1. Introduction: making inclusion work in academia

Janne Tienari, Susan Meriläinen and Saija Katila

This book is for inclusion and multiplicity in academia. To this end, it is against standardization. As academics in Western countries, we are being organized to conform to rigid standards of teaching and research. This book shows how we can meaningfully challenge such standardization through inclusive practices in our everyday work. We – the authors in this edited volume – present inclusive ideas and ways of interacting that have worked in different university contexts around the world. We share our personal experiences on working for inclusion, account for the relative success of our efforts and provide insights that may prove helpful for others, too.

We care passionately about inclusion in academic work. For us, inclusion means bringing in new voices, themes and methods in teaching and research. Most often, inclusion refers in this book to incorporating considerations of gender and ethnicity in the ways in which curricula, courses and research projects are developed and run. By questioning established power relations, privileged knowledge and locally held truths regarding good and proper academic standards and practice, we have each in our own way sought to challenge the status quo. We have sought to make alternative understandings and practices visible.

We are aware of current criticism of ‘positive scholarship’ (Fineman, 2006). We distance ourselves from this notion. As feminist organization and management scholars we have learned not to be naive. We are aware of unequal power relations and structures of domination that our work is embedded in. These relations and structures are woven into the fabric of our academic lives, even if we sometimes refer to particular experiences as positive. Also, our stories relate to relative success in changing everyday academic practices, not to great breakthroughs or unselfish service to community. In this way, we also distance ourselves from the notion of ‘engaged scholarship’, which has in recent years become a popular concept to describe meaningful academic work. Engaged scholarship can refer to admirable efforts to incorporate key stakeholders’ perspectives in the study of complex social problems
(Van de Ven, 2007). However, especially in the US, it has been appropriated as a label by the university institution – and it has thus become marketized. Ours is a more bottom-up approach, with a focus on everyday practices in local units embedded in particular institutional and cultural contexts.

We have crafted this book with three main audiences in mind. First, we aim to bring hope to those teachers and researchers who feel disheartened in the contemporary globalizing academia that sets the stage for organizing teaching and research. We want to show that it is possible to challenge standardization and survive. Second, PhD students may find the book helpful in their search for meaningful ways to navigate an academic world that often seems awkward and incomprehensible – at least judging from our own experiences and those of others with whom we have discussed the issue. Third, we are bold enough to hope that more mainstream scholars and decision-makers will also get hold of this book and find some food for thought in it.

Our message is that we can make a difference, although working for inclusion today takes place in a global system that does not appear to be receptive to such efforts. There are strong forces for convergence in academia according to an Anglo-American model, which is obsessed with audits and assessments based on standardized criteria (Engwall, 2007). Beyond these supposedly global processes, however, local contexts continue to differ. Local standardizers differ with respect to both outlook and room for manoeuvring. Crucially, then, enhancing inclusive practices and carving out a space for action demands understanding of local power structures, actors and established practices. For this reason, the authors of this book turn to their own experiences to highlight the emotional and political struggles in bringing about change. At the same time, we argue that there is something to be learned in each chapter that can be tailored to fit local conditions elsewhere.

IN THE SYSTEM

Most contributors to this book are organization and management scholars. Many of us work in business schools, where it is clear that the nature of academic work is changing. There is increasing control over what we do as academics, when and how we do it, and to whom we are responsible. The hegemonic global academic system standardizes work through three intertwining elements: teaching, research and funding. Yet, as Myrtle P. Bell (2009) puts it, we must constantly seek to do work that matters.

First, what and how we teach is increasingly determined by the logic of the market and business enterprise. The paradox is obvious. There are increasing pressures to provide academic education that is both innovative enough to satisfy the needs of business, yet cost-effective enough to satisfy policy-
makers in their quest for lean government. On the one hand, rhetoric that celebrates excellence and innovativeness affects the content and form of our work. Universities are in a quest for global quality certificates, and different kinds of rankings and indexes play a huge role in the provision and assessment of education (Hedmo et al., 2005; Wedlin, 2007). Deans, department heads and administrators eagerly follow university rankings provided by global business media and the like.

