

CHAPTER CONTENTS

• Theorizing Globalization	43
<i>Connecting the Local and Global</i>	44
<i>Time–Space Compression and Scapes</i>	46
• Existing Approaches to Resistance	49
<i>Traditional Approaches</i>	50
<i>Postmodern Approaches</i>	54
<i>Discourse-centered Approach</i>	58
<i>Feminist Approaches</i>	63
<i>Postcolonialism and Subaltern Studies</i>	66
• Resistance in a Global Context	71
<i>Transnational Activism: The New Global Movement</i>	71
<i>Generating Issues and Mobilizing Resources</i>	73
<i>Transformative Potential</i>	75
• Conclusion	75
• References	78

2 Theorizing Resistance in a Global Context

Processes, Strategies, and Tactics in Communication Scholarship

Mahuya Pal

Purdue University

Mohan J. Dutta

Purdue University

In recent years, we have witnessed an increase in scholarship documenting the relevance of theorizing resistance in communication scholarship in globalization contexts. Historically, communication scholars have studied resistance in organizational communication, public relations, health communication, gender, and rhetoric. Our review of this research documents the common threads among distinct yet interdependent lines of scholarship, and we identify additional ways in which communication theorists have explored resistance (and processes for communicating resistance) in the contexts of power, ideology, and hegemony. We conclude our chapter by discussing the need to theorize power, subordination, and resistance as complex and intertwined processes in light of globalization that play out in the complicated terrains of transnational hegemony. In so doing, we suggest an overarching framework for locating studies of resistance in the realm of globalization politics and connecting resistance theories in communication to the possibilities for transformative politics.

The processes of globalization have widened the disparities between the developed and developing nations. The flow of capital determined by the pro-market economy—which protects the interest of transnational corporations—remains central to these disparities (Miyoshi, 1995). However, the flow of capital intersects with resistance efforts that counter the hegemonic forces and system (Tarrow, 2005). Enactment of such resistance within

Correspondence: Mahuya Pal and Mohan J. Dutta, Department of Communication, Steven C. Beering Hall of Liberal Arts and Education 2114, Purdue University, 100 North University Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907-2098 USA. Phone: 765-494-3429; Fax: 765-496-1394; E-mail: mpal@purdue.edu; mdutta@purdue.edu

dominant configuration of capital holds the potential to advance social change by emphasizing an equitable structure of development.

Increasingly, communication scholars have started attending to the concept of resistance as a communicative strategy in the realm of globalization (Cloud, 2001; Cox, 2004; Ganesh et al., 2005; Grossberg, 1993; Holmer Nadesan, 2001). As globalization opens up the doors of nation states to the dominant configurations of transnational capitalism accompanied by the dramatic rise in global inequalities (Lyotard, 1984; Millen & Holtz, 2000; Millen et al., 2000), they also generate new avenues for theorizing resistance as enacted in the context of the rapid diffusion of global capitalism. Against the backdrop of this divide between “North” (wealthy countries in the northern hemisphere) and “South” (poorer developing countries; see Melkote & Steeves, 2001), scholars conceptualize resistance in terms of the communicative processes and messages that seek to counter the dominant structures of power (i.e., efforts to maintain the status quo in transnational configurations); they treat resistance as active and manifest in the form of communicative practices (Cheney & Cloud, 2006). Theorizing about resistance offers opportunities for conceptualizing and enacting social change in the global arena, challenging the dominant structures of power that create and sustain the conditions of marginalization, and presenting the voices of marginalized cultural and economic sectors of the global complex that have historically been silenced by powerful actors. In our review of communication scholarship, we pay particular attention to those areas within the discipline of communication that have explored this active communicative nature of resistance, specifically considering communicative practices that oppose dominant structures.

