

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

The Making of the Global Subject: Discourse, Power and Subjection

O Gbor, John O

Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration and Marketing,
Delta State University, Asaba Campus, Nigeria

Iyamabhor Martins

Ph.D. Student, Department of Business Administration and Marketing,
Delta State University, Asaba Campus, Nigeria

Ndudi Ejimofor Francis

Ph.D. Student, Department of Business Administration and Marketing,
Delta State University, Asaba Campus, Nigeria

Abstract:

This paper examines the rules of discursive formation about globalization, i.e., how knowledge about globalization is produced, the mechanisms facilitating the production of this particular form of knowledge and how it is used to normalize the global subjects. Through a Foucauldian discourse analysis and interpretation of knowledge, power and the subject, it is indicated that the existing knowledge about globalization is a product of power relationships. The exercise of power produces the global subject who then becomes the object for further subjection. It is suggested that insofar as the language (or knowledge) of globalization renders it possible to classify subjects along a continuum (e.g., developed and underdeveloped societies) it also legitimizes the exercise of power along this order of classification. Through this interpretation, the paper explains how the global subject and the exercise of power are enacted and sustained.

Keywords: Globalization, global economy, discursive praxis, knowledge, power, subjection

1. Globalization: Discourses and Praxis

The subject of globalization has been in our consciousness for a while and, from the disciplines of management and organization studies, it has become part of our general stock of theoretical concepts. However, the excessive popularity of globalization as a subject is gradually approaching its twilight as in many popularized subjects in the social sciences. What is left now is to settle down and critically examine the problems that the discourse of globalization has really generated. To do this, we have to see how the knowledge about globalization has been presented (its discourse), what it has created (the global subject) and how it is created (power relationships).

The discourse of globalization has over the past three decades been dominated by the concepts of interdependence and interconnectedness among nations, corporations, and people across national and cultural boundaries (Gills, 1997; Held and McGrew, 2007; Kofman and Youngs, 2003; Tomlinson, 2007). Globalization is presented almost exclusively in terms of networks that bind institutions, countries, and people in an interdependent and interconnected global economy; as a phenomenon based on worldwide interdependence of resource supplies, product markets, and business competition; or else in Darwinian terms because companies and nation-states are under pressure to globalize or face extinction (Beck, 2005; Gill and Law, 1993; Weiss, 1999).

In Cross-cultural Management, we have also experienced a booming market for cross-cultural training, where the underlying theme has been cultural convergence (Ogbor and Williams, 2003). In "Women-in-Management" studies, the imprint of globalization discourses seems indelible because the rhetoric of women empowerment has been shown to be one of the strategies through which diversity is managed and conformity is enforced into the mainstream "man-made world." About this, Adler and Izraeli (1995: 189) suggest that the successful performance of global corporations depends on how they are able to utilize women's talents as prerequisite for global competitiveness.

The above ideas about globalization raise four fundamental questions. First, the mechanisms promoting interdependence, interconnectedness and convergence in the global system is rarely discussed; only its structure, which is crudely reduced to a global form of interdependence. Such crude characterization ignores the fact that there are losers and winners in the global system. The idea of "interconnectedness" and the discourse accompanying it seem to suggest the absence of hierarchies in global networks of communication and information (Risse, 2007). Similarly, Tomlinson (2007: 150-151) argues that the proliferation of complex connectedness across distance has resulted in a form of deterritorialization. "Deterritorialization", according to Tomlinson, is disruptive and involves "the simultaneous penetration of local worlds by distant forces, and the dislodging of everyday meanings from their 'anchors' in the local environment [...] involving winners and losers, felt more forcibly in some places than others." The globalization discourse

also nourishes itself on the ground that “much of the world is experiencing a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding” (Waters, 1995: 3). Thus, Clegg and Gray (1996: 296-297) suggest that globalization rides on the back of the convergence debate and its assumptions, where “nearly all societies were converging on the same point.”

Second, the political nature of the actors and their actions involved, that is, the role played by various organizations (e.g., nation-states, global corporations/institutions, etc) in strategically positioning themselves for the exercise of power in the global systems is not critically examined (Hoogvelt, 2006). As an extension of this idea is the prevailing argument in the discourse that globalization is something that is *inevitable* and *irreversible* (Risse, 2007). The apolitical, inevitability and irreversibility conceptualization of globalization ignores its historical context and the strategic actions taken by *powerful actors* to manage the globalization process to their advantage through such actions as cartels, alliances, trade blocs, structural adjustment programs, protectionism and even military invasions. Indeed, the globalization discourse ignores the reality of how and under what conditions the process of globalization has been politically “managed” and how much political autonomy nation-states continue to possess under globalization.

Until recently, the discourse of globalization has upheld its economic dimension to the exclusion of its political and cultural aspect. Beginning from the mid-nineties, the political agenda (globalization’s power structure) has gained its momentum (e.g., Beck, 2005; Gill and Law, 1993; Tomlinson, 2007; Weiss, 1999). Thus Weiss (1999: 59) argues that issues that fundamentally interest critics of globalization “are usually less economic than political. That is to say that their efforts to analyze or demonstrate economic change – the extent to which national economies have become more interconnected through trade, production, finance, and the growing web of international rules and institutions – are often a prelude to the political project.”

The third issue concerns existential and ontological questions which the present discourse has conveniently swept under the carpet. Within the *discipline* of management and organization studies, this paper is concerned with the manner in which globalization discourse is frozen and reduced exclusively in economic terms, thereby ignoring the ontological and existential status of the global subjects. A number of studies in the tradition of critical organization analysis have examined the problem inherent in the existing knowledge of globalization vis-à-vis ontological and existential issues (Alvesson and Deetz, 2000; Steingard and Fitzgibbons, 1995; Matthews, 2001). Specifically, Clegg and Gray (1996: 306) raise questions regarding the issues of human identity vis-à-vis the discourse and praxis of globalization. In general, such existential questions involve, among others, (1) the salience of individualism or familiarization as TNC employees, (2) the salience of their life-worlds as a sphere of both TNC production and consumption, (3) cultures of the life-worlds, such as ethnicity, tribe, gender, age, and their degree of impermeability/permeability to the new forms of consciousness the TNCs transmit. Thus, globalization, as discourse, is not just a form of representation; it is a material condition (or set of conditions), which enables and constrains the socially productive “imagination”. For Tomlinson (2007), globalization has resulted in the disruption of everyday life in local communities and the dislodging of everyday meanings. The idea of interconnectedness has been shown as a process of managing and curtailing global diversity. Thus, Beck (2005: 56) argues that, “the hegemony of globalization discourse reveals itself paradoxically in precisely that which seems to contradict it, namely, in the international debate about the new diversity of modernity options.”