On the other hand, paradoxically, volume continues to be king for most of us. In practice, universities continue to be governed by principles of cost-effectiveness. We are required to produce (sic) an adequate number of MSc, MBA and PhD degrees for our student-customers every year, and we are monitored on the basis of the volume of our output. While the excellence rhetoric urges us to compare ourselves to, and compete with, the likes of Harvard and MIT, our resources remain trifling by comparison. At the same time, the power of the business community and student-customers limits our possibilities to make curriculum changes that are considered by deans and department heads as risky. It is difficult to offer courses not considered part of the so-called core of the field. In these conditions, it is hard to be different and to offer, for example, teaching that draws on critical feminist or race theory. The very notion of being critical tends to make students, colleagues and administrators feel uncomfortable or even threatened. This is the case specifically if there is no time and space to explain to them what critical theorizing is about and what it can offer.

Second, practices of research are changing worldwide. Rankings and indexes are, if possible, even more influential in assessing research than they are in teaching. With the touch of a button,1 the output of each and every individual scholar is available online to deans and department heads. Journal articles are (over)valued as our academic performance indicators. We are encouraged by our host universities to report our research findings in article format, and to plan our publication strategies so that we target our work in journals that are thought to have the highest impact as measured by popular rankings and citation indexes.2 As individuals, we are encouraged to climb the rankings and indexes; to strive for world class performance as if objective and individual standards were possible.

The politics of distribution affects our work – and the gatekeepers in the system are typically mainstream scholars who have little tolerance for what they consider unorthodox research (Westwood and Clegg, 2003). The high-impact ‘top’ journals idolized in the system tend to favour particular kinds of research and reporting (Adler and Harzing, 2009). They cherish positivist and functionalist research that is technically elegant. In doing so, they scorn original and avant garde contributions, especially critical ones. They seldom provide opportunities for alternative or critical theorizing that would foster
more inclusion (Özbilgin, 2009). Critical theorists often need to make do with alternative channels for making their work known.

To be sure, many scholars are critical or even hostile towards rankings that for them represent unnecessary control and interference with academic freedom. Journal rankings and the publishing practices these rankings support have been criticized for being circular, self-fulfilling and marked by gamesmanship (Macdonald and Kam, 2007). Also, as all the ‘top’ journals in fields such as business and management are published in the Anglo-American cultural sphere and in the English language, we non-native English speakers from peripheral countries face an extra burden in the contemporary global academic system (Thomas et al., 2009; Tietze and Dick, 2009).

Third, the doing of research is increasingly tied to successful efforts to obtain external funding for research projects that are focused, on the one hand, and that address issues that are considered directly relevant for business practice, on the other. Needless to say, obtaining external funding often depends on the support of mainstream scholars and on adherence to topics deemed timely by those who finance the undertaking, that is state apparatuses (directly and through intermediary organizations), private foundations and business as well as supranational institutions such as the European Union. Those who fund research not only dictate the relevant topics, but often also the number and type of (international) partners in the research, thus also influencing the creation of collaborative networks among academics.

In sum, the contemporary hegemonic global academic system appears to be unwelcoming to those who question standardization and the mainstream. Why do we call the system hegemonic, then? Well, it is not a given that an article published in a high-prestige journal contributes more to knowledge than work appearing in less prestigious journals (Starbuck, 2005). Yet, we are led to believe that this is the case, and provided with incentives to act accordingly. The system seduces us to do what everyone else seems to be doing, not by direct force but by consent (Meriläinen et al., 2008; Nkomo, 2009). At the same time, the wide range of examples in this book demonstrates that to work for inclusion in contemporary academia is not impossible. On the contrary, it is not only possible, it can be meaningful – and it can lead to what we would consider positive experiences and outcomes.

DOUBLE STRATEGIES

Clearly, it would be safer to comply with the contemporary system and do mainstream teaching and research, rather than to follow one’s passion. Many of us who are not lucky enough to have an established position are forced to carry out double strategies in order to be taken seriously. We have chosen a
path of engagement with the mainstream (Grey, 2008). In this vein, we call double strategies those practices that scholars like us engage in to cope with the pressures for standardization in academic work, without compromising (too many of) our principles and ideals. Below, we reflect upon such double strategies from the position and viewpoint of scholars outside the Anglo-American core, in our case Finland.

One example of a double strategy is to attempt to publish actively in sufficiently highly ranked international journals that are open to non-mainstream research, and in this way carve out a local position for being critical or different, with a proven track record in global academia. With experience in publishing internationally (in English), it is often a little less difficult back home to find room for tackling alternative research topics and to introduce these topics in teaching. Conforming to the hegemonic academic system can thus be used as an advantage in the local context. Rankings and indexes can be used strategically as long as there are journals that are open to the non-mainstream and enjoy a relatively good standing in the international community.