The significance of examining communicative processes through which stakeholders enact resistance has become particularly relevant in the realm of globalization processes that have brought the role of resistance in challenging the dominant structures to the forefront (Ganesh et al., 2005). In the communication literature, scholars have investigated resistance in the areas of organizational communication, public relations, health communication, gender, and rhetoric. Organizational communication scholars have traditionally focused on resistance with regard to internal organizational publics (Larson & Tompkins, 2005; Mumby, 1993a, 1993b; Tracy, 2000; Tretheway, 1997); public relations researchers have explored resistance by activist groups (see Dozier & Lauzen, 2000; Dutta & Pal, 2007; Murphy & Dee, 1992); health communication scholars have studied individual practices within the physician-patient relationship and participatory processes that challenge unhealthy structures (Dutta-Bergman, 2004a, 2004b; Zoller, 2005). Moreover, the literature on resistance and gender has detailed the ways in which social actors challenge patriarchal practices through their everyday practices as well as through their participation in transformative politics (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004; Buzzanell, 1994, 1995), and rhetoricians have historically analyzed message strategies utilized by social movements

to mobilize action and the discursive spheres for political action. (Stewart et al., 2006)

This chapter theorizes about the possibilities of conceptualizing resistance to the dominant structures in the realm of globalization politics, explores the empirical research on resistance, and creates strategic opportunities for action, situating these discussions in light of the globalization processes that maintain and propagate the domination of transnational hegemony (Krugman, 2002). This examination of resistance also establishes a foundation for future scholarship on resistance, particularly in the context of globalization processes. Such theorizing about resistance offers entry points for new theory building that acknowledges the multiple processes and ways through which individuals, groups, and communities come to organize themselves and challenge the dominant structures that constrain their lives and to spark change. These processes create the substratum for understanding the ways in which individual and collective entities seek to transform the ideologies, practices, and institutions that serve as sites of the dominant hegemony in the realm of transnationalism (Ganesh et al., 2005). This review begins by describing the literature on globalization, following with a discussion of the common threads and tensions that connect the current literature on resistance in a variety of communication contexts, and concluding with an exploration of the gaps in the literature on resistance in the realm of globalization processes. Locating our conversation about resistance in the context of globalization provides both pragmatic and theoretical value by suggesting new arenas for research and practice by communication scholars.

THEORIZING GLOBALIZATION

The increasing speed and flow of people, capital, ideas, goods, and services that connect actors across national borders remains central to many definitions of globalization (Keohane, 2002; McMichael, 2003). The creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in the 1990s (accompanied by the formation of the many regional and trans-regional blocs such as North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], The European Union, Asia Pacific Economic Corporation, and Asia-Europe Meeting [ASEM]) marked the decade as the harbinger of globalization, reflected in significant increases in cross-national trading and communication, expanding operational scope of transnational corporations (TNCs), and increasingly evident inequalities between the North and South. Simultaneously, the various avenues through which globally dispersed publics resist these dominant structures became more clear (Sriramesh & Vercic, 2003; Tarrow, 2005). According to Tarrow, the interplay between the global and the local, the complicated interconnections among the five *scapes* of globalization, and the nature of time-space distancing play an important role in activist publics' resistive practices. The complex and continuous interconnections

between local spaces and global agendas mark globalization; the local constitutes (yet continually becomes defined by) the global. Globalization also reflects the increasingly multi-layered interpenetrations of identities, mediated communications, technology flows, economic flows and flow of ideas, prompted by the compressions in dimensions of time and space (Giddens, 2000; Harvey, 2000). These key concepts developed from the globalization literature (Dutta & Pal, 2007) offer theoretical entry points for connecting collective resistance in the global realm with the opportunities for transformation in global politics that define the parameters for global organizations (transnational corporations, WTO, World Bank, IMF, etc.) and global organizing (i.e., activist organizing).

Connecting the Local and Global

The mobilization of local issues in the global arena and externally originating conflicts locally challenge the modernist discourse of organizational management and facilitates the articulation of hitherto silenced voices on key issues (typically performed by powerful social actors in traditional domains located at the center; Dutta & Pal, 2007). Particularly given globalization, the surge in activist movements demonstrates the need to focus on the diffusion of movements across borders and the opportunities for international mobilization (Della Porta & Tarrow, 2005). Activist movements draw our attention to the necessity of theorizing about the ways in which stakeholders enact resistance in complexly connected sites that weave the global with the local. Resistance becomes a communicative space connected with individual and collective practice through which the interplay of the global and local becomes situated in the realm of transformative politics (Mittelman & Chin, 2000). On one hand, according to Dutta and Pal, local economies and livelihoods are embedded within global politics; on the other hand, locally situated practices challenge global politics and organize globally with other locally dispersed actors to mobilize for change. For instance, the recent Argentine protests were triggered by the pressures of international financial institutions but directed at local institutions (Auyero, 2003). Simultaneously, movement organizations often become involved supranationally in order to create international alliances for nationally weak social movements. With their Eurostrike in 1997, Spanish, French, and Belgian Renault workers protested the closing of the Renault factory of Vilvorde in Belgium at the EU level (Drache, 2001).

