Relations of Suspicion: Critical Theory and Interdisciplinary Research

Jennifer Sumner

Abstract

While interdisciplinary researchers cultivate a critical attitude toward disciplinary constraints, they do not necessarily extend that attitude to their research design, interpretation of findings, role as researchers, or society at large. Allying interdisciplinary research with critical theory opens up the critique that interdisciplinarity begins, allowing research to move beyond the bounds not only of disciplines, but also of the status quo. By looking at interdisciplinarity through the idea of relationships and then infusing those relationships with a critical attitude, researchers can build interdisciplinary relations of suspicion. These relations of suspicion can help researchers begin to address complex contemporary issues such as globalization and sustainability.

> *Social science is a social phenomenon embedded in a political and ethical context. What is explored, and how it is explored, can hardly avoid either supporting (reproducing) or challenging existing social conditions. Different social interests are favoured or disfavoured depending on the questions that are asked (and not asked), and on how reality is represented and interpreted. Thus the interpretations and the theoretical assumptions on which these are based are not neutral but are part of, and help to construct, political and ideological conditions.* (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 8)

While interdisciplinary research is not a new phenomenon, interest in it is growing as more and more scholars come to understand its ability to analyze current issues and construct new visions. But how does interest in interdisciplinarity manifest itself? Do scholars move to interdisciplinary research as an extension of system-serving research that merely reinforces existing relations of power and inequality in society? Or do they choose interdisciplinary research as a powerful tool for understanding, critique, explanation and change?

This article will explore the links between interdisciplinary research and critical theory to create a potent mixture of negotiation and critical questioning, resulting in the kind of research program that is capable of addressing two of the most complex issues of our time: globalization and sustainability. It will begin with a discussion of interdisciplinary research, move to a discussion of critical theory and then lead interdisciplinarity into a critical realm that dares to challenge not only disciplinary conventions, but also deeply vested interests.

Interdisciplinary Research

Interdisciplinarity

Whether championed, vilified, tolerated, or marginalized, interdisciplinarity seems steeped in debate. As a departure from purely disciplinary studies, interdisciplinarity exhibits the dialectical development of academic innovation by being "both an embattled site of controversy and a new battle cry" (Hutcheon, 1997, p. 19). Imbued with an air of excitement and power,

interdisciplinarity is here to stay, with all its flaws and potential. Given its uncomfortable but grudgingly accepted place in the academy, what does this term really mean?

Locker (1994, p. 138) argues that "our research is interdisciplinary when we build on theories and previous research from more than one discipline and use methods for data collection and analysis from more than one research tradition." Nissani (1995, p. 122) proposes a minimalist definition of interdisciplinarity as "bringing together in some fashion distinctive components of two or more disciplines." Newell and Green (in Richards, 1996, p. 115) define interdisciplinary studies as "inquiries which critically draw upon two or more disciplines and which lead to an integration of disciplinary insights." In the view of Richards (1996, p. 124), "authentic interdisciplinary efforts possess as a defining characteristic, the ability to identify and illuminate the *connections* between disciplinary insights and materials." Quoting Austin, Hutcheon (1997, p. 19) ascribes the popularity of interdisciplinarity to its characteristics of "collegiality, flexibility, collaboration, and scholarly breadth." Stephanovic (1997, p. 84) contends that genuine interdisciplinarity "seeks to integrate disciplines in a more truthful reflection of the whole phenomenon under study."

From these descriptions, we can glean that interdisciplinarity involves more than one discipline and results in new connections, integration, and breadth. But even the attempt to define interdisciplinarity is not without problems. Nissani (1995, p. 122) contends that definitions "attempt to confer upon this term a precision it does not possess," and so "run the risk of missing its essential nature." That essential nature is emphasized by Salter and Hearn (1996, p. 174) when they define interdisciplinarity as "the sum of all the challenges offered by researchers to their own disciplines or to the structure of disciplines in general."