The catch is that in order to get stuff published, one must usually sacrifice some of one’s principles. For example, we have found it difficult to convince our colleagues in other countries that reporting on data from Finland is interesting per se. Sometimes we are forced to downplay the Finnish context in our research reports when we try to make our theoretical point. A viable double strategy, then, is to engage in cross-cultural comparative studies. This not only proves our international outlook back home, but it gives us an opportunity to both highlight the Finnish context (which is important for us Finns) and to put it into scrutiny vis-à-vis other cultural contexts. Comparative studies across national boundaries can also be great fun, given that the collaborators are prepared to reflect upon the joint experience. This is particularly pertinent when the cross-cultural comparison involves scholars from the Anglo-American core, who – unlike us – are not encouraged by the system to reflect on the specificities of their own cultural context (Meriläinen et al., 2008; Thomas et al., 2009).

Yet another possible strategy is to build on sophisticated, alternative and critical theories in teaching, and to carve out a position locally on this basis. There is a distinct possibility that a divide between teaching universities and research universities is currently being manufactured, and that this affects what it means to be an academic in each setting. For academics working in teaching universities in peripheral countries such as Finland, being theoretically sophisticated may prove important in two ways. First, on the individual level, it helps in constructing a comfortable academic identity. Second, theoretically oriented people may be appreciated in teaching universities because they keep up academic standards. This, in turn, is based on the fact that keeping up standards is...
important for legitimizing the university within the national system of higher education.

In this book, we share positive experiences of intervening in teaching and research. We reflect on inclusive practices that seem to have worked in the Netherlands, Austria, Sweden, Finland and the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada as well as Australia and New Zealand. The contributors to this book – with very different backgrounds, acting in very different academic milieus – have each tried out some of the double strategies outlined above, carving out solutions that work for them. The geographical scope in this book is far from exhaustive, but we hope that the contributions offered will serve as a catalyst for scholars in other contexts to bring their stories forward.

WRITING ABOUT POSITIVE EXPERIENCES

There is a strong element of autobiography and autoethnography throughout the book. We look at academic work through personal accounts, which are reflexive and contextual (Ellis and Bocher, 2000, 2006). We write about ourselves in relation to others, and connect the personal with the social and the cultural (Katila and Meriläinen, 1999, 2002). The concept of situated knowledge captures this well (Haraway, 1991; Calás and Smircich, 2006). We view knowledge as contextualized. It is linked to time and place; to particular situations and actors. The authors in this book are viewed as situated knowers who reflect upon their own everyday experiences, practices and understandings. A sense of confession is inherent in the stories – it cannot, and should not, be avoided (Lemons, 2008).

However, we are conscious of the fact that what stands as autoethnography remains unclear and contested, and that the form of autoethnography advocated in this book may have its limitations (Anderson, 1999; Buzard, 2003; Charmaz, 2006). Throughout the book, the authors’ claims to autoethnographic authority are not attempts to close meaning and advocate singular interpretations of social reality. The stories reflect on how the authors have each acquired knowledge of the particular local contexts – that is, universities and their particular traditions and practices – they describe and make sense of, and how, on this basis, they assume a form of authority to speak about these contexts.

Our goal is also to be critical in an approachable way (Grey, 2008). Approachable means that as editors of this book, we have tried to persuade the authors to be personal and practical and to avoid theorization in their texts. However, as you can see in the various chapters, academics manage to be personal and reflexive, but it seems to be difficult for them to avoid the temptation of framing their experiences vis-à-vis particular theories. This is only
natural and, reconsidering the issue, we came to the conclusion that it adds to
the appeal of the book. This is how academics are… and how they choose to
frame their experiences theoretically is interesting in its own right. Also, it
enables readers to follow the reasoning on the basis of which the authors
assume autoethnographic authority. In a similar vein, this introduction is
merely one possible interpretation of the variety of experiences and under-
standings offered in the chapters. Other interpretations may be equally plausi-
ble.