In the domain of global organizations, issues of workplace practices in locally situated sites intersect with the global politics surrounding these practices (Cheney & Cloud, 2006). Though dominant cultural practices become imposed as the acceptable practices within globally dispersed organizations, they can also spark resistance in the everyday strategies of local actors and the transformative cultural politics in which they participate. The globalization of communicative platforms also create new spaces for organized

resistance that connect the local with the global (Herod, 1997; Juravich & Bronfenbrenner, 2000; Moody, 1988); new media such as the Internet prompt offline activism that connects locally dispersed workers on globally situated workplace policies (Juris, 2004). Movements in global labor demonstrate the possibilities of international solidarity; issues of workplace organizing aimed at specific organizational practices locally draw on the collective involvement of globally dispersed stakeholders and simultaneously seek to impact global policies. For instance, the protests against the Free Trade Agreement of Americas (FTAA) in Miami in 2003 brought out labor leaders who stressed the relevance of international solidarity in labor organizing (Cheney & Cloud, 2006). In addition to resisting the specific unhealthy and worker unfriendly practices of organizations at the local level that directly impact worker rights and working environment, international movements of solidarity also challenge the hegemonic global structures that promote and upkeep unhealthy workplace policies.

The practice of global activism underscores the global connectivity of issues, demonstrating that issues are no longer simply situated within locally isolated spaces but rather interrelate globally with global processes and practices (Smith, 2001). The WTO protests, for example, reveal the ways in which global policies impact local actors and the processes through which participation by geographically dispersed local actors bring about globally situated resistance to powerful social actors (in this instance, the WTO) (Routledge, 2000). Global events impact local ones and vice versa. Global policies inform and constrain local issues and potential reactions.

For instance, the articulation and implementation of global health policies (especially those that govern the innovation, dissemination, and use of health products) impacts the framing of local policies related to the pharmaceutical industry. Drawing on this emphasis on transnational resistance, critical public relations scholars (Bardhan, 2003; Curtin & Gaither, 2005; Dutta-Bergman, 2005a; Karlberg, 1996; McKie & Munshi, 2005; Pal & Dutta, in press) explore the ways in which the public relations strategies of powerful global actors affect global and local policies, the lives of locally situated publics, and opportunities for resistance. Furthermore, this line of critical scholarship interrogates how the framing of global issues emerges from the flow of power and control in the realm of globalization. Global HIV/AIDS activist groups have emerged that mobilize locally as well as globally to shape global HIV/AIDS policies (see DeSouza & Dutta, in press). DeSouza and Dutta detailed discourses of resistance that circulate in the e-forum of Saathi, a not-for-profit organization that “was founded in response to numerous requests to create a neutral platform for multi-sectoral dialog among people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA), health care providers, policy makers, educators and volunteers.” They described the ways in which local HIV/AIDS activists throughout various parts of India use the forum to align with each other, to connect and co-organize with other HIV/AIDS organizations in other parts of the world, and to mobilize

both offline and online around key issues such as patent acts and WTO policies that affect PLWHAs globally.

This example suggests the relevance for engaging in globally situated issues management that is sensitized to the continuous interpenetration of the local and the global. This critical standpoint affirms the importance of pursuing the global power structures within which stakeholders frame issues and manage policies. Time-space compression in global organizations accompanies this local-global interflow and impacts the complex interplay among the various scapes of social life within which people organize experiences and human activism becomes possible.

Time-Space Compression and Scapes

Time-space compression has disrupted and disoriented political-economic practices as well as cultural and social life (Harvey, 2000). Harvey asserted that accelerating turnover time (coupled with speed-up in exchanges and consumption, outsourcing and sub-contracting, and improved systems of techniques of distribution) has “accentuated volatility and ephemerality of fashion, production, techniques, labour processes, ideas and ideologies, values and established practices” (p. 83). This time-space compression underscores the complexity of global processes within which members communicate. Strategies and tactics employed by organizations in the global landscape occur amid these dynamic intersections of identities, mediated communications, technology flows, economic flows, and sharing of ideas.

