers face in trying to practice in a socially just way are not often addressed. As stated by managers, administration is rarely discussed *at all*. As discussed above, it is surprising that many managers spoke of these unexpected constraints as placing limiters on their social justice agenda. I would argue that this speaks more to the absence of a fulsome discussion of constraints than it does to the existence of those constraints. One could suggest that it was because education lacked an extensive discussion of the context constraints and their benefits in terms of social justice that was lacking rather than a removal of constraints. For example, several managers brought up how the unionization of their staff put limits on their ability to make exceptions for staff who were exceptional in one way or another. However, unionization actually facilitates critical management if we consider the context of increased privatization and labour precarity. The efforts that managers make to justify the efforts of their teams which also highlight the built-in efficiencies of publicly owned and funded services, are an important part of the critical manager's job. Furthermore, teams which are able to effectively deliver services must be properly resourced and part-time casual staff are not always able to fulfill these roles. Critical managers have a crucial role in making a case for hiring permanent full-time frontline staff, which are often able to provide better service.

Limitations

There are several issues that limit the conclusions that can be drawn. A small convenience sample of social service administrators cannot fairly represent the diversity of experiences in this role. That said, the initial hope was to have a more homogenous sample of managers who practiced, and trained, from a critical perspective. However, this proved impractical and what was gathered were the perspectives of social service managers who worked from diverse theoretical positions and took wide variety of educational paths. This paints a much broader portrait of the challenges presented by social service management than was originally intended.

In some senses, this is a deviant sample, i.e. a selection of cases that are in some way unique, because with the possible exception of Max's agency, the social service organizations where these managers worked tended to be mid-sized. Mid-size agencies do not employ the majority of social service administrators. Moreover, based on my own experiences in the sector, I would suggest that mid-sized agencies tend to be more eclectic in their approaches to service delivery. As with many organizations, the larger they get, the more—out of necessity—they rigidly adhere to bureaucratic processes. Furthermore, the sample of educators, as stated above, was also a convenience sample and, though not atypical of qualitative studies, limits the kinds of conclusions that can be drawn. Nevertheless, both of these samples share a valuable perspective. The managers have engaging stories to tell about the challenges of working on a tightrope, balancing between their workplace demands in a climate of neoliberalism and their understanding of how they would ideally like to inhabit their roles. The educators share the difficulties and uncertainties of trying to engineer learning opportunities for students about to face these dilemmas. What has worked; what hasn’t; what obstacles they face—despite their potentially poor external validity, theirs are important, interesting narratives.

The study is grounded in critical theory and inherits some of its weaknesses. First, the theory makes several assumptions that are untested. It presumes that efficiency through hierarchy is to be avoided because of the inherent contradiction between worker empowerment and social justice. Moreover, social service agencies are almost always supported by public money and it is therefore incumbent upon policy makers to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent in ways that maximize public good. Lee (2011) makes the point that institutional requirements around organizational structure are usually hierarchical and non-egalitarian. Management structures that are potentially oppressive may indeed wring out more productivity from their workforces, although at what cost is be debated.

This design, furthermore, like many other qualitative studies that examine social inequity, does not really test a theory, i.e., we cannot determine if the suggestions that come from educators or managers would truly result in any practice changes. These are perceived and predicted shortcomings and improvements. It cannot say if the proposed method of instruction is better than any other. Indeed, I struggled when it came to practicing management in a way that was congruent with my values and theoretical orientation—there is no evidence that the sampled managers have fared any better. Thus, although the descriptive evidence examined and discussed in the form of university/agency texts, as well as interviews, will point a way forward in the education and practice of management—whether or not these strategies will actually make any difference in how post-secondary education prepares students for the complexity of the work will be unresolved without further study. That said, it's important to note that, although we may not know if the knowledge and practice gaps that are identified will be resolved if the participants' recommendations are adopted, the challenges and beliefs of the participants are real, and as the Thomas theorem argues, things we *believe* to be real *are* real because their consequences are real.

What the study *does* provide is a close examination of the disjunction between perceived/idealized teaching strategies and the perceived/idealized performance of management. It also reveals the perceived differences between ideal teaching situations and what PSE educators are actually faced with. This data is also a glimpse into the challenges that some social service administrators come up against and the identity work they must engage in to perform those duties given the constraints of their employment; and furthermore how their education may, or may not, have prepared them for the challenges of this identity work.