Furthermore, as feminist organization and management scholars we know
that by being personal and positive we are easy prey to fellow critical schol-
ars who like to remind us about the futile nature of our efforts in the big
picture, in supporting the hegemony rather than challenging it. This is under-
standable because working for inclusion is a notoriously difficult task
(Danowitz Sagaria, 2007). There are plenty of texts documenting disappoint-
ments, and for good reason. In a recent book, a team of Swedish feminist
scholars led by Professor Anna Wahl shared their experiences and insights in
struggling to make their voices heard in public arenas (Wahl et al., 2008).
Sweden is popularly considered an egalitarian society where gender issues are
a serious concern. However, Wahl and her colleagues have first-hand experi-
ences of another Sweden. They tell stories of being ignored, ridiculed and
attacked with aggressive rhetoric when they have worked to promote feminist
scholarship and ideas.

Our point of departure in the present book is that to work for inclusion, ‘we
must begin with understanding our subjective orientations and commitments
as well as our motivations and desires’ (Nkomo, 2009, p. 109). On this basis,
the journey to inclusion is often step-wise. First, we need to be able to describe
and account for current practices in different academic milieus. Second, we
need to be prepared to ask questions about the status quo; the taken-for-
granted practices it sustains and the knowledge it privileges. Third, and only
then, we are ready to offer constructive alternatives and provide suggestions
for change. In other words, we must be prepared to move from constitutive
questions (what? how?) via critical and evaluative questions (how good is it?)
to constructive questions (how could it be otherwise?). We need to be prepared
to move from practical questions to more political and moral ones (Räsänen et
al., 2005; Korpiaho et al., 2007).

The authors of the chapters of this book have in their own local contexts
and in their own distinctive ways gone through these steps (though not always
in the same order). We feel that the time is right for sharing experiences of
alternatives and alternative understandings. Of course, the three-step journey
outlined is no guarantee for positive outcomes. Anna Wahl and her colleagues
have followed the steps, but nevertheless experienced a mixed response to
their efforts.
We are also aware that our efforts for inclusion are affected by gendered and racialized power relations that are difficult to challenge, let alone change (Mohanty, 2004; Acker, 2006). We know that we are privileged. Unlike many people around the world, we do not have to worry about how to get food on our tables every day – or to fear being imprisoned or worse if we speak our minds and work for inclusion. We also realize that what we mean by inclusion in our Western local settings may not make sense in other contexts. In fact, we do not even claim that we have managed to change or seriously challenge power relations in our own societies as a whole. What we have done, however, is introduce change in everyday local practices that we are involved in.

**MAKING INCLUSION WORK**

Without conscious efforts to the contrary, the content and form of our curricula, the courses we offer our students and the research we carry out will address a decreasing number of topics deemed legitimate by a mainstream elite. A decreasing number of ‘truths’ about social life will be privileged. Without intervening in mundane everyday practices the voices heard and appreciated will become ever fewer. Throughout the book, we offer examples of interventions that have challenged standardization. The book is structured in three parts.

**Developing Curricula**

The first part of the book includes contributions by Patrizia Zanoni and Hans Siebers (The Netherlands), Mary Ann Danowitz and Frank Tuitt (USA), and Regine Bendl and Angelika Schmidt (Austria). The three chapters present examples of how curricula are developed and institutional arrangements are challenged to foster inclusiveness in different university settings.

In Chapter 2, Patrizia Zanoni and Hans Siebers share with us their experiences and insights in tackling ethnic and cultural inequality in The Netherlands. Patrizia and Hans work in Tilburg University, a relatively new university in a small city in the southern part of the country. They take us through a journey that resulted in the successful introduction of a new Masters’ Programme in the Organization of Cultural Diversity. Reflecting on their joint efforts with a number of colleagues, Patrizia and Hans call themselves tempered radicals who seized the moment to make a difference (Meyerson and Scully, 1995). Dutch society is currently marked by ethnic tensions, and there is a dire need for competences related to diversity. The double strategy of Patrizia, Hans and their colleagues was to draw on this need and to work towards building a more inclusive society.
In Chapter 3, Mary Ann Danowitz and Frank Tuitt introduce us to the University of Denver in western USA. Mary Ann and Frank offer us an opportunity to follow in their footsteps the building of an inclusive curriculum for doctoral studies. Similarly to Patrizia and Hans, the focus in Mary Ann and Frank’s chapter is on ethnicity and culture. They designed and implemented a PhD programme that builds on inclusive knowledge and pedagogies. To do so successfully, Mary Ann and Frank needed to adopt a strategic approach, starting from the description of positions and search committee membership to the precise ways course offerings and pedagogies were changed. Changes that appeared minor and technical eventually became substantial and structural.