Critics are also concerned about the process of *naturalization*, which characterizes knowledge production within the field of globalization and management (Boje, 1998; Steingard and Fitzgibbons, 1995). Naturalization here is a discursive praxis in which “social formation is abstracted from the historical conflictual site of its origin and treated as a concrete, relatively fixed entity” (Alvesson and Deetz, 1999: 191). The problem, according to these authors, is that globalization is reduced simply to economic dimension or simply in “terms of the representation of the interests of practitioners of the study of international business” (Clegg and Gray, 1996: 300). This reification becomes the manufactured reality rather than life processes (Alvesson and Deetz, 2000).

The fourth issue is that of the knowledge about globalization. This paper argues that the knowledge produced from the discourse in creating the global subject and the processes facilitating the production of this knowledge have not been critically examined as instruments for the exercise of power. Several critics of globalization in its present form (e.g., Burbach et al, 1997; Clegg and Gray, 1996; Hoogvelt, 2006; Risse, 2007; Steingard and Fitzgibbons, 1995) have shown how globalization discourse represents a strategic construction of powerful actors in the world system. The manner in which globalization knowledge is produced (through research, pedagogy, textbook and consulting) and the manner in which this knowledge is internalized reinforce the structure of power and its hierarchies of domination and subordination in the global system. In fact, these critics have shown how the discourse of globalization, as in several managerial discourses, promotes and institutionalizes the universalization of managerial interests, the suppression of conflicting interests, the domination of everything else through instrumental mode of reasoning, the eclipse of competitive and reasoning processes, the promotion of hegemony, and the way consent becomes orchestrated (Alvesson and Deetz, 2000: 193).

Finally, the idea that the global economy constitutes an arena where there is unequal exchange between the rich and poor nations and where subjection is created has long been established (Beck, 2005; Gill and Law, 1993; Held, et al, 1999). What has been ignored in the discourse, however, is the reason why there is little resistance by subordinate groups in the global exchange relationship. Clegg and Hardy (1999: 373) put this question in an interesting way: “Why did these groups (subjected groups) so often consent to their own subjugation”. Thus, we are concerned about how the global subject is produced through the theories and practices of globalization.

The main argument of this paper (and its point of departure) is that the conventional globalization discourse creates, institutionalizes and reinforces the instruments of domination and exploitation. The paper argues that, based on a crude functionalist paradigm (e.g., the appeal for a normative integration of societies in a global economy that is interdependent, interconnected and converging), the conventional globalization discourse eschews knowledge of the

processes in which the global exchange relationship is based. To support this tentative conclusion, we turn to an overview of Foucault's various works on how knowledge produces power and how power relationship in social interaction produces the subject, which then becomes an object for further exercise of power.

2. An Overview of Foucault's Work and Its Implication for the Globalization Discourse

As a philosopher, the focus of Michel Foucault's (1926-1984) inquiry is on the very question having to do with "ontology of the present", namely, "who are we today?" Specifically, Foucault wants to know who we are in terms of either the disciplines (or form of knowledge) we have of ourselves, the political forces which make us what we are and our "internal" relations to ourselves. In this philosophical enterprise, Foucault was interested in the genealogical investigations into the social construction of knowledge and the consequences in terms of which the subject is created. Although Foucault did not seek to understand the phenomenon known as globalization in its present form, his theorization about discourse/knowledge, power and the subject, however, involves various forms of theoretical underpinnings that are useful in understanding globalization as a manifestation of *discursive productions*, *power relations*, and the *creation of the subject*. For the purpose of this paper, these three Foucaultian themes are examined in relation to the philosophical question with which Foucault was confronted, namely:

- Who are we in terms of knowledge of ourselves? (Discourse/knowledge).
- Who are we in terms of the ways we are produced in political processes? (The exercise of power relationships).
- Who are we in terms of our relations with ourselves and the ethical forms we generate governing these? (The subject and subjection).

The first aspect of Foucault's work (discourse and knowledge) concentrates on the description of discourses or disciplines of knowledge (particularly the human sciences), which indicates how official knowledges work as instruments of "normalization" and "naturalization". Knowledge or discourses, according to Foucault, continually attempt to manoeuvre populations into "correct" and "functional" forms of thinking and acting. The old saying that knowledge is power resonates well in Foucault's philosophical enterprise, because, for Foucault, there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations.

Foucault also has an interest in examining the methods, practices and techniques by which official discourses go about this process of normalization and naturalization by occluding forms of knowledge which are different from those sanctioned by the officially scripted version. This strategy is achieved by dividing the normal person from the pathological specimen, the good citizen from the delinquent, and so on. A particular strategy by which knowledge is used as a process of normalization, naturalization, and the hierarchical segregation of individuals, according to McHoul and Grace (2000: 17) is "when science transforms non-scientific discourses into 'data', mere objects for analysis and so produces an implicit (or even quite explicit) *hierarchy* of languages". What is counted as "truth" is therefore always the effect of specific kinds of techniques. Knight (1992) calls this form of knowledge "positive forms of knowledge" and the conditions that make it possible are precisely those that render it precarious, for, far from representing knowledge, such positivistic forms of knowledge are merely the outcome of a set of disciplinary practices that involves classifying people along hierarchical ordering.

The relevance of this aspect of Foucault's work is in the emergence of globalization as a discipline including the proliferation of business schools and the establishment of global knowledge institutions with the "mandated" and "institutionalized" role of producing "scientific knowledge" on, for instance, how to manage in the global economy. In Foucault's work, the knowledge produced from these pseudo-scientific disciplines constitutes a form of *disciplinary action*. For instance, in cross-cultural-, human resource- and international management courses and practices, indoctrination seems to be the underlying theme: how to develop and train local and host country employees to act in ways that are in conformity with the needs of multinational and global corporations (Bailey, et al., 1993; Steingard and Fitzgibbons, 1995).