The study also focuses on economics and class, at the risk of simplifying relationships and ignoring other axis of oppression, e.g. race, gender, etc. Critical theory has, historically looked at class as a kind of master status (Held, 2004), i.e., that class is subservient to all other forms of oppression, e.g., sexism. However, as has been stated by many researchers, e.g., the work of Aronson and Smith (2010, 2011) who specifically examine how women navigate the complexities of female administrators in the social services, the long history of challenges for women in leadership positions would easily lend itself to research that focuses on their particular complications. Similarly, how racialized people with power and authority are perceived and treated has a long history and merits further analysis in the context of critical approaches to management in the social services. How managers and management function, in relation to these other structural mechanisms of oppression, is an important area of examination and there *were* intersections between managerial activities and, for example, racial or gendered organizational structures that came to light in the examination of the data. It is regrettable that follow up questions regarding the social location of the respondents and how it impacted their work were not asked. A more detailed look at positionality in relation to the role of critical management and CME would, no doubt, enhance and further nuance the findings of this study.

Another limitation is that there may be a pedagogical gap that educators are unaware of. PSE educators are teaching with methods and content that they believe will lead to outcomes that promote social justice, but despite the education they have received, managers are not finding their educational experiences helpful in the field. So, hearing more, through interviews, about what educators *think* works (but doesn't) may not facilitate the goal of enhanced education. The interview have added value because we have gained knowledge about strategies that educators have used. Because students were not interviewed, it will not be possible to tease apart which strategies were successful and which were not.

It's also possible that the classroom is not where the gap lies at all. It may lie in the curriculum. There might be a disjunction between what students think they'll need while they're students and what they actually need when they're in the workplace. Changes to social work pedagogy might make no difference because those being trained in social work are not taking administration courses. Many social work students, even ones who go on to administrative positions, don't take administration related courses (or programs) and it's not a requirement. So, in some sense this is a failure of universities to provide students what they truly need. This might be a space for a continuing education opportunity. Unfortunately, due to the challenges in sample selection described above many of the managers did not have critical training so even if they had had a BSW or MSW, we may not have gotten a clear picture of what a critical education provides or how it might be adjusted to enhance its relevance. That said, the managers were able to provide a comprehensive idea of what was helpful in their education more broadly—which can, and does, provide useful information. Critical social work in particular is proud of its interdisciplinary nature. A manager who speaks of how their humanities education helped them address the challenges of working as an ethical manager of a social service program, *is* helpful for the educator developing critical pedagogy in social work.

Finally, the questions are not neutral extractors of information. As discussed above, questions are strategic—and these questions perhaps are especially so. They were written to activate recall of situations that are ambiguous—maybe even risky. When managers are faced with circumstances where they're expected to act in ways that conflict with their notions of equity and fairness, how they chose to act can have material and psychological consequences. However, these moments may be rather atypical of the work. Much of the work may be quite routine and devoid of ethical conflicts (though it may also be argued that this routine work is also ethically loaded though we don't often think of it as such). Regardless, the questions may lead me to make generalizations about situations that are really quite exceptional.

Implications for Practice

When I first began the dissertation process the underlying theme was one of complaint. I had an education which I felt did not well prepare me for the reality of work. The interview data, and personal reflection, has led me to a surprising conclusion. I never felt very sure of myself as a social service administrator. I was uncomfortable with power I held over my staff and questioned their infantilization. What I failed to realize was that this was exactly this tentative approach to organizational hierarchy that defines a critical approach, i.e., it was the "questioning", "problematizing", "critical" education that I received which *intended* to produce the kind of managers I was. That said, it is clear from the data that more needs to be done. Managers need to clearly and explicitly elucidate alternative models for management, i.e., alternatives to the managerialist frameworks that currently dominate the field. They see the performance of their duties as *difficult* and not readily transferable to a classroom. Meredith's response exemplifies this problem when she tells a story of having to impose a charge on a tenant for damaging a unit, when the tenant has very little income. Meredith's default position is to examine the challenges and tensions of service provision, i.e., the staff/agency relationship with service users. This analysis is essentially at the level of the front-line worker and, as discussed above, has a large body of literature associated with it. It is the perspective of the front-line worker that most people think of when they consider the duties of a social worker. Meredith's focus reflects the paucity of introspection around the tensions within the management-staff relationship. When pressed, Meredith did recall a situation in which a staff member was "really negative and unkind to a lot of other staff members", though still "a valuable team member in terms of their knowledge and their skill[s]". Meredith has rightly pointed out one role of the manager is to mediate staff relationships—a skill that has thus far not been discussed here. One reason for that is the study is largely about when duties and values conflict (and how people respond). In this example, that tension is mostly absent. I doubt anyone would disagree that in cases where a staff member is, to use Meredith's words, a "bully", it is the manager's duty to address the situation such that the workplace is not toxic. In this case, a board member witnessed the staff member's bullying behavour and brought it to the Meredith's attention. She was able to speak to the offender which resolved the situation.