In Chapter 4, Regine Bendl and Angelika Schmidt take us to Vienna in Austria. Regine and Angelika work at the Vienna University of Economics and Business. They provide us with a historical account of the joint efforts of a large number of female scholars to institutionalize gender studies and the inclusion of women in a traditionally male-dominated university. Through their personal reflections, Regine and Angelika offer insights on what it means to be an active feminist scholar at an Austrian university. Their story brings forward the ambiguity of ‘success’ and how it is linked to particular viewpoints and interpretations.

Reworking Pedagogy

The second part of the book includes contributions by Myrtle P. Bell (USA), Sandra Billard (Australia), Ulla Eriksson-Zetterquist (Sweden), and David M. Boje (USA). The four chapters focus on efforts by scholars to set examples and to rework pedagogy.

In Chapter 5, Myrtle P. Bell shares with us her personal account of teaching diversity issues in a university in a conservative southern state in the US. Myrtle reflects on her own solutions that have worked at the University of Texas in Arlington. She discusses challenging erroneous views and misunderstandings that students in the US have about minorities, and about different people in general. Using herself as an example, Myrtle offers us hands-on advice on how to tackle diversity in the classroom. By coupling her own experiences and those of the students with research evidence and statistical data, Myrtle has managed to make students rethink their deeply held stereotypical perceptions of different groups of people.

In Chapter 6, Sandra Billard moves our focus down under to the state of Victoria in Australia. Sandra works at the University of Ballarat, a small town near Melbourne. She shows how respecting difference and inclusion can be taught to business school students in courses that are not explicitly created to tackle these issues. Sandra reflects on her experiences in teaching a year-long action learning and research programme, and explores the
practical interventions, strategies and methods that can be used to facilitate effective ‘doing’ of difference in such a setting.

In Chapter 7, Ulla Eriksson-Zetterquist provides an account of promoting gender equality at the School of Business, Economics and Law at Gothenburg University on the western coast of Sweden. As a novice PhD student some ten years ago, Ulla became involved in a project that shaped her identity as a feminist academic. Together with a colleague, she managed a state-funded project that aimed at increasing academics’ knowledge of the role of gender in teaching. Ulla reflects on how despite several obstacles along the way the project successfully raised awareness of gender issues throughout the School, and provided an important learning experience for her personally. Ulla’s chapter highlights the importance of taking different university sub-cultures – or academic tribes (Ylijoki, 1998) – into account when working for inclusion.

In Chapter 8, David M. Boje takes a different perspective on inclusion. David works in New Mexico State University, on the Rio Grande river in Las Cruces, USA. David is a critical postmodernist scholar who over the past ten years has been active in using the internet as a means of sharing his insights on society and on different ways to make it more inclusive. David discusses the pros and cons of developing websites as a free-to-public pedagogy, moving beyond linear and sequential approaches into networked interconnectivity.

**Shifting Strategies and Identities**

The third part of the book includes contributions by Judith K. Pringle, Rachel Wolfgramm and Ella Henry (New Zealand), Jean Helms Mills and Albert Mills (Canada), Beverly Dawn Metcalfe (UK), and Elina Henttonen and Kirsi LaPointe (Finland). The four chapters focus on shifting research strategies and academic identities.

In Chapter 9, Judith K. Pringle, Rachel Wolfgramm and Ella Henry provide us with an account of what it means to do research in a cross-ethnic team in contemporary New Zealand, which is marked by historical relations between Māoris (the indigenous people) and Pakeha (settlers of European origin). Judith and Ella are affiliated with Auckland University of Technology, while Rachel works at the University of Auckland. The three scholars with different ethnic backgrounds share their joint experiences in research projects, and reflect on how they have managed to find a shared epistemological terrain, and create equitable research relationships across historically fractured ethnic lines while studying indigenous communities.

In Chapter 10, Jean Helms Mills and Albert Mills reflect on their lives as researchers and teachers. Jean and Albert work in St Mary’s University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, on the eastern coast of Canada. They explore the influence of what they call sensemaking communities on events that they have
been part of and on theoretical work that they have been engaged in. Jean and Albert’s chapter offers a self-consciously retrospective sense of the development of ideas and strategies over time, offering critical sensemaking as a valuable heuristic for examining gender discrimination in particular.