Social theory, according to Rosen (1984), functions as validity claim legitimating a group's pretext to dominance. We see how knowledge about globalization is primarily promoted and institutionalized through the needs of "First World countries" (Matthews, 2001), large multinational or global corporations (Clegg and Gray, 1996) who insist on relevant research by "donating" money to build office and class buildings, fund academic chairs, support research, send some of their employees to part/or full-time MBA programs, hire the bulk of undergraduate and graduate business school students and insist on production of management knowledge that is relevant to their globalization interest. Thus, local people are taught the act of scientifically investigating their "managerial" and economic developmental problems with the aid of management and economic models and theories developed in the West (Bailey, et al., 1993). In particular, through management pedagogy and practices, "knowledges" of globalization not only facilitates the management of "global diversity" but, more importantly, in *containing* diversity through what are considered as "scientific means" (Cox and Blake, 1991; Herriot and Pemberton, 1996). Knowledge about globalization thus creates and institutionalizes a monolithic worldview in which diversity in the world is reduced in convergence terms (Ogbor and Williams, 2003). Indeed, Foucault (1972) offered similar descriptions in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* when he writes that knowledge is not a question of structure; rather, "like those that preceded it ... belongs to that field in which the questions of the human being, consciousness, origin, and the subject emerge, intersected, mingle and separate off" (1972: 16).

The historical shift in major business schools from functional management training to more "inter-disciplinary" aspects in which "managing in the global economy" has become the dominant managerial pose is an example of how persons are "accumulated" into the discipline of globalization and where academic knowledge and theory legitimize the capitalist power order and the mode of its reproduction (Rosen, 1984). Through "corporate colonization" (Deetz, 1992),

people are indoctrinated and transformed as part of the global capitalist system/economy, where it sustains itself through this indoctrination. Foucault (1977) suggests that capitalism would not have been possible without the controlled “insertion” of bodies into the production processes. Men and women had first to be “accumulated” via the types of techniques of power, for “the accumulation of men and the accumulation of capital cannot be separated; it would not have been possible to solve the problem of the accumulation of men without the growth of an apparatus of production capable both in sustaining them and using them” (Foucault, 1977: 72).

In other words, we are interested in how globalization, as a discourse, has emerged overtime through the various discursive practices that constitutes its knowledge arena. Foucault does not separate philosophy or the constitution of knowledge from history, because, the question of the ontology of the present (who are we today: poor country versus rich country) entails the question of the emergence of the human subject along a number of conceptual fronts which are historically constituted. Hence, one can assert that globalization as an object of discourse must be located in its historical context (Foucault’s archeology of knowledge).

The second aspect of Foucault’s works that is relevant to our understanding of the global economy/globalization is about how he views *power* in social relations. This is a political question of power (or the power of discursive practices) and the control of populations through disciplinary practices that result from the discourse of objects such as the penal system. The discourse of an object (e.g., globalization) creates a space (Knight, 1992) within which power is and/or its relationship is made possible. This possibility produces the subject (e.g., developed and underdeveloped nations) as an object of discourse and the exercise of power. Thus, for Foucault, the immanent philosophical problem in social relations is not who is in power. Rather, it is how we understand the way and mechanisms in which power installs *itself* and produces real material effects; where one such effect might be a particular kind of subject who will in turn act as a channel for the flow of power itself (the processes of power). In effect, Foucault was not interested in who controls power, but the arena or space in which power is constituted and manifested – *the field of power*:

Let us not ... ask why certain people want to dominate, what they seek, what is their overall strategy. Let us ask, instead, how things work at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes that subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviors etc. In other words, rather than ask ourselves how the sovereign appears to us in his lofty isolations, we should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts, etc. We should try to grasp subjection in its material instance as a constitution of subjects (Foucault, 1980: 97).

To paraphrase Foucault, the arena in which relationships in the global economy are constructed and maintained is not to be understood simply in terms of which country or organization in the global economy has power over the other (the structural aspect of power). It is rather, the processes and strategies in which the global economy is constituted and the manner in which its material inducements (what Ogbor, 2002 calls the spectacle of globalization) produce global dependency/interdependency. Many researchers have concluded that in terms of material and psychological resources and their distributive patterns in the global economy, the West and its institutions achieve control over others largely by affecting the conditions of interaction and exchange relationships (Beck, 2005; Gill, 1995; Ogbor, 2002.). By virtue of their position of control in the nexus of global economic exchange, regulatory agencies (e.g., the World Bank, the IMF, WTO), and symbol-creating and culture-carrying organizations, (e.g., Levi-Strauss, MTV, McDonald’s, CNN, Nike), can have a pervasive effect on entire cultural values and communication structures (Tomlinson, 2007).

From a Foucaultian perspective, the strategy in which the exercise of power in the global system is made manifest should become the focus of our inquiry in understanding the workings of the global economy. In this context, Foucault was interested in what is it that has the worst implications for our societies, for people? What declares people incapable of managing their own affairs in the global economy? What moulds, adjusts and normalizes the individuals to become “passive” recipients of the material and psychological products of this power relationship in the global system? Most importantly, Foucault was interested in the *how* this power relationship and the mechanisms that produce it are manifested: the techniques of power that make globalization and its discourse/praxis possible as an exercise of power (globalization and its conditions of possibility). For Foucault,

Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody’s hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its application (1980: 98).

This aspect of power is important in the sense that resistance is more effective when it is directed at “technique” of power rather than at “power” in general. As pointed out by McHoul and Grace (2000: 86), “it is techniques which allow for the exercise of power and the production of knowledge; resistance consists of ‘refusing’ these techniques”.

A third philosophical question facing Foucault is that of the *subject* of discourse. Here, Foucault was interested in how particular kinds of subjects (the mad, the ill, the criminal, the sexual pervert, for example) were *produced* as effects of discursive practices and power relations. In so doing, Foucault eschews the investigation of a subject as a pregiven entity. Instead, his enquiries were directed to the historical conditions that made various types of quite specific and differentiated subjects *possible*. For instance, in *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1977) examines how the human being or “soul” is produced as a result of power relations.