Conducting Interdisciplinary Research

When it comes to conducting interdisciplinary research, the act of stepping outside disciplinary "corsetry" (Massey, 1999, p. 5) or "disciplinary bondage" (Kroker, 1980, p. 8) is not easy for many academics. Locker (1994, p. 139) lists why interdisciplinary research is so difficult:

1. Doing interdisciplinary research requires even more time and effort than research in a traditional, narrowly defined discipline.
2. When we work in different paradigms, we disagree about what kind of data is relevant, what kind of analysis is convincing, and indeed what research questions are important.
3. When we import concepts or apply methods from other fields, we are more likely to make conceptual and methodological mistakes.
4. Interdisciplinary research is less likely to be cumulative.

To this list, Kent (1994, pp. 154-5) adds that another reason interdisciplinary research is difficult, and thus avoided, is that it is political. Within the academy, he claims, interdisciplinary research "gets no respect," which results in a version of academic repression that returns as increased specialization to please those power figures in the institution who reward academic work.

In spite of these difficulties, interdisciplinary research is vital, even essential, given the complex issues the academy, and the world, must face. Richards (1996, p. 124) argues that "the basic idea of any interdisciplinary enterprise is that there are concerns and issues that serve to

bring various disciplines together in their exploration." Hutcheon (1997, p. 22) concurs, contending that "some intellectual problems simply do not belong to a single discipline." In the face of growing complexities, disciplinary foundations are receding further and further as researchers focus on common problems such as:

> themes of knowledge, power, resistance, identity, subjectivity, and citizenship; the politics of cultural production at sites previously regarded as non-political including the street, the family, the pub, and the home; the globalisation of markets, money, corporations, and culture; and the rise of post-colonial cultural and environmental challenges. (Anderson, 1996, p. 121)

In her article entitled "The Challenge of Interdisciplinary Research," Locker (1994, p. 142) enumerates the importance of interdisciplinary research in terms of concepts, methods and perspectives. Interdisciplinary concepts illuminate our own work and allow us to extend it, while raising new questions for research. These concepts enable us not only to theorize and contextualize our research, connecting our own findings with larger conversations, but also to reframe our data and theories, so that we see them in new ways and gain new insights.

Interdisciplinary methods are also enabling, helping us to answer different questions and to study both phenomena about which we have hypotheses and phenomena about which too little is known to formulate hypotheses. If used concurrently, interdisciplinary methods provide triangulation. In addition, they ally us with colleagues in more traditional disciplines who are also, increasingly, doing interdisciplinary research, while at the same time satisfying the requirements for good research. Finally, interdisciplinary perspectives may enable us to make truly original and useful contributions to knowledge, as well as to critique both the fields from which we draw and the field in which we are working.

Thus, the benefits of interdisciplinary research are clearly obvious. What is not so obvious is whether this hybrid vigour in research merely reinforces the status quo — resulting in what Kroker (1980, p. 7) describes as "vacant interdisciplinarity" — or whether it has the capacity to challenge it. Part of the answer to this question involves an understanding of critical theory.

Critical Theory

Background

One of the first forms of interdisciplinarity, critical theory originated with the Frankfurt School, a group of German intellectuals who came together in the late 1920s. Although it has roots in Marxism, critical theory questions many of the assumptions made by Marxism and highlights the problems of distorted communication in ways that cut across class lines. As a social theory, critical theory "aims to give us knowledge of society: its structure and its dynamics and its life-world . . . [thus] enabling us to determine what our true interests are" (Nielsen, 1992, p. 265). In essence, it shines a critical light on the workings of society and finds them dominated by the interests of a wealthy elite who have succeeded in convincing most people that those elite interests are also the interests of society at large. In spite of this domination, Max Horkheimer (1972, p. 227), one of the original members of the Frankfurt School, argues that humans can change reality and that the necessary conditions for such change already exist.

In this way, critical theory is both critical and emancipatory — critical in the sense that it critiques capitalist society and emancipatory in the sense that it imagines something better for human beings. These interests are underscored by Welton (1995, p. 14), who defines critical theory as

> a theory of history and society driven by a passionate commitment to understand how ideological systems and societal structures hinder and impede the fullest development of humankind's collective potential to be self-reflective and self-determining historical actors.