Giddens (2000) advanced his conceptual framework of “time-space distanciation” (p. 92) noting the complicated relations between “local involvements” (p. 92) and “interaction across distance” (p. 92). Globalization comprises a “stretching” process that represents the interconnectivity between different social contexts or regions across the world. The action in a “distanciated” location influences events in another place through economic, political, or media processes. For instance, Giddens explained how prosperity of an urban area in Singapore could be causally linked to the impoverishment of a neighborhood in Pittsburgh, whose local products have become globally uncompetitive. The outcomes of “distanciated” influence do not act in a homogenized manner, nor are they in sync with the happenings of distant locales. Local happenings caused by an infinite distance may move in a reverse direction. As noted in the previous example, the decline in the economy of a neighborhood in Pittsburgh enables the economy in an urban locale in Singapore to flourish and, hence, influences it to move in a reverse direction. While the globalized social relationships diminish nationalist sentiments linked to the nation-state, it also simultaneously intensifies localized identities. For instance, call center employees in India catering to the clients in the United States display a tension in their interactions as they experience possibilities of cultural erosion at their workplace (Pal & Buzzanell, 2008).

Globalization also suggests rapid deployment of new organizational forms, new technologies, and revolution of communication systems. Altering Fordist tendencies of vertical integration, globalization emphasizes flexible accumulation and accelerating turnover time by speedy production system involving sub-contracting and outsourcing, quick delivery system and intense labor processes. Within these satellite networks of global organizations, new opportunities for resistance arise. The emergence of the Internet as a powerful medium in facilitating activist movements validates the phenomenon (Juris, 2004; Routledge, 2000).

Reflecting on this complexity of global processes, Appadurai (2000) argued that “the new global cultural economy has to be understood as a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order” (p. 230). He offered five dimensions of global cultural flow: ethnoscaples, mediascaples, technospaces, finanscaples, and ideoscaples. According to Appadurai, *ethnoscape* essentially consists of diasporic community moving in a fluid world constituted in the realm of the politics of nations. This global flow of diasporic communities is central to the ways in which organizations conceptualize and communicate with their internal and external stakeholders. For instance, according to Appadurai, the off-shoring of jobs in developing countries, the flow of technology-based expertise across nation states, and the fluid movement of knowledge managers across national boundaries critically affects how organizations develop, implement, and communicate such policies. Similarly, the idea of ethnoscaples also suggests that organizational communication with external stakeholders is continually fragmented and interwoven across multiple spaces.

According to Appadurai (2000), *technoscape* refers to the fluidity of technology that makes tangible and intangible knowledge flows possible across boundaries. For public relations practice, this possibility of knowledge flow across boundaries significantly impacts the ways in which organizations craft and target information toward various publics. For instance, the growing reach and penetration of the Internet have fostered new challenges for public relations practitioners regarding the ways in which practitioners communicate with their publics within the rich intersections of time and space (Lordan, 2001; M. Taylor et al., 2001). The use of the Internet as a medium for exchange of information globally within short time frames suggests that an organization might need to communicate with geographically dispersed publics pretty rapidly during a crisis (Coombs, 2007; Heath, 2001; Springston, 2001). From a critical standpoint, Heath asserted that the mobilizing power of the Internet in organizing local communities into global platforms has resulted in an emancipatory role of public relations. Critical public relations scholars examine the ways in which technology serves as a site of contestation and framing of global issues and the processes through which power and ideology emerge through technologically mediated sites (Dutta & Pal, 2007). As Appadurai explained, the growth of technologically mediated activism brings forth the importance of theorizing the communication of resistance in the realm of technoscaples.

Appadurai (2000) defined *finanscape* as the inter-linkage of capital with monetary and commodity flows across boundaries; it enables stakeholders to challenge the political economy of public relations practice in the context of globalization. According to Appadurai, the practice of public relations conceptualized within the dominant framework of managerial utilitarianism takes the economic functions served by powerful social actors for granted. From a critical standpoint, finanscape offers a theoretical lens for examining the complex interflow of economic interests and the political processes through which participants pursue economic interests in the global arena. In doing so, it takes discussions of political economy from beyond the realm of locally situated actors and relationships into one of complexly interconnected webs of global actors situated both locally and globally. For example, a criticism of the public relations strategies used by Nike in its “sweatshop” dilemma may be considered through a political economic lens that interrogates the financial interests of the various stakeholders at the local and global levels (Bullert, 2000).