Foucault’s preoccupations here was to understand those discourses that constitute a “subject” such as an individual or a discipline such as science by focusing not only on the archeology of knowledge – seeking to understand the historical constitution of what is and not, but also in how these discourses that are historically constituted create the *subject*. This is evident in his introduction to the second volume of *The History of Sexuality* where he suggests that “it

seemed appropriate to look for the forms and modalities of the relation to self by which the individual constitutes and recognizes himself *qua* the subject" (Foucault, 1986: 6). The *subject* and its identity, including the discourses and relations of power that legitimize, normalize, and naturalize this identity are products of discourses and power relations. Foucault (1979a) explains in the first volume of the *History of Sexuality*, how the processes of subject-production or *subjection*, are affected by modern scientific forms of knowledge.

One important aspect of Foucault's work in which he illustrates how the subject is created is his discussion of techniques that can take effect at the level of the body. Two such techniques are the confessional and the prison design known as "the Panopticon." These two techniques form the internal and external aspects of persons under surveillance, their bodies and minds, as *objects*. Panopticism is an exemplary technique through which disciplinary power is able to function and the subject is successfully created. For it relies not only on "surveillance", but also on the alteration of behavior in order to conform to "correct" individuals and "normalization". It also relies on the internal training that incites states of docility; "it need not rely on displays of physical force or violence. The subject of surveillance, by contrast disciplines him- or herself. Through the Panopticon, "the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers" (Foucault, 1977: 201). Surveillance, discipline, control, and the production of the subject, according to Foucault, occur in institutions that serve as machinery of *governmentality*. The political dimension of surveillance or the "political strategy" within which institutions are often part of a more general political system also received Foucault's attention when he notes that

In order for a certain relation of forces not only to maintain itself, but to accentuate, stabilize and broaden itself, a certain kind of manoeuvre is necessary. The psychiatrist had to manoeuvre in order to make himself recognized as part of the public hygiene system (1980: 206).

As we shall indicate in the next section, the global economy can be construed as a network consisting of system of surveillance, discipline and control by a wide range of institutions (economic-, trade-, political- and cultural- policies, programs and regulations). In order to enforce these policies and to institute disciplinary actions "global" institutions or supra organizations such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organizations, trade/economic blocs, etc, are created.

Foucault's thesis of the "confessional" is also important for us in the context of the techniques upon which the global subject is created. For example, in order to receive foreign aid and loan, developing countries must admit (confess) to their "wrong-doings" (poverty and mismanagement of their economies) and show that they are in need of economic "intervention." In most instances, the expert opinion of World Bank or the IMF experts is needed to enforce this confession. Foucault's explanation of how the Western man is made to confess is relevant here. According to Foucault, Western man has become a confessing animal:

The confession has spread its effects far and wide. It plays a part in justice, medicine, education, family relationships, and love relations, in the most ordinary affairs of everyday life, and in the most solemn rites; one confesses one's crimes, one's sins, one's thoughts and desires, one's illnesses and troubles; one goes about telling, with the greatest precision, whatever is most difficult to tell. One confesses in public and in private, to one's parents, one's educators, one's doctors, to those one loves; one admits to oneself ... Western man has become a confessing animal (1978: 59).

In the context of the global system, the confessional can take the form of interrogations, interviews, conversations, consultations (as when World Bank/IMF experts are dispatched to consult with officials of Third World countries prior to their qualification for debt restructuring and economic aid). After the confessional, countries that are categorized as "poor" or whose economies are "sick" are then given "conditionalities" (e.g., deregulation of their economies) as conditions for their participation in the global system. This entails the opening up of Third World economies for further "accumulation", regulation and "governmentality". It is precisely along this line that Foucault insists that through "the confessional" subjects actively participate in social relations in which they subject themselves.

Foucault points out that one confesses to a real or imaginary partner who represents not just the other party of a dialogue, "but the authority who requires the confession, prescribes and appreciate it, and intervenes in order to judge, punish, forgive, console, and reconcile" (1979a: 62). The processes and strategies through which the global subject is created follow a pattern of knowledge production about the subject (sending explorers or missionaries to discover Africa), the classification of the subject along a scale (e.g., the classification of Africa as "the Dark Continent"), the normalization of the behavior of the subject through disciplinary activities (e.g., colonization, Western culture, education, political ideologies and religious practices) and the reconciliation of the subject within the "whole" (e.g., Third World Countries operating in the global economy). In fact, the "confessional" has taken a much wider implication in terms of which the global subject is created.

3. Globalization Discourse as a Discipline and Disciplinary Action

So far, we have shown that our present understanding of globalization refers not just to language or social interaction but also to relatively well-bounded areas of social knowledge that carves out its object. We have also indicated how the discourse of globalization is historically constituted and specific; how subjects/objects in the global system are discursively produced and re-produced. In this section, we will examine in detail why the discourse of globalization is construed as a *discipline* and how the *discipline* of globalization has gravitated along a series of interconnected historical sequences and disciplinary actions.

As a discipline, in a Foucaultian sense, we can attribute two meanings. On the one hand, a discipline is seen as a demarcated area of knowledge and praxis such as the scholarly disciplines of medicine, science, economics, psychiatry, scientific management and strategic management (Knight, 1992) or human resource management (Townley, 1993). For

Foucault, these are examples of disciplines in which knowledge/discourses are produced, reproduced and maintained as historically constituted body of knowledge. In other words, it is history or “the archeology of knowledge” that gives the subject of globalization its *relevance* as a discipline. As seekers and producers/disseminators of globalization knowledge, our procedures and rules governing our research tradition are anchored in our paradigms or frame of references (Kuhn, 1970). Collectively, these procedures and norms determine our allegiance to a particular form of knowledge, producing what Foucault calls a discipline.