Critical theory as a paradigm that frames the way we look at the world involves the cultivation of a critical attitude on all levels. Indeed, Horkheimer (1972, p. 229) was convinced that the future of humanity depended on the existence of the consciously critical attitude, which he conceived as "part of the development of society." While the economy is central to this paradigm, critical theory is not limited to economics, nor does it involve economic determinism. On the contrary, its emancipatory worldview includes vital human agency and creativity. How does the critical-emancipatory orientation of critical theory translate into research?

Critical Theory Research

As a research methodology, critical theory adopts an overtly critical approach to inquiry. It proceeds with an attitude of suspicion, calling into question not only the data itself, but also the researcher, the research design, and the interpretation of findings. Every part of the research process comes under critical scrutiny in order that it neither proceed from taken-for-granted assumptions that serve elite interests, nor result in findings that reinforce the status quo. Critical theory research is, in essence, the political and ideological dimension of research (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 110) that disavows the belief that research can be apolitical, objective and value neutral. It firmly asserts that all research serves certain interests, and that these interests are seldom clarified by traditional forms of research. Critical theory not only chooses to serve critical-emancipatory interests, but also demands that all researchers confront the question of whose interests their research serves.

From a critical theory viewpoint, the task of the social scientist has three dimensions (Dryzek, 1995, p. 99):

1. To understand the ideologically distorted subjective situation of some individual or group;
2. To explore the forces that have caused that situation;
3. To show that these forces can be overcome through awareness of them on the part of the oppressed individual or group in question.

It is clear from this description that critical theory research gets underneath the appearances that many other forms of research merely describe. It is based on the firm belief that "societal conditions are historically created and heavily influenced by the asymmetries of power and special interests, and they can be made the subject of radical change" (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 110).

Given this belief, it is not surprising that critical theory has a long history of criticism of positivism, including positivist research. Indeed, an important method in critical theory research consists of the meticulous examination of theories and research that represent traditional, positivist thinking (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 135).

In terms of verification, Dryzek (1995, p. 99) emphasizes that A critical social science theory is verified not by experimental test or by interpretive plausibility, but rather by action on the part of its audience who decide that, upon reflection, the theory gave a good account of the causes of their sufferings and effectively pointed to their relief. Such verification allies with feminist Patti Lather's (1991) description of the concept of catalytic validity:

> Catalytic validity represents the degree to which the research process re-orients, focuses and energizes participants toward knowing reality in order to transform it, a process Freire terms conscientization. . . .The argument for catalytic validity lies not only within recognition of the reality-altering impact of the research process, but also in the desire to consciously channel this impact so that respondents gain self-understanding and, ultimately, self-determination through research participation. (p. 68)

Dryzek (1995) describes how the critical theory of Jürgen Habermas, a current member of the Frankfurt School, can be fruitfully applied to a research program. First, he argues that Habermas' contrast between strategic and communicative action, and his distinction between system and lifeworld, can provide a framework for the interpretation of many kinds of social phenomena, such as social movements. Second, he maintains that Habermas' concept of communicative rationality can be used as an evaluative principle for evaluating social practices. Using Habermas' version of critical theory, he provides examples of research to assess and compare the degree of authoritarianism prevailing in political systems, to analyze distortions in the mass media, to investigate the level of participation in public inquiries, and to conduct critical ethnography. In terms of applied social science, Dryzek finds the area of planning and policy analysis ripe for applications of critical theory, as well as for "the design of institutions oriented toward consensus or compromise under conditions of free discourse among equals" (p. 109).

All in all, critical theory research aims to increase our awareness of the political nature of social phenomena and to develop the ability of researchers to reflect critically upon those taken-for-granted realities which they are examining and of which they are also — as members of society — an inevitable part (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 111).

One important aspect of critical theory research is its ability to assimilate other research programs. Dryzek (1995, p. 111) argues that critical theory can often be vital in making sense of existing approaches to social science inquiry by liberating them from self-misunderstanding. Given this ability, could an overtly political research orientation like critical theory inform current manifestations of interdisciplinary research?

Exploring the Possibility of Critical Interdisciplinary Research

Can critical theory enhance interdisciplinarity in a research program? A look at the commonalities between these two paradigms will begin to answer this question.