This challenge of connecting theory and practice is hardly a new story. Students have complained about the relevance of classroom material for as long as there have been classes. What is new, is the realization that students seem to resist that critical material which they don't often understand will actually prove enlightening later in their careers. Though resistance can come from different places and in different forms, it is incumbent upon educators to provide context for their pedagogical strategies. When students have a better understanding of why they are not being provided with the formula for engaging in social service administration in a way that is anti-oppressive, they are more likely to incorporate such learning into their schema for management.

Furthermore, although the data indicates that managers have an inkling of what needs to happen, e.g., they need to consider the welfare of those who report to them; their education reflected a gap that was only rarely addressed; and unfortunately, there is no way for students to realize what they are missing, until they miss it. It is the working world that shocks them into the realization that they don't have a clear path somewhere between "selling out" (to a managerialist approach to work) and getting fired (i.e., a complete repudiation of what many see as the essential duties of management). For some, they simply never received what they needed because it wasn't available; or because the discipline they studied did not have relevant content, or for the simple reason that they did not realize they would need administrative training. For others, like myself, they may have received some critical instruction, but it was never in administration and it lacked a clear picture of how the complexity of critical theory translated to practice.

Critical management, according to participants, is the acknowledgment of power and the limitations of formulaic management techniques. It is a recognition of the fiction of the manager/technocrat as an effective response to the challenges of injustice within organizations and external to them. It is in this theme that we see the practical application of postmodern philosophy by all participants. Very few critical educators or managers were adherents of any one particular strategy, as a matter of fact, this was a defining feature critical practice. As stated elsewhere, it was a deep understanding of the real challenges of education or management practice that steered many participants away from mechanistic methods. Harkening back to Alvesson and Deetz's (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996) core features of postmodernism, both educators and managers expressed features of all seven. For example, when Mohan referred to naivete in how management is conceptualized he invoked conceptions of discourse. He problematizes the assumed shared meanings of management and its function. The notion of fragmented identities was often brought up by Mary and Elaine who both spoke the difficult identity work that came with having multiple, and often conflicting, demands regarding value-laden work. Several participants drew on the philosophy of presence in their conceptualizations of leadership and how this form of agency could be practiced by anyone in an agency. Leadership was not a fixed feature, identified in a particular person or position but was relational. Finally, also all participants spoke of the difficult nature of power; and more specifically, how the arcane discourse of managerial strategies and other artifacts of technocratic forms, produced power. Educators spoke of the necessity, for critical education, of unpacking how power in the workplace is negotiated, managed, and played out—how power is dangerous but also has emancipatory potential. Managers spoke of their struggles with power and how their organizations were constructed in such a way as to inhibit their capacity to carry out a social justice agenda in the face of constraints on their power.

Educators have implemented strategies to discuss critical approaches but there are often too few opportunities to explore alternative strategies for administration. Interestingly very few educators or managers spoke of more fundamental alternatives to organization building, e.g., worker cooperatives. Instead, both managers and educators spoke of ways to engage in values-based work that worked within extant organizational models. There is wisdom in this. As Lee (2011) points out,

> power is always part of the equation. To try to deny it, and develop a "structureless" organization, will only mean that we have to deal with power in an unclear and disabling manner. The point is, then, not to avoid power, but rather to have its exercise transparent and appropriately dispersed, so that all people are able to act upon their environments (p. 70).

Moreover, although they have tried to use pedagogical tools that reflect the complexity of this work, the *why* of the critical approach does not seem to have been effectively communicated. As a result, we see managers who don't understand how to translate theory into practice and, naturally, resist education that, on the surface might seem irrelevant or even counterproductive, e.g., the use of case studies that extol the virtues of democratic decision making over more autocratic forms of authority.