Thus, the discipline of globalization does not emerge overnight; rather it is historically constituted in the sense that statements about globalization are understood, not as fixed components, but only via the rules which govern their functioning. These rules have to do with historically variable bodies of knowledge; they are the rules for what is possible to know at a particular time. Although the rules or the languages that constitute the object of discourse may be altered, their underlying goal remains. As Matthews (2001) has pointed out, although the imagery reflecting the darker side of capitalism: cartel, restrictive practice, collusion, and entry barrier has been rewritten over the years to read: alliance, supplier agreements, networking, leveraging, globalization still remains the contemporary manifestation of a system that evolved over several years, the primary purpose of which was to be the economic servant of Western society (Steingard and Fitzgibbons, 1995). Similarly, Berry et al (1997: 5) write that the roots of globalization “go deep into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to the colonial operations of British, Dutch, and French trading companies that exploited the resources of their governments’ overseas possession, and often led their home countries into colonial adventures. This tradition has been continued into the present century by the overseas activities of giant oil, mineral, and fruit companies”.

The point here is that in each of these stages, we also see an overlap and areas of intersection as they change historically. Thus, Foucault (1970) was interested in tracing this complex coming-together and departures in *The Order of Things*. A discourse is also what Foucault calls *énonciation* (or enunciation, in English), which means “the techniques, the structures, the forms of know-how by which people are able to produce and recognize utterances” (McHoul and Grace, 1993: 35). To state that globalization entails “worldwide integration of economic systems” (Berry, Conkling, and Ray, 1997) or “the compression and the intensification of consciousness in the world as a whole” (Robertson, 1992: 8) are but ways of stating that which is possible or accepted at a particular time. Statements such as these can therefore be understood not in fixed components, but only via the rules, which govern their functioning.

Foucault’s (1967) work on *Madness and Civilization* has shown how madness is not a pre-given entity, but something constituted historically through discourses as both an object of knowledge and a target for institutional practices. Globalization is not a pre-given entity, neither is it a “natural” phenomenon that is “inevitable” and “irreversible”. In the same manner as psychiatric knowledge invents, moulds, and carves out its object – mental illness” so also globalization knowledge produces its object – rich/poor country, North/West, European Union/African Union and, especially, the “Triad nations” (Ohmae, 1990).

On the other hand, a discipline refers to a specific disciplinary institution of social control such as the prison and its inmates, the university system and its academic “inmates”, the hospital and its sick, or the asylum and its madmen, the IMF/World Bank and their “sick” economies. Thus, many critics of globalization have argued that globalization as a project has become an institution for disciplining erred and “sick” economies (Beck, 2007; Burbach, et al, 1997; Hoogvelt, 2006). By analyzing how various institutions work, Foucault has shown how discourses on sanity (or insanity), health, knowledge, and punishment have been developed and the implications that this has had for the individual (the criminal, the madman) who becomes an object of knowledge and discipline. The underdeveloped countries, for instance, find their “true identity” when they behave according to the “order” in which they have been classified. The stigma of being a “poor country” produces a consciousness upon which one acts.

4. The Power of Discourse and the Creation of the Global Subject

We now turn to a discussion of how the global subject is created. We will discuss this along the following order: (i) the process of knowing, naming, classifying and differentiating the global subject; (ii) the process of enclosure as a technique for the exercise of power; and (iii) the process through which the global subject is normalized, internalized, governed and disciplined in the global economy.

4.1. Knowing, Naming, Classifying and Differentiating the Global Subject

As Foucault has pointed out, power is first and foremost exercised by the virtue of what is known. A simple examination of Foucault’s work indicates the following stages; (1) knowledge about the subject, (2) naming the subject, (3) classification and differentiation of the subject, and (4) ultimately, internalization, govern mentality and discipline. The historical processes through which globalization has attained its present status has already been discussed. First, unknown territories have to be discovered and known. Christopher Columbus and church missionary “societies” accomplished this task. In the case of Africa, the series of missionary journeys, explorations and “discoveries” led to the naming of the continent as the “Dark Continent” and classified as poor, under-developed and Pagan which must be governed through first christening (in this case, conversion into the Anglican or the Catholic Faiths) and then colonization. This was then followed by the phenomenal growth of European merchant houses that were chartered by His/Her European Royal Majesties. The material, religious, cultural and psychological “emancipation” of the various “primitive societies” – from the native Indians of North and South America to the Africans arguably constituted one of the defining moments for the expansion of globalization. It is precisely along this line that Steingard and Fitzgibbons (1995, p. 31) argue that “the globalization of capitalism is the contemporary manifestation of system that evolved over several centuries, the primary purpose of which was to be the economic servant of Western society”.

The complexities of doing business with unknown territories gave rise in the early seventies to the subject and discipline of "International Management" within the field of economics. As this discipline evolves, a new one – "Cross-Cultural Management" emerged. In this new field, "souls" were inserted and knowledge "accumulated" to fit into what is supposed to be the underlying theme, which is to study and "know those cultures out there" in order to make them amenable to recipients of Western material and cultural "resources". As typical of Western systems of knowing, cultural typologies and systems of classification were elaborately enacted to promote globalization – from Weber's "ideal-type" construction to Clyde Kluckhohn's "Cultural Value Orientations" and Geert Hofstede's "Cultural Value-Dimensions" (Weber, 1930; Kluckhohn, 1961; Hofstede, 1980).

In Hofstede's (1980) "Cultural Dimensions", the author was able to pigeonhole the world's cultural diversities into two grand categories: individualist/collectivist; small power and large power; strong uncertainty and weak uncertainty avoidance; masculine and feminine. These classifications help in normalizing "deviant cultures" and normalize the "order of things." Thus, Matthews (2001: 177) points out that "Global capitalism, the global market system has the status of an ordering system or archetype in Gnostic or Jungian sense. Like a complex system, an archetype contains its opposite". As a discipline, therefore, the globalization discourse serves as an instrument for the justification of the West's long history of classifying people along what Foucault calls the "Order of Things".