Commonalities

There are a number of commonalities that critical theory and interdisciplinarity share. To begin with, both paradigms are academic outcasts, interdisciplinarity for its disciplinary violations and critical theory for its critique of the status quo. However, while critical theory accepts its outcast status, interdisciplinarity struggles for mainstream acceptance.

Both paradigms also contain some elements of each other. Kellner (n.d., p. 1) reminds us that critical theory is inherently interdisciplinary, describing it as

> a multi-disciplinary approach for social theory which combines perspectives drawn from political economy, sociology, cultural theory, philosophy, anthropology, and history. It thus overcomes the fragmentation endemic to established academic disciplines in order to address issues of broader interest.

Such interdisciplinarity is evident in critical social science, described by Fals Borda (1987, p. 221, cited in Morrow & Torres, 1995, p. 244) as "interdisciplinary in itself." In turn, interdisciplinarity can be seen as potentially critical because of its ability to cross disciplinary boundaries and look at disciplinary understandings in new ways. In the words of Locker (1994, p. 147), "interdisciplinary perspectives can also help us to be more critical, both of the fields from which we draw and of that in which we work." But how often is this critical potential realized in the rush to ride the new wave of interdisciplinary research?

The ability to look at knowledge in new ways forms another common bond between critical theory and interdisciplinarity. By looking at research through the critical lens, critical theory opens up new ways of knowing about the world. In the same vein, interdisciplinarity, by incorporating a more holistic approach to research, can encompass a wider perspective. Indeed, according to Klein (1990, p. 96), "interdisciplinarity signifies a new way of knowing."

Both paradigms can offer the possibility of synthesis. Synthesis is inherent in a dialectical paradigm like critical theory, where thesis and antithesis combine to form a "higher stage of truth" (Webster's, 1990, p. 1198). Synthesis is also immanent in interdisciplinarity, where various forms of knowledge meet and create new knowledge. While that synthesis may not constitute some higher stage of truth, it can, according to Stefanovic (1996, p. 83), embrace a more "holistic" understanding. Both paradigms also encourage reflexive scholarship. Critical theory entails not only critique of the world, but also self-critique. As Alvesson and Sköldberg (2000) maintain when discussing critical theory research, "the process of research must include self-reflection" (p. 144). Interdisciplinarity also includes reflexivity. Kroker (1980, p. 7) argues that interdisciplinarity involves "scholarship, that reflexive habit of mind which insists on the habit of intelligence in the midst of a maelstrom of madness."

Researchers in both paradigms experience disciplinary pressures, although for different reasons. From the critical theory orientation, the pressure on researchers in most disciplines to engage in "normal puzzle-solving science" is very strong (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 133)

and works against a critical perspective. Similarly, from the interdisciplinary orientation, the academic pressure to remain within traditional, established disciplines is not only strong, but also financially and professionally rewarding, thus working against an interdisciplinary perspective.

Building Relations of Suspicion

The commonalities discussed above open up the possibility of infusing interdisciplinarity with critical theory to create a kind of critical interdisciplinarity that can address complex contemporary issues. Such an infusion would move beyond academic trespassing to critical engagement or full-blown confrontation. Two steps are required for this infusion to work. The first step lies in looking at interdisciplinarity in a new way — through the idea of relationships. A relationship implies some sort of connection with the Other, whatever or whoever that Other is. It is a portal between two solitudes that opens up possibilities. Looking at interdisciplinarity from a relational point of view provides a whole new lens for looking at the world. The second step in this infusion involves steeping this relationship with a critical attitude, resulting in interdisciplinary relations of suspicion that question the status quo and open up the road to change.

Doreen Massey (1999) has pioneered the idea of looking at interdisciplinarity relationally. While many people talk about disciplines in terms of boundaries, Massey suggests that it would be better to imagine disciplines in a relational way, "defined not by what they (try to) exclude but by the particularity of their position within a complex net of interrelations" (p. 6). Consequently, interdisciplinary researchers should not see themselves as breaching disciplinary walls or crossing disciplinary boundaries, but as conducting "a range of different kinds of negotiations and accommodations across different pairs and groups of disciplines" (p. 6). Massey sees two advantages to this relational perspective: it provides a potential basis for conversations between disciplines and it exposes to view the relations (both good and bad) that could be the basis and the subject of negotiations (p. 6).