The irony of the initial goal, as stated above, is not lost on me. The desire to find a formula which is, by definition, non-formulaic is an impossible task. That said, I've learned a great deal from the participants. First, that kinds of struggles I underwent are not at all uncommon. Most of the managers interviewed had similar tensions to those I experienced. It appears, from the data, that with time comes some realization that it is the willingness to question and reconsider the process of management that is crucial. Moreover, doing this with an understanding and awareness of the context of social services and how they are being transformed in ways that confirm to neoliberalist ideals is key to practicing management that minimizes the potential for reinscribing dominant forms of power, and maximizing its potential for realizing its emancipatory potential.

With regards to education, there are some disconnections between what managers need and what they get (as discussed above). Educators tend to work with idealized forms which rarely exist in the messy world of work. In a sense, educators and managers are analogous to idealists and pragmatists (B. Heron, personal communication, September 21, 2018). Interestingly, despite the playing out of this age-old disconnection between theory and practice, educators do give many managers the tools they need. As stated already, many of the cognitive skills they obtained in general education courses were helpful in their work. But what was most surprising, but perhaps should not have been, was the realization by managers that educators that were providing material which students often did not think was either relevant or useful found that it was exactly this material that was best able to shed light on the complexity of their work life. This seems to point to an uncomfortable conclusion for educators. Uncomfortable because it promotes an approach to education that many would consider paternalistic; however, the data from the participants—and this authors personal experience—suggests that educators who hope to encourage critical management, should be using pedagogical strategies that unsettle and ask questions rather than simplify and answer questions. In other words, educators with social justice as their principal goal, are best served by giving students what they need, rather than what they want.

References

Adler, P. S., Forbes, L. C., & Willmott, H. (2007). Critical management studies. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *1*(1), 119–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/078559808

Allen, A. (2012). Using Foucault in education research. *British Educational Research Association On-Line Resource*. Retrieved from https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Using-Foucault-in-education-research.pdf?noredirect=1

Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (1996). Critical theory and postmodernism: Approaches to organizational studies. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 191–217). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing critical management research*. London: Sage Publications.

Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2012). Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity. *Human Relations*, *65*(3), 367–390. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726711430555

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2003). Introduction. In M. Alvesson & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Studying management critically* (pp. 1–22). Retrieved from https://www-library-yorku-ca.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/1687000;

Arendt, H., & Kohn, J. (2006). *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought*. Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/2327717

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Aronowitz, S. (2008). *Against schooling: Toward an education that matters*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Aronson, J., & Smith, K. (2010). Managing Restructured Social Services: Expanding the Social? *The British Journal of Social Work*, *40*(2), 530–547. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcp002

Aronson, J., & Smith, K. (2011). Identity work and critical social service management: Balancing on a tightrope? *The British Journal of Social Work*, *41*(3), 432–448. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcq102

Baines, D. (2011). *Doing anti-oppressive practice: Social justice social work* (2nd ed.). Halifax, N.S: Fernwood Pub.

Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: A critical business*. Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/1360427

Blackstock, C. (2009). The Occasional Evil of Angels: Learning from the Experiences of Aboriginal Peoples and Social Work. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, *4*(1), 28–37.

Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, S. (1982). *The one minute manager* (1st Morrow ed). New York: Morrow.

Bok, D. C. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/2026370

Brockbank, A. (1998). *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education* (I. McGill, Ed.). Retrieved from https://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/1413958

Brookfield, S. (1994). Tales from the dark side: A phenomenography of adult critical reflection. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *13*(3), 203–216.

Brookfield, S. (2005). *The power of critical theory: Liberating adult learning and teaching* (1st ed.). Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/1721086

Cavanaugh, J. M., & Prasad, A. (1996). Critical theory and management education: Some strategies for the critical classroom. In R. French & C. Grey (Eds.), *Rethinking management education*. London: Sage Publications.

Chomsky, N. (2000). Paths Taken, Tasks Ahead. *Profession*, 32–39.

Choo, K. L. (2007). Can Critical Management Education Be Critical in a Formal Higher Educational Setting? *Teaching in Higher Education*, *12*(4), 485–497.