According to Appadurai (2000), *mediascape* carries the information across borders by providing images that depend on several interests of global actors. Appadurai observed that the way in which consumerism has fuelled across the world for new commodities attests to the power of media.

Appadurai (2000) asserted that *ideoscape* refers to the conflict of often political ideologies due to clashes with perspectives of nation states. A critical approach examines the contestation of ideologies and the hegemonic processes through which certain ideologies are privileged over others in global discursive framing and implementation of global policies. Ultimately, ideoscapes provides a link into the interrogation of the intricately complex processes through which multiple local and global actors interact to shape communicative practices. Explaining the phenomenon, Appadurai wrote:

So, while an Indian audience may be attentive to the resonances of a political speech in terms of some key words and phrases reminiscent of Hindi cinema, a Korean audience may respond to the subtle codings of Buddhist or neo-Confucian rhetorical strategy encoded in a political document (p. 233).

In summary, the global shift associated with the creation of world markets and with international communication and media flows holds profound implications for how people make sense of their lives, the changing world, and the ways in which they resist the dominant global configurations (Robins, 2000). According to Robins, “It is provoking new senses of disorientation and of orientation, giving rise to new experiences of both placeless and placed identity” (p. 198). In essence, most of the globalization theories (such as Appadurai’s *scapes*, Giddens’ time–space *distanciation*, or Harvey’s time–space *compression*) explain globalization in terms of diversity and difference

rather than in terms of homogenization. National identities are no longer marked by simplistic concepts such as collectivism and individualism that offer polar opposites to locate national cultures as static and delimited within the geographical definitions of nation states (Appadurai, 2000; Giddens, 2000; Harvey, 2000). Cultures exist in continuous flux, constantly interpreted and reinterpreted through human interactions, and embedded within the context of the lives of members (Dutta-Bergman, 2004a, 2004b).

Within this dialectical tension between tradition and transformation, identities and relationships become meaningful, suggesting the necessity of conceptualizing communication within an organic framework of evolving relationships, rather than within a simplistic modernist frame that seeks to develop the best strategy for a national culture based on predefined markers such as individualism/collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity/femininity (see Curtin & Gaither, 2006; Pal & Dutta, in press). The complex interplay of the global-local tension, accompanied by dynamic interactions among the five scapes, offer theoretical and pragmatic entry points for exploring the ways in which parties enact resistance through global activism.

EXISTING APPROACHES TO RESISTANCE

The communication literature has explored and theorized the concept of resistance in multiple ways in a variety of contexts, ranging from organizations to small groups to relationships to individuals. Whereas a bulk of the scholarship on resistance has occurred in organizational communication, with its emphasis on resistive strategies utilized by workers (Murphy, 1998; Tracy, 2000; Trethewey, 1997), other areas of the communication discipline (such as public relations, health communication, gender, performance studies and rhetoric) have also explored resistance, either implicitly or explicitly. Several epistemological pursuits and a wide array of methodological tools with an impetus on critical inquiry have opened up vistas of research in resistive politics (Mumby, 2005). Along with issues related to macro- and micro-level interplays of power, control, and domination, critical communication studies have also pursued different possibilities for resistance. (Boal, 1985, 1998; Chatterjea, 2004; Hashmi, 2007) In this section, we map four different approaches to and concepts of resistance in communication—traditional, postmodern, discourse-centered, and feminist—before discussing resistance from a postcolonial perspective. Notably, these four categories extend from diverse epistemological, ontological, and axiological foundations, though we note overlaps between them throughout this section.

Traditional Approaches

Marx's (1867, 1967) labor process theory provides a historical backdrop to different philosophical traditions that primarily draw from or contend with the former. For Marx, the concept of resistance revolves around one key source: revolutionary class consciousness. In this case, resistance opposes the capitalist mode of production and the exploitation of labor through surplus value and remains firmly rooted in a material base (Cheney & Cloud, 2006). This postulate assumes inevitability of antagonism between the capitalist class and the working class, and resistance embodies the mobilization of a collective identity that opposes the exploitative goals of dominant social actors. Estranged from the ownership of production, laborers must abolish private ownership of production by organizing labor solidarity and "class-based resistance" (Jermier et al., 1994, p. 3). Members exert control through economically sustained access to discursive spaces and processes that serve as sites of power and control; resistance, therefore, is constituted in the realm of the opposition to the materially located economic disparities within the system (Cloud, 1994; Marx, 1867, 1967). In public relations scholarship, the material substratum of traditional critical theory offers the basis for critique of dominant models (such as the symmetrical model of public relations) that does not account for the material nature of structural inequities that are fundamental to the communicative processes, strategies and outcomes (Grunig, 2001).