The second step in the alliance between interdisciplinarity and critical theory involves cultivating Horkheimer's critical attitude. Kroker (1980, p. 3) describes interdisciplinarity as "an active migration beyond the disciplines to a critical encounter with different perspectives." This critical encounter imbues Massey's relationality with an air of suspicion that questions every facet of the research project. Such relations of suspicion set the stage for critical interdisciplinarity.

Applications of Critical Interdisciplinary Research

The infusion of interdisciplinarity with critical theory can create a kind of critical interdisciplinarity that is powerful enough to address crucial global issues. [1] Interdisciplinarity itself opens up "new, hybrid spaces" (Massey, 1999, p. 5) such as cultural studies or rural studies. Looking at interdisciplinarity relationally adds the potential of negotiation between these new, hybrid spaces and traditional disciplines. Fusing a critical perspective onto this relational interdisciplinarity gives it the license, one might say, to use these new, hybrid spaces

to critically investigate complex contemporary issues. Two of those issues — globalization and sustainability — can illustrate this idea.

Globalization

Massey's (1999) discussion of globalization illustrates clearly how to work within a critical interdisciplinary framework. While she alludes to a comradely notion of interdisciplinarity when recommending a relational perspective, she also emphasizes that there can be "a range of different kinds of negotiations and accommodations across different pairs and groups of disciplinary borders" (p. 6). Her analysis of globalization shows how to effectively engage on the critical side of negotiations.

Massey argues that, too often, globalization seems to function as a fact, as something unquestionable from within a discipline like sociology (1999, p. 7). As such, globalization seems to lie outside the purview of the discipline and function like some kind of *deus ex machina*. In reality, Massey argues, this is not the case. What we face every day is not some warm and fuzzy interconnection between the peoples and societies of the world, but a highly particular form of globalization — neo-liberal globalization. And neo-liberal globalization is not inevitable, not determined, but what Massey describes as

> a project maintained by a powerful discourse produced in the North of the planet, a discourse with its institutions (the IMF, the World Trade Organization and so on) and its professionals. It is in a very classic way a project maintained by a discourse of inevitability, which precisely serves to hide the agencies and the interests which are producing it. 'Globalization', as a term embedded in this set of discourses, is not so much a description of how the world is as an image in which the world is being made. (1999, p. 7)

In the face of neo-liberal globalization, Massey warns that "we must not draw lines around disciplines in such a way that it makes us unable to question phenomena as significant as this" (1999, p. 8).

In other words, looking at disciplines in terms of boundaries makes many of us either unwilling or unable to cross those boundaries, which, in turn, makes us consider phenomena like globalization as inevitable or given, or as the purview of some other discipline, specifically economics. And this boundary observance is ultimately what Massey calls "our collusion with power" (1999, p. 8). To overcome this collusion with power, Massey suggests that "we should give more serious attention to the nature of relations between the disciplines and abandon over-easy notions of boundary closure" (p. 8).

Specifically, in the face of neo-liberal globalization, Massey advises that there is "an urgent need to activate, and to change, our relationship with the discipline of economics," not attributing some presumed pre-eminence to it and so believing that it has some "unmediated access to the truth," but actively deconstructing it (1999, p. 9). [2] Such active deconstruction would expose economics for what it is: just one more discourse among many, just one more discipline that we should be critically negotiating with. To avoid such negotiation would, according to Massey, be dangerous, not only because we would miss an opportunity to deploy

our skills in fields of enquiry around some of the most important changes going on in today's world, but also because of the currently dominant nature of the discipline of economics itself (1999, p. 8).

By using a critical interdisciplinary perspective, we can look at a discipline like economics relationally and critically negotiate with its current "neoclassical Anglo-Saxon" manifestation (Massey, 1999, p. 8), with the aim of ending its academic, political, social, cultural, and environmental domination. To avoid doing so is to avoid the responsibility of the mission of academia itself, which could be described as the advancement of learning and the dissemination of knowledge. Why let neo-classical economic knowledge control our daily lives in the form of trade agreements, genetically modified food, and environmental pollution? Why abandon the planet to a discipline that is totally blind to the requirements of life and only serves the requirements of money accumulation? Building a relationship with neo-classical economics, from a critical interdisciplinary perspective, gives us the confidence to approach it, challenge it, critique it, and inject new knowledge into our lives — knowledge that can counter the negative impacts of neo-liberal globalization and foster new understandings of what the world could be. One of those new understandings is sustainability.