Clark, T. N., & Lipset, S. M. (1991). Are social classes dying? *International Sociology*, *6*(4), 397–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/026858091006004002

Cole, J. (2011, May 13). The Koch Brothers and the end of state universities. Retrieved from Informed Comment website: https://www.juancole.com/2011/05/the-koch-brothers-and-the-end-of-state-universities.html

Contu, A. (2011). Critical management education. In M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of critical management studies* (Reprinted, pp. 536–550). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Coronado, G. (2016). Teaching management critically: Classroom practices under rival paradigms. In A. Prasad, P. Prasad, A. J. Mills, & J. H. Mills (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to critical management studies* (pp. 263–277). London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

D’Cruz, H., Gillingham, P., & Melendez, S. (2007). Reflexivity, its Meanings and Relevance for Social Work: A Critical Review of the Literature. *The British Journal of Social Work*, *37*(1), 73–90. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcl001

Dehler, G. E. (2009). Prospects and Possibilities of Critical Management Education: Critical Beings and a Pedagogy of Critical Action. *Management Learning*, *40*(1), 31–49.

Dominelli, L. (1996). Deprofessionalizing social work: Anti-oppressive practice, competencies and postmodernism. *The British Journal of Social Work*, *26*(2), 153–175.

Eakin, L. (2007). *We can't afford to do business this way: A study of the administrative burden resulting from funder accountability and compliance practices*.

Ehrenreich, B. (2009). *Bright-sided: How the relentless promotion of positive thinking has undermined America* (1st ed.). New York: Metropolitan Books.

Felman, S. (1992). Education and crisis, or the vicissitudes of teaching. In D. Laub (Ed.), *Testimony: Crises of witnessing in literature, psychoanalysis, and history* (pp. 1–56). Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/1084886

Fisher, D., Rubenson, K., Jones, G., & Shanahan, T. (2009). The Political Economy of Post-Secondary Education: A Comparison of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning, 57*(5), 549–566.

Ford, J., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2008). *Leadership as identity: Constructions and deconstructions*. Basingstoke [England]: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (2nd Vintage Books ed.). New York: Vintage Books.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations*, *53*(1), 7–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700531002

Fox, M. A. (2005). *The accessible Hegel*. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0422/2004019442.html

Franklin, U. M. (1999). *The real world of technology* (Rev. ed.). Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/1434357

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (New rev. 20th-Anniversary ed). New York: Continuum.

Gibbs, A. (1997). Focus groups. *Social Research Update*, (19). Retrieved from http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/SRU19.html

Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

Grey, C. (2007). Possibilities for critical management education and studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *23*(4), 463–471. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2007.08.006

Habermas, Jürgen. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism* (Oxford Scholarship Online - York University., Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Held, D. (2004). *Introduction to critical theory: Horkheimer to Habermas* (repr). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heller, H. (2016). *The capitalist university: The transformations of higher education in the United States, 1945-2016*.

Henkel, M. (1995). Conceptions of knowledge and social work education. In M. Yelloly & M. Henkel (Eds.), *Learning and teaching in social work: Towards reflective practice* (pp. 67–82). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Horkheimer, M. (1972). Traditional and critical theory. In *Critical theory: Selected essays* (Vol. 1, pp. 188–243). A&C Black.

Hunka, R., Odele, C., Rajotte, C., Kinew, W., & Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. (2012). Indigenous in the city. In *Doc Zone*. Toronto, ON: CBC Learning.

Incite! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.). (2017). *The revolution will not be funded: beyond the non-profit industrial complex*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, *21*(1), 77–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170903560444

Jones, S., & Joss, R. (1995). Models of professionalism. In M. Yelloly & M. Henkel (Eds.), *Learning and teaching in social work: towards reflective practice* (pp. 15–33). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kauffman, L. A. (2017). *Direct action: protest and the reinvention of American radicalism*. London ; New York: Verso.

Knights, D. (1992). Changing spaces: The disruptive impact of a new epistemological socation for the study of management. *Academy of Management Review*, *17*(3), 514–536. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1992.4281996

Learmonth, M., & Harding, N. (2006). Evidence-Based Management: The Very Idea. *Public Administration*, *84*(2), 245–266. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2006.00001.x

Lee, B. (2011). *Pragmatics of community organization*. Toronto: CommonAct Press.