The material and symbolic closely interpenetrate each other; for instance, Cheney and Cloud (2006) observed:

Class is both material and symbolic, especially if one understands Marx's distinction between a 'class in itself'--the material existence of a mass of people who share in common the experience of exploitation under capitalism--and a 'class for itself'--understood as the rhetorically shaped and motivated movement of workers organized to demand both greater voice and greater control of their economic lives (pp. 517-18).

For instance, Clair and Thompson (1996) argued that pay inequity exists both as discursive and material practices that are interdependent and intertwined. According to Cheney and Cloud, this relationship between the symbolic and the material becomes particularly evident in light of globalization as dominant discursive strategies create climates of support for neo-liberal policies that contribute to the economic disparities across the globe, and these economic disparities serve simultaneously as the material bases on which the discursive strategies are constituted through access to dominant public spheres.

Notably, the ideology of liberal democracy emphasizes privacy and autonomy and does not entertain the possibilities of economic self-rule of workers and the redistribution of wealth as the bases for democratic participation in work

and in society as a whole (Cheney & Cloud, 2006; Dutta-Bergman, 2005b); therefore, drawing on Marxist notions of revolutionary class consciousness, Cheney and Cloud suggested that global efforts of resistance ought to be theorized in terms of a revolutionary model of democratic change that draws from the fundamental structural antagonism between employer and worker in capitalism and builds on the transformative capacity of worker solidarity. We witnessed this solidarity in the varied forms of labor participation in global justice movements against corporate globalization such as the Seattle protests against the WTO in 1999 and the mass protests against the FTAA in Miami in 2003 (Turner, 2006).

Resistance in the traditional sense has a distinctly material component that draws on the antagonistic relationship between employers and labor (Marx, 1833–4; 1975). The role of labor in the production process is both materially and rhetorically significant; production of goods and services stops when workers collectively refuse to work (J. Freeman & Rogers, 1999; R.B. Freeman & Medoff, 1984). Unions have historically afforded one of the best avenues for negotiating favorable conditions for workers through their ability to collectively refuse to work. Cheney and Cloud (2006) asserted that “it is the economic force of the strike or threatened strike that provides workers with leverage to reach agreements on their terms, rather than just those of the bosses” (p. 524). Through materially driven strategies, in addition to the use of symbols, workers can bring about changes in the structure. For instance, in the Justice for Janitors case in Houston, Texas, workers gained union victory through their use of collective refusal to work (Greenhouse, 2000). The strike of drivers against the United Parcel Service (UPS) for full-time jobs led to an estimated \$30 million loss each day in profits, ultimately forcing UPS to create 10,000 full time jobs, to limit the use of subcontracted labor, and to increase the pay of both part-time and full-time workers.

In health communication, the local politics of marginalized groups with limited access to basic resources reveal the material basis of resistance, and efforts such as *gheraos* (collectively blocking a health service facility) and sit-ins seek to disrupt the very materiality of the production/service process (see Dutta-Bergman, 2004a, 2004b). Disrupting the materiality of hegemonic spaces historically has been at the heart of performative avenues such as street theater, described by Hashmi (2007) as a “militant political theater of protest” (p. 13) that employs performance to raise consciousness, bringing forth the closely connected relationship between the material and the symbolic.

Scholars of labor movements maintain that this sort of collective action is increasingly difficult to organize in the realm of globalization, given the loss of power by states to protect domestic labor and the increased disjunction between the mobility of capital and the localization of labor (Silver, 2003; Tilly, 1995). In the global economy, access to labor is cheap, and capital can move to wherever companies can pay less for labor, leading to the increasing tendency of weak governments eager to attract foreign capital to side with the

interests of foreign capital and repress labor on their behalf. Tarrow (2005) noted:

[The] basic gap is strengthened by several structural features of the current wave of globalization: sharply lowered costs of transportation; the internationalization of finance; a dominant ideology of neoliberalism; and the segmentation of production, which makes it possible for multilateral companies to subcontract important stages of their production process to firms for which they bear no legal responsibility (p. 154).