Sustainability

While neo-liberal globalization includes the pernicious domination of one unchallenged discipline — neo-liberal economics — the concept of sustainability has been adopted by a wide range of disciplines: economics, geography, sociology, political studies, philosophy, ecology, feminist studies, and rural studies. In many ways, it is the perfect candidate for interdisciplinary research. According to Kane (1999, p. 20), "those who have been researching sustainability have often found themselves crossing disciplinary borders." Although many interdisciplinary researchers might see themselves as being involved in border crossings, Massey's notion of relationality opens up new ways of looking at sustainability, and of "establishing meaningful conversations" between and among disciplines on this multi-layered and slippery subject. Adding a critical perspective to this relational understanding of interdisciplinarity enables us to question the identification of sustainability with neo-liberal economic imperatives.

In other words, just as a critical interdisciplinary look at globalization critiques the dominant position of neo-liberal economics, so too can a critical interdisciplinary look at sustainability work to undermine the dominance of this discipline. From the time of the Brundtland Commission, the concept of sustainability has gained worldwide acceptance. But this acceptance is premised on the fact that the Bruntland Commission based its understanding of sustainable development on economic growth, specifically a "five- to tenfold increase" (WCED, 1987, p. 213). With this prestigious endorsement of the economic growth imperative, transnational corporations have given sustainability their international stamp of approval. Shiva (1992, p. 217) explains how this "dangerous" understanding of sustainability refers not to sustaining nature, but to development itself, by "ensuring the continued supply of raw materials for industrial production, the ongoing flow of ever more commodities, [and] the indefinite accumulation of capital." Such an understanding of sustainability aligns it with the "utopia" of neo-liberal globalization promoted by neo-liberal economics.

In environmental terms, this understanding of sustainability has serious consequences:

> If today is a typical day on planet earth, humans will add fifteen million tons of carbon to the atmosphere, destroy 115 square miles of tropical rainforest, create seventy-two square miles of desert, eliminate between forty to one hundred species, erode seventy-one million tons of topsoil, add twenty-seven hundred tons of CFCs to the stratosphere, and increase their population by 263,000. Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. By year's end the total numbers will be staggering: an area of tropical rainforest the size of the state of Kansas lost; seven to ten billion tons of carbon added to the atmosphere; a total population increase of ninety million. (Orr, 1992, p. 3)

In human terms, the consequences for such an understanding of sustainability are just as dire. The losers in the "casino capitalism" that is neo-liberal globalization, according to a United Nations Human Development Report, include

> the 1.3 billion people living on a dollar a day or less, the 160 million malnourished children, the one-fifth of the world's population not expected to live beyond 40, and the 100 million people in the West who are living below the poverty line. (Brittain & Elliott, 1997, p. 23)

In the face of this evidence, we might well ask, "Whose sustainability are we promoting?" Without a critical relationship to the discipline that dominates current understandings of sustainability, the answer would be, "Everybody's sustainability," as long as they tighten their belts, slash their public sectors, privatize their public services, overturn their environmental legislation, rescind their health and safety regulations, and abolish their labour laws. Without a critical relationship to the discipline of neo-liberal economics, we would accept and obey these "restructuring" requirements, believing in the rhetoric of the inevitability of neo-liberal globalization. Critical interdisciplinarity not only opens up the possibility of activating, and changing, our relationship with the discipline of neo-liberal economics, but also encourages it to happen. The same engagement can be opened with other disciplines, building that "range of different kinds of negotiations and accommodations" that Massey refers to, but always with an overtly critical perspective.