Levin, M., & Greenwood, D. (2011). Revitalizing universities by reinventing the social sciences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.)*, The Sage handbook of qualitative research*: *Vol. 4th ed.* (pp. 26–42). Retrieved from https://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/2550481

Levy, D. L., Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2003). Critical approaches to strategic management. In M. Alvesson & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Studying management critically* (Vols. 1–Book, Section, pp. 92–110). Retrieved from https://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/1687000

Lewis, A. (1992). *Fast food women* [Documentary]. Appalshop Inc.

Martinez, D. B. (2014). The liberation health model: Theory and practice. In D. B. Martinez & A. Fleck-Henderson (Eds.), *Social justice in clinical practice: a liberation health framework for social work* (pp. 9–28). Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge.

Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. *Social Forces*, *18*(1), 560–568.

Mills, A. J., Simmons, A. M., & Mills, J. H. (2010). *Reading organization theory: a critical approach to the study of organizational behaviour and structure*. North York, Ont.: University of Toronto Press.

Mills, C. W. (2000). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford [England]: Oxford University Press.

Mingers, J. (2000). What is it to be critical? Teaching a critical approach to management undergraduates. *Management Learning*, *31*(2), 219–237.

Moffatt, K. (1999). Surveillance and government of the welfare recipient. In A. S. Chambon, A. Irving, & L. Epstein (Eds.), *Reading Foucault for social work* (pp. 219–245). New York: Columbia University Press.

Monin, N. (2004). *Management theory: a critical and reflexive reading*. London ; New York: Routledge.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/2384258

Pajares, F. M. (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, *62*(3), 307–332. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307

Parton, N. (1998). Risk, Advanced Liberalism and Child Welfare: The Need to Rediscover Uncertainty and Ambiguity. *The British Journal of Social Work*, *28*(1), 5–27.

Perriton, L. (2007). Really useful knowledge? Critical Management Education in the UK and the US. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *23*(1), 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2006.11.001

Perriton, Linda, & Reynolds, M. (2004). Critical Management Education. *Management Learning*, *35*(1), 61–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507604041165

Phillips, D. C. (2014). *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy*. Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/york/detail.action?docID=1715010

Pietroni, M. (1995). The nature and aims of professional education for social workers: A postmodern perspective. In M. Yelloly & M. Henkel (Eds.), *Learning and teaching in social work: towards reflective practice* (pp. 16–50). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Pozatek, E. (1994). The problem of certainty: clinical social work in the postmodern era. *Social Work*, *39*(4), 396–403.

Raab, N. (1997). Becoming an Expert in Not Knowing: Reframing teaching as consultant. *Management Learning*, *28*(2), 161–175.

Reynolds, M. (1998). Reflection and critical reflection in management learning. *Management Learning*, *29*(2), 183–200.

Reynolds, M. (1999a). Critical reflection and management education: Rehabilitating less hierarchical approaches. *Journal of Management Education*, *23*(5). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/64285819?accountid=15182

Reynolds, M. (1999b). Grasping the Nettle: Possibilities and Pitfalls of a Critical Management Pedagogy. *British Journal of Management*, *10*(2), 171–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00118

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). Retrieved from https://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/

Rose, N. (1990). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self.* London: Taylor & Frances/Routledge.

Rossiter, A. (2001). Innocence Lost and Suspicion Found: Do we Educate for or Against Social Work? *Critical Social Work*, *2*(1). Retrieved from http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/innocence-lost-and-suspicion-found-do-we-educate-for-or-against-social-work

Savaya, R., & Gardner, F. (2012). Critical reflection to identify gaps between espoused theory and theory-in-use. *Social Work*, *57*(2), 145–154. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sws037

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seife, C. (2010). *Proofiness: The dark arts of mathematical deception*. Retrieved from http://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/2477220

Shiah, Y.-J. (2016). From Self to Nonself: The Nonself Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00124

Shulman, L. (1993). *Interactional supervision*. Washington, DC, US: National Association of Social Workers Press.

Spencer, B. (2013). New way to run universities; Athabasca U staff look at shifting from corporate-style management. *Edmonton Journal*, p. A.16.