4.2. Enclosure, Normalization, Internalization and the Social Construction of Inequality

Although the possibility for the exercise of power is tenable when the powerless is drawn into the system of exchange by the powerful, the former must be perpetually kept at bay lest they attain the status of equal partnership in the exchange relationship. In order to achieve this purpose, some societies or countries are enclosed or separated from others. *Enclosure* here, according to Townley (1993), involves the geographical or spatial separation of a place and positioning oneself for strategic purpose. Enclosure, in this context, involves the geographical or spatial separation of a place and people. Berry, et al (1997: 428-429) discuss what they term as the "Global Space Economy of the Future". In this global space economy, there is the prevalence of forces reinforcing regionalization giving birth to super economic regions such as the European Union, NAFTA and a Japan-dominated Asian bloc. All other regions are classified as "others". The result of this classification and its material and psychological consequences is the fact the rich are getting richer, while the poor are getting poorer. Thus, the dichotomization between the discursive divide is perpetuated not only by the manner in which theory is reproduced, but by the way in which it is practiced. Some critics have seen this classification of people as an imperialistic mode of exploitation (Steingard and Fitzgibbons, 1995: 33).

Discourses can be internalized and become the "self-evident truth" as soon as the subject has been "normalized", i.e., brought into the mainstream. In the global system, we see evidence of these normalizing/internalizing practices. Society expects "underdeveloped countries" to behave and act as "poor" – in fact, there must be evidence of poverty in order to qualify for economic aid and other forms of developmental assistance sponsored and packaged by the rich countries. Thus, both parties (the poor and the rich countries) simultaneously produce the "truth" about themselves. It is on the basis of this shared truth – the arena/space – that the exercise of power is manifested. Listen to Foucault,

I would say that we are forced to produce the truth of power that our society demands, of which it has need, in order to function: we *must* speak the truth; we are constrained or condemned to confess or to discover the truth. Power never ceases its interrogation, its inquisition, its registration of the truth: it institutionalizes, professionalises and rewards its pursuit. In the last analysis, we must produce truth as we must produce wealth, indeed we must produce truth as we must produce wealth in the first place (Foucault, 1980a: 93).

Controls over interactions in the global economy are provided by the structure of power relations. On the one hand, organizations and countries gain control over others by virtue of their positions in the global exchange relationship. On the other hand, once this initial control is established it is perpetuated by the very conditions that gave birth to it, namely *dependency* in the global system of exchange: there is no control without dependency. Global exchange of resources ties together differentiated units which lead to competition, cooperation or control. Actually, this is no more than repeating what classical social exchange theorists have long argued (Blau, 1994; Emerson, 1976). In general, classical exchange theory has made a set of assumptions that collectively reinforce the notion that distributive justice or equality is not and cannot be obtained in the global system of exchange because the *conditions* or assumptions favoring them are not available. Ogbor (2002) states these assumptions as follow: (1) that exchanging parties have basic equality of status, either legal equality or equality of opportunity; (2) that exchange brings about the mutual benefit to the parties involved, that is, that the exchange ratio tends to be equal; (3) that exchange decisions are made voluntarily, that is, with an absence of coercion; and (4) all parties have adequate knowledge of costs and alternatives, that is, "market conditions" and its knowledge is equally available to the parties involved in the exchange relationship. Ogbor (2002) refers to these four conditions collectively as the conditions of equal exchange.

Using Ogbor' framework, it is easy to see how inequality is socially constructed in the global system of exchange precisely because the conditions favoring equality in the exchange relationship between the developed and developing countries are conspicuously absent. Actors in the global economy are *interdependent* in the sense that one cannot exist without the other; the *inequality* in the global system of exchange is a condition for the functioning of the global economy. And once this inequality is established, it is reinforced and intensified by the very system that has created it. Hence, some partners (e.g., Industrialized nations and institutions) in the exchange relationship, by virtue of their position are able to impose control and disciplinary action on some other parties (e.g., underdeveloped countries), economically, politically, psychologically, and culturally.

One reason why there is inequality in the system of global exchange points to the differentiation of functions within the global economy both historically and economically and thus differential expropriation of resources by actors

involved. It is thus possible to suggest that any inequality in the exchange of products and services leads to inequality in the resources available for productive activities and ultimately to unequal control over the procedural conditions of exchange. Likewise, while exchange may involve mutual benefits, there is no guarantee that the total benefit to each party (where "total benefit" equals rewards minus costs) will be equal. Within the global system of exchange, exchange decisions may be severally constrained by lack of suitable alternatives and thus may be less than fully voluntary. A disadvantaged party, with fewer resources or some other structural disadvantages, may be forced into exchange in order to survive, or to meet some legal requirement imposed by the advantaged party (as in the case of the World Trade Organization). Finally, information is systematically limited and distorted, and this may accrue to the advantage of the dominant partner.

The relevance of the above discussion is in our understanding of the mechanisms of the global economy against the background of power relationship in situations of social exchange and the manner in which subjects are produced in terms of which they participate in the exchange relationship and thus *subjection* to the mechanisms of power. As we have already observed, power relationship in the global economy, to put it bluntly, seems to be mutual in the sense that if one of the parties no longer has any resources to engage in the relationship, neither has it anything to exchange, and we can say that our party can no longer be regarded as involved in a global power relationship. But when our party continues to participate in the exchange relationship, what it can offer is *subjection*.

This *subjectification* which results from the internalization of knowledge about one-self leads to active self-formation of subjects, namely, those ways in which individuals objectify themselves so as to recognize (and be recognized) to a particular sense of their own subjectivity (Knight, 1992). Referring to this subjection produced within the globalization discourse, Alvares (1992: 227) suggests that: "People lost the right to claim that they could function as competent human beings unless they underwent the indoctrination required by modernity. It was *a priori* assumed that they were deficient as human beings and had to be remade." Thus, the stigma attached to the mad, the sick, the criminal, the black, the poor, the unemployed and so on, provides an objectification that not only classifies and contains the deviant, but also "normalizes" the rest of the population.