In Chapter 11, Beverly Dawn Metcalfe shares with us her journey as an academic in several universities in the United Kingdom. Acknowledging that a feminist pedagogy is increasingly difficult within the neo-liberal, market-oriented UK academia (Morley, 1999), Beverly tells us a story of how she has developed different modes of teaching and research identities dependent on local context. She describes how different spaces have provided her with different opportunities and obstacles as a feminist scholar. Beverly offers positive reflections of her feminist pedagogic practice while teaching a range of undergraduate and postgraduate equality and diversity courses in UK universities.

In Chapter 12, Elina Henttonen and Kirsi LaPointe take us up north to the Helsinki School of Economics in Finland. Elina and Kirsi relate their experiences and emotional turmoil in becoming academics at the Department of Organizations and Management in HSE. This is an academic community that we – the editors of this book – know only too well. Saija and Susan both did their PhDs there, before moving to other universities in Finland. Janne has just moved back to the HSE after eight years at another university. Elina and Kirsi’s account reflects on Saija and Susan’s work to foster gender equality in the Department in the 1990s and early 2000s. Elina and Kirsi provide a story of how they have benefited from their predecessors’ work, on the one hand, and how it is a constant struggle to keep gender awareness on the departmental agenda, on the other.

Conclusions

Finally, in Chapter 13, Silvia Gherardi from the University of Trento in northern Italy comments on the key points in the various chapters of the book, and offers her insights on inclusion in academia. Silvia’s work first got us interested in gender studies in the early 1990s (Gheradi, 1995). We found Silvia’s insightful ideas – for example, in developing the notion of doing gender (West and Zimmerman, 1987) – helpful in moulding our respective identities as academics. Later, we discovered her work on practice-based theorizing on learning and knowing in organizations (Gherardi, 2000). In this book, Silvia comments on notions such as being critical and positive, provides a practice-theoretical reading of the other chapters, and offers a theorization of inclusion on this basis. Silvia maintains that ‘this is a book which discusses academic practice without directly naming it’, and goes on to offer the missing piece in the puzzle.
In brief, the thread running through the chapters in this book is that local context matters in working for inclusion (cf. Klein and Harrison, 2007). Despite the forces for convergence, national academic systems and cultures remain distinct. Within the Anglo-American core itself, there is a lot of variety to be cherished (Korpiaho et al., 2007). The space for working for inclusion varies (Meriläinen et al., 2009). Different spaces must be enacted differently.

Considerations of context lead us back to the notion of situated knowledge. We seek to account for why particular practices seem to have worked in particular contexts (Haraway, 1991). In general, the answer is simple: the scholars in this book have managed to make inclusion work because they have been sensitive to local traditions, power relationships, social practices and situations. What works in one place does not necessarily work elsewhere, and what does not seem to work in a specific setting may well work elsewhere. Similarly, what works at one point in time may not work in another, and vice versa (Bell and Berry, 2007).

The chapters in this book differ in their specific messages. However, there are also notable similarities across the chapters. It is safe to say that in making inclusion work, academics need to be able to rely on one or, usually, several of the following. First, a little help from your friends is always a good idea. Making inclusion work is generally more productive and definitely more fun if you embark upon the journey together with others. Second, it is not a cliché that support from the top is often crucial if you want to do something new or different. Many of the authors in this book are candid about the fact that they have benefited from the open mind of one or several people in positions of authority in their universities.

Third, carpe diem. Timing is crucial. Seizing the right moment to act is paramount. This relates to the three steps presented above. Sometimes it suffices to describe and account for current practices in different academic milieus. Sometimes scholars need to be prepared to go beyond this and ask questions about the status quo; the taken-for-granted practices it sustains and the knowledges it privileges. Sometimes windows of opportunity are open to offer constructive alternatives and work for change. Fourth, and finally, courage and patience are necessary. Doing things differently takes a lot of guts, because someone is bound to judge you – or even to stab you in the back (metaphorically speaking). Criticism may come both from the mainstream elite and from fellow critical thinkers. Challenges can, however, be overcome in time. Used wisely, a bit of passion and reflection goes a long way.
NOTES

2. For example, ISI Web of Knowledge, owned by the global publishing house Thomson Reuters, has managed to become one of the current global standards.
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