Spicer, A. (2017, November 23). From inboxing to thought showers: how business bullshit took over. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/news/2017/nov/23/from-inboxing-to-thought-showers-how-business-bullshit-took-over

Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2009). Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies. *Human Relations*, *62*(4), 537–560. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708101984

Stoller, A. (2015). Taylorism and the logic of learning outcomes. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *47*(3), 317–333. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2015.1018328

Stoney, C. (1998). Lifting the lid on strategic management: a sociological narrative. *Electronic Journal of Radical Organization Theory*, *4*(1), 1–35.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Retrieved from https://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/2281406

Toffler, A. (1981). *The third wave*. New York: Bantam Books.

Wren, D. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (2009). *The evolution of management thought* (6th ed.; D. A. Wren, Ed.). Retrieved from https://www.library.yorku.ca/find/Record/2271789

Wuenschel, P. C. (2005). Who’s Managing Our Agencies and What Do They Think They’re Doing? A Challenge for the Social Work Profession. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, *66*(3), 1168-A-1169-A.

Zald, M. N. (2002). Spinning Disciplines: Critical Management Studies in the Context of the Transformation of Management Education. *Organization*, *9*(3), 365–385.

Appendix A: Interview Prologue

What is a “Critical” Approach?

Critical management suggests managers question and reconsider commonly held assumptions about why people are where they are and do what they do. It especially values the voices of groups who have often been left out. It argues that how we think about the social world as well as the kinds of ideas we explore are often determined, either purposely or not, by powerful people and groups. Critical approaches try to draw attention to those webs of power. It acknowledges that people can work to *undermine* relationships of power while at the same time *participate* and be *constrained* by them. In this way, binaries like powerful and powerless are no longer so clear cut. Managers, for instance can be both powerful and powerless at the same time.

Finally, critical approaches emphasize that it’s not enough to *recognize* that some people are disempowered and have been denied opportunities to decide their own destiny; not through any fault of their own, but because of social and economic circumstance—people must also take action to addresses these injustices.

Appendix B: Interview Questions

Educator Questions

Management Focused

- What is social justice?
- What is the role of a manager?
- How should management/leadership reflect a commitment to social justice?
- What values should management practice reflect?
- How are these different from corporate ethics?
- Who do you consider the stakeholders? (in other words, should management also be considering the environment, employment conditions of their employees, etc.
- Are management and leadership the same thing? How so? (in other words, does management have a broader role than simply control, e.g., inspiration)
- How does, or should, non-profit management differ from for-profit?

Education Focused

- How can management be taught?
- How do you define/describe critical management education?
- What are the challenges you face in teaching critical management studies from within a university?
- What do you see as the relationship between content and pedagogy in CME
- What pedagogical philosophy or approaches do you advocate or have you used?
- Should management education be focused on practical skills? Why or why not?
- In what way should education train students to “think like a manager”?
- How would you say it prepares students for non-profit leadership?

- In what ways does it fail to prepare them?
- How could management education be better?
- How has teaching management changed your thinking about what function managers should be serving?
- What is the resistance, if any, you receive from students?

Manager Questions

Sub-questions were employed when observation was not permitted

Management Focused

- What is social justice?
- Do you feel you work within that (the critical) perspective? Why or why not?
- Are there any published or prescribed management strategies that you've found particularly helpful?
- What constraints are there in your ability to work with that philosophy?
- What is the role of a manager?
- Are management and leadership the same thing? How so?
- Has being a manager changed your thinking about how to work with people in any way?
    - Tell me about a time your work changed your thinking about how to work with people?
- Who do you consider your stakeholders? (in other words, should management also be considering the environment, employment conditions of their employees, etc)
- How does management represent, or fail to represent, your commitment to social justice?
    - Tell me about a time when your work represented, or failed to represent, your commitment to social justice?

- How does management practice reflect, or fail to reflect your values?
    - Tell me about a time when your work did or did not reflect your values.
- Do you experience any tension between your duties and obligations as a manager, and the principles of social justice?
    - Tell me about a time when you experienced some tension between your duties and obligations as a manager and your principles.
- How do you address that tension, if any? How do you prepare?
    - Did you address that tension and, if so, how?

Education Focused

- What is your educational background?
- Can education prepare critical managers for the non-profit sector? Why or why not?
- How would you say it prepared you for non-profit leadership?
- In what ways did it fail to prepare you?
- How could it have been better?
- Were you taught management skills and, if so, were they put to use?
- Did your education train you to “think like a manager”? How so?
- Did it offer alternate perspectives on management?
- Did it offer you critical approaches for management?