5. Concluding Remarks: Towards a Critique of Discursive Praxis

Following a Foucaultian and critical theory traditions, the argumentation made so far in this paper points to the idea that the discourse of globalization constitutes an arena for the exercise of power, the creation of the global subject, and how domination and subjection are enacted. One element of Foucault's work involves an attention to the subjugated or "marginal knowledges", especially those which have been disqualified, taken less than seriously or deemed inadequate by official histories. These subjects are called "naïve" because they "are located low down" on most official hierarchies of ideas" (Foucault, 1980: 82). According to Foucault, they are the discourses of the madman, the patient, the delinquent, the pervert and other persons who, in their respective times, held knowledge about themselves which diverge from the established categories. One of the reasons for a Foucaultian interpretation of the global economy then is not so much the attempt to bring forth knowledge of power relations in globalization practices, but more importantly, to assert the political obligation of the oppressed. In *Language, Counter-memory, Practice*, Foucault writes that:

When the prisoners began to speak, they possessed an individual theory of prisons, the penal system, and justice.

It is this form of discourse, which ultimately matters, a discourse against power, the counter-discourse of prisoners and those we call delinquents – and not a theory *about* delinquency (Foucault, 1977b: 209).

From a Foucaultian perspective, an examination of the discourse of globalization does not seek to develop a grand theory of globalization, but to uncover the structure of domination. As Risse (2007: 138) aptly points out, "the main task of a critical deconstruction of globalization discourse is to uncover the structure of power as a structure of domination and subordination that this discourse itself establishes." To paraphrase the work of Foucault, (it is difficult to paraphrase such work – as it leads to the academic sin of reductionism) a deconstruction of globalization's power structure seeks to bring forth the voices of the "others" in the globalization discourses – those voices that are discursively blanketed out in legitimizing the globalization praxis. Such critical descriptions of the "grand narratives" (Boje, 1998) contribute to political action not only by entering the fray of the discourses, but also by providing studies of official techniques of regulation, punishment, normalization and so on to those groups which have a direct interest in their subversion. Hence, Foucault's main focus "was on the counter-discourses mobilized by these persons (the mad, the perverts) against various dominant scientific accounts of their 'crimes' and transgressions" (McHoul and Grace, 2000: 92).

Foucault also suggests the usefulness of criticisms by elaborating on the subject of subjugated knowledge (e.g., the silence voices in the global economy):

I believe that by subjugated knowledges one should understand something else ... a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity ... It is through the reappearance of this knowledge, of these local popular knowledges, these disqualified knowledges, that criticism performs its work (Foucault, 1980: 81-2).

It is on this basis that Boje (2001) suggests the relevance of "rebel voices" in a critical analysis of the discourses on globalization. "Rebel voices," he argues, "is a way of telling the story from the voice and perspective of those put at the margins or silenced altogether by the dominant voices" (p. 23). A Foucaultian interpretation of the workings of the global economy thus enables the possibility for hearing the silenced voices as it traces the historical roots within which the dominant voices are constituted and the power relationship involved. Hence the re-appearance of these "rebel voices" can serve as "tools" for resistance against repressive discursive practices. The reason is simple: the possibility for resistance is achieved, not by endorsing the officially sanctioned discourses or dominant voices of globalization, but by subjecting them to critical analysis because as Cooper and Burrell (1988: 101) have indicated in a reference to the significance of the works

of Foucault in management and organization studies, "In order to see the ordinary with a fresh vision, we have to make the 'extraordinary', i.e., to break the habits of organized routine and see the world as though for the first time, it is necessary to free ourselves of normalized ways of thinking that blind us to the strangeness of the familiar".

How then should we conceptualize globalization or the global economy, the discipline of globalization and the knowledge it has produced based on its Foucaultian analysis?

First, we should see globalization not simply in terms by which firms extend their sales or manufacturing facilities to new markets abroad, nor, simply as networks that bind countries, institutions, and people in an interdependent and interconnected global economy. Most importantly, globalization should not be seen as a pre-given, irreversible entity. Such characterization of the global economy is an inadequate tool of analysis because it fails to consider the *strategical* aspect of the interacting actors in this relationship and its political character. The orthodox or existing mode of analysis seems to dis-engage the knowledge of the global economy from the political/power context in which it exists. The nature of interdependency which the existing discourse so much proclaimed is possible only through a system of power, dependency and subjection as the preceding analysis indicates. In other words, the hierarchical structuring of the global economy with its structure of domination and subordination is the condition for its existence.

Second, we should re-examine the way knowledge about globalization in management and organization studies is produced, disseminated and internalized. Recognizing that the discourse on globalization and its knowledge are mechanisms of power relationship would then lead to questioning the basis of this power and to re-examine critically the sources of this knowledge and the mechanisms that sustain its production, dissemination and internalization. On this basis, we conclude this discussion by connecting our critical view of the discourse on globalization to research activities in this field.

The conventional research in the "discipline" of globalization seems to mirror what Foucault calls techniques of power in the sense that some of our fellow "inmates" of the academic zoo produce a type of knowledge that reproduces the power position of the dominant coalition in the global system. In order to produce research results that attend to the interests of the dominant coalition, many of us have been seduced into the practice of "back grounding" knowledge, which contradicts and/or challenges premises supporting existing global power structure and its conditions of existence. The few that dares to question globalization's power structure and its mode of domination are classified as "radicals", "socialists", "rebels" and "anarchists". Thus, for fear of being branded "mad" we re-produce research that upholds the status quo: the extension of the forces promoting globalization's existing power-structure. Although the reproduction of societal ideology in research may be seen as a tapestry for unexamined assumptions which may be necessary for any social discourse to achieve its legitimacy (Rosen, 1993), the effect of such research procedure is subjection to the dictates of power: it does not encourage intellectual curiosity. Neither does it lead to emancipation from societal repressive forces and the abolition of social injustice (Horkheimer, 1982). On the contrary, such type of research that follows the "consistency condition" and reinforces the social order from which it is derived and legitimated has no objective relevance, "in the last resort, it constitutes a method of deception" (Feyerabend, 2010: 45).

Finally, if this paper has raised questions regarding "who we are" in terms of the global knowledge of ourselves, "who we are" in terms of the ways we are produced in political processes through the globalization discourses, and "who we are" in terms of how we define ourselves and the ethical forms we generate for governing these through the discourses of globalization, it should have accomplished the purpose for which it was set.