Conclusion

Always controversial, interdisciplinarity has yet to acquire the notoriety that comes with a critical approach to research. But without a critical approach, facilitated by taking a relational point of view to disciplines, interdisciplinary researchers run the risk of colluding with power, reinforcing the status quo, contributing to current problems, and blocking paths to progressive change. Critical theory can actively inform interdisciplinarity, preventing it from becoming just one more form of narrow-minded investigation that merely dilutes established disciplines. In the face of crises of planetary proportions — global warming, exponential poverty, dwindling supplies of fresh water — we simply can't afford *not* to establish a critical relationship with

academic disciplines. As we carry out our interdisciplinary research programs, we need, above all, to cultivate relations of suspicion, taking nothing for granted, questioning all assumptions and revealing whose interests our research will serve.

Notes

1. Arthur Kroker (1980) pioneered the concept of critical interdisciplinarity in his theoretical discussions of Canadian studies. His understanding of critical interdisciplinarity, however, was not formally allied with critical theory. He describes critical interdisciplinarity as "a style of knowledge, a method of discourse in which the principle of selection is the intrinsic one of giving birth to reason by means of collective deliberation on public problems"(p. 8).

2. Stone (2000) agrees, arguing that "economics has hegemonic tendencies in the social sciences and has been intellectually imperialistic"(p. 249). She adds that "other disciplinary and practitioner perspectives can 'house train' economists" (p. 249).

Works Cited

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. 2000. *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Anderson, K. 1996. In the place of trans-disciplinary space. *Australian Geographical Studies*, *34*(1), 121-125.

Brittain, V., & Elliott, L. (1997, June 22). World's poor lose out to corporations. *Guardian Weekly*, 23.

Dryzek, J. S. (1995). Critical theory as a research program. In S. K. White (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Habermas*, 97-119. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical theory: Selected essays*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell and others. Toronto: Herder and Herder.

Hutcheon, L. (1997). Disciplinary formation, faculty pleasure, and student risks. *ADE Bulletin*, *117* 117(Fall), 19-22.

Kane, M. (1999). Sustainability concepts: From theory to practice. In J. Köhn, J. Gowdy, F. Hinterberger & J. van der Straaten (Eds.), *Sustainability in question: The search for a conceptual framework*, 15-31. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Kellner, D. (n.d.). *Critical theory and the crisis of social theory.* Retrieved December 4, 1997, from http://www.uta.edu/huma/ illuminations/kell5.htm

Kent, T. (1994). Interdisciplinary research and disciplinary toleration: A reply to Kitty Locker. *Journal of Business Communication*, *3* 3(2), 153-155.

Klein, J. T. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory and practice*. Detroit: Wayne State UP.

Kroker, A. (1980). Migration from the disciplines. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, *15* (3), 3-10.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.

Locker, K. O. (1994). The challenge of interdisciplinary research. *Journal of Business Communication*, *31*(2), 137-151.

Massey, D. (1999). Negotiating disciplinary boundaries." *Current Sociology*, *47*(4), 5-12.

Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (1995). *Social theory and education: A critique of theories of social and cultural reproduction*. Albany: State University of New York P.

Nielsen, K. (1992). On the status of critical theory." *Interchange*, 23(3), 265-284.

Nissani, M. (1995). Fruits, salads, and smoothies: A working definition of interdisciplinarity. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 29(2), 121-128.

Orr, D. W. (1992). *Ecological literacy: Education and the transition to a postmodern world*. Albany: State University of New York P.

Richards, D. G. (1996). The meaning and relevance of 'synthesis' in interdisciplinary studies. *The Journal of Education*, 45(2), 114-128.

Salter, L., & Hearn, A. (1996). *Outside the lines: Issues in interdisciplinary research*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP.

Shiva, V. (1992). Resources. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*, 206-218. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books.

Stefanovic, I. L. (1997). An integrative framework for sustainability: The Hamilton Harbour ecosystem. *Ekistics*, 384, 83-91.

Stefanovic, I. L. (1996). Interdisciplinarity and wholeness: Lessons from eco-research on the Hamilton Harbour ecosystem. *Environments: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 23(3), 74-94.

Stone, D. (2000). Knowledge, power and policy. In D. Stone (Ed.), *Banking on knowledge: The genesis of the global development network*, 241-258. New York: Routledge.

WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development). (1987). *Our common future*. New York: Oxford UP.

Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary. (1990). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Welton, M. (ed.). (1995). *In defense of the lifeworld*. Albany: State University of New York P.