6. References

- i. Alder, N. J. and Izraeli, D. N. (1995), "Women Managers: Moving Up and Across Borders", In Shenkar, O. (ed.), *Global Perspectives of Human Resource Management*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ; Prentice Hall, pp. 147-164.
- ii. Alvares, C. (1992), "Science", in Sachs, W. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Development*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books.
- iii. Alvesson, M. and Deetz, S. (2000), *Doing critical management research*, Sage, London.
- iv. Bailey, D., Hèon, F. and Steingard, D. (1993), "Post-modern International Development: Interdevelopment and Global Interbeing," *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 43-63.
- v. Beck, U. (2005), *Power in the global age: a new political economy*, Cambridge: Polity.
- vi. Blau, Peter (1994). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: John Wiley.
- vii. Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative Methods for Organizational & Communications Research*. London: Sage.
- viii. Burbach R., Soto, O and Kagarlitsky, M (1997), *Globalization and its discontents: the rise of postmodern socialism*, London: Pluto Press
- ix. Clegg, S.R, and Gray, J. T. (1996), "Metaphors of Globalization", In Boje, D. M.,
- x. Gephart, R. P. and Thatchenkery, T. J. (eds.), *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 293-307.
- xi. Clegg, S and Hardy, C. eds. (1999), *Organization Theory and Method*, Sage, London
- xii. Copper, R. and Burrell, G. (1988), "Modernism, postmodernism and organizational analysis", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 9, No 1, pp. 91-112.
- xiii. Cox, T. and Blake, S. (1991), "Managing Cultural Diversity: Implications for Organizational Competitiveness", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 45-56.
- xiv. Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 2, pp. 335-362
- xv. Feyerabend, Paul (2010). *Against Method*. 4th ed., New York, NY: Verso Books.
- xvi. Foucault, M. (1967), *Madness and Civilization: A history of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, London: Tavistock (first published, 1961).

- xvii. Foucault, M. (1970), *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*, London: Tavistock (First published, 1966).
- xviii. Foucault, M. (1972), *The Archeology of Knowledge*, London: Tavistock
- xix. Foucault, M. (1973), *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception*, London: Tavistock.
- xx. Foucault, M. (1977a), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, London: Allen Lane.
- xxi. Foucault, M. (1978), *The History of Sexuality*. London/New York: Penguin.
- xxii. Foucault, M. (1979a), *The History of Sexuality, Volume One: An Introduction*, London: Allen Lane.
- xxiii. Foucault, M. (1979b), "Governmentality", *Ideology and Consciousness*, Vol. 6, pp. 5-21.
- xxv. Foucault, M. (1980), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, London: Harvester Press.
- xxvi. Foucault, M. (1986), "Preface to the History of sexuality, Vol. II" In P. Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*, Harmondsworth, Penguin
- xxvii. Gill, S. (1995), "Globalization, Market Civilization, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism." *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 24, No.3, pp. 399-423.
- xxviii. Gill, S. and Law, D. (1993), "Global Hegemony and the Structural Power of Capital," In S. Gill (ed.) *Gramsci, historical materialism and international relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 93-124.
- xxix. Gills, B. (2002), *Globalization and Politics of Resistance*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- xxx. Held, D. (1999), *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- xxxii. Held, D. and McGrew, A. eds. (2007), *Globalization theory: approaches and controversies*, New York, NY: Wiley, pp. 126-148
- xxxiii. Held, D., et al. (1999), *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*, Stanford Stanford, CA: University Press.
- xxxiv. Herriot, P. and Pemberton, C. (1995), *Competitive Advantage through Diversity: Organizational Learning from Difference*, London: Sage.
- xxxv. Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequences - International Differences in Work- Related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- xxxvi. Hoogvelt, Ankie (2006), "Globalization and post-modern imperialism," *Globalization*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 159-174.
- xxxvii. Horkheimer, Max. (1982). *Critical Theory Selected Essays*. New York: Continuum Pub.
- xxxviii. Inglehart, R. (2002), "Globalization and Postmodern Values," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp 215-228
- xxxix. Jackall, R. (1988), *Moral mazes: The world of corporate managers*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- xl. Kluckhohn, Clyde (1961), Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action: An Exploratory Definition and Classification, in *Toward a General Theory of Action*, eds. Talcott Parson and Edward Shils, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 388-433
- xli. Knights, D. (1992), "Changing spaces: The disruptive impact of a new epistemological location for the study of management", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 514-536.
- xlii. Kofman, E. and Youngs, G. eds. (2003), *Globalization: theory and practice*, London: Continuum.
- xliii. Kuhn T. S. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- xliv. Matthews, R. (2001), "Complexity ontology and globalization: Some propositions," *Business Research Yearbook*, Vol. VIII, pp. 175-9.
- xlv. McHoul, A. and Grace, W. (2000), *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. New York: New York University Press.
- xlvi. Ogbor, J. (2002), "From Spectacle to Surveillance: The Making of the Global Subject", *Business Research Yearbook*, Vol. IX, pp. 524-528.
- xlvii. Ogbor, J. and Williams, J. (2003), "The Cross-Cultural Transfer of Management Practices: The Case for Creative Synthesis", *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 3-23
- xlviii. Ohmae, K. (1990), *The Borderless World*, London, Collins.
- xlix. Reed, M. (1999), "Organizational Theorizing: A Historically Contested Terrain", In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy, *Studying Organization: Theory and Method*, London, Sage, pp. 25-50.
- l. Risse, Thomas (2007), "Social Construction Meets Globalization," In D. Held and A. McGrew (eds.) *Globalization theory: approaches and controversies*, New York, NY: Wiley, pp. 126-148
- li. Robertson, R. (1992), *Globalization, social theory, and global culture*. London, Sage.
- lii. Shenkar, O. (1995), *Global Perspective of Human Resource Management*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- liii. Steingard, D. S. and Fitzgibbons, D. E. (1995), Challenging the juggernaut of globalization: A manifesto for academic praxis, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 8 (4): 30-54.
- liv. Townley, B. (1993), Foucault, power/knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 518-545.
- lv. Waters, M. (1995) *Globalization*. Routledge, London.
- lvi. Weber, M. (1930), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, New York, NY: Charles Scribner & Sons.
- lvii. Weiss, Linda (1999), "Globalization and national governance: autonomy or interdependence?" *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25, pp. 59-88.