Given these structural barriers in globalization processes, workers increasingly turn to domestic direct action that draws on their rights as citizens, operating with the assistance of external allies and international institutions; issues of worker's rights have spilled over to the public sphere and become starting points for community action. In addition to utilizing traditional forms such as protests, direct action also involves community-wide events that are difficult for authorities to repress without drawing public attention; resources supplied by international allies and institutional access gained through cross-border collaborations fit with the local direct action of workers (Gentile, 2003). The case of the Coalition for Justice in *Maquiladoras* exemplifies how local actions by workers to defend their rights were complemented by cross-border institutional support in the form of publicizing the local movement globally, drawing on international solidarity networks to put international pressures on corporations, and coalition building to challenge free trade policies such as NAFTA, Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), and Korea–U.S. Free Trade Agreement (KORUS) (Williams, 1999). As *Maquiladoras* demonstrates, forms of direct action in the realm of globalization are no longer simply localized but, rather, realized at the interstices of the local and the global. Furthermore, local-global resistance simultaneously operates in terms of identities, mediated communications, technology flows, economic flows, and flow of ideas, as local cultural identities interweave within complex global networks that connect the local politics with a global audience and challenge global policies.

Discussing the material foundations of resistance and suggesting the necessity to theorize about the various contexts within which resistance plays out, Edwards (1984) offered a typology of control—simple control, technical control, and bureaucratic control—with the rationale that social and historical contexts shape the forms of control. For simple control, capitalists exercise power obtrusively; for technical control, they assert power through machines or technology; and, for bureaucratic control, power emerges through the social relations of production. For the latter two, the systems of control are institutionalized and operate through structures. Edwards explained that this typology of control reflects the historical process of organizing work. Each form marks a definite stage of the capitalist era by reflecting different stages

in the process of the development of the firms. Also, because of the uneven progress of capitalism, all types of control coexist in the economy.

Contrary to Marx (1967, 1867) and Braverman (1974, 1984) who did not acknowledge resistance beyond revolution, Edwards (1984) suggested that the objective behind such systems of control is to combat resistance. Stakeholders reorganize work to establish structures to minimize resistance and maximize profits. Each system exploits wage-labor and shapes the working class accordingly, which, in turn, has its implications for resistance. As Edwards explained, in simple control, workers struggle to oppose the despotic control; in technical control, workers resist the mechanized pace of production and fight for rights collectively; and in bureaucratic control, workers demand workplace democracy. Thus, the modes, strategies, and tactics of resistances are influenced by the different forms of exploitation that, in turn, impact the needs and demands of the workers.

Critics of the traditional approach argue that Marx's (1967, 1867) and Braverman's (1974, 1984) explanation of capitalist interest undermines subjective consciousness and its role in reinforcing resistance to capitalist labor processes. To the contrary, labor becomes a normative category of universal human nature. Understanding resistance objectively (i.e., labor as a universal category) does not account for subjective experiences and the meanings that stakeholders attach to resistance. Jermier et al. (1994) observed:

Marx and Braverman were aware of the importance of subjective consciousness and the part it plays in resistance to capitalist labour processes. Neither could escape these issues, even when their work consciously attempted to limit the scope of analysis to a more [objectivist position]. However, neither chose to theorize subjectivity and resistance (p. 6).

Subsequently, scholars (Edwards, 1984; Friedman, 1977) called for the need to theorize resistance and made necessary contributions by emphasizing the importance of the concept through documenting various class struggles and other labor processes. However, this literature focuses more on the managerial control rather than on specific resistance practices. Overall, the traditional idea of resistance hinges on the grand narratives of class conflict and revolutionary struggle. It refers to any kind of organized collective opposition such as organized worker protests, strikes, grievances, unionized movements, etc. (Jermier et al., 1994; P. Prasad and A. Prasad, 2000). Early uses of resistance concentrated on the reaction of employees primarily in factories to specific changes in management practices. As Jermier et al. noted, within the United States, for example, much of the previous empirical work explained resistance as "actions of a seemingly homogeneous group of male blue-collar factory workers fighting an assumed, common identifiable cause" (p. 9). Such an understanding has its theoretical limitations because it suggests a simplistic

relation of power between the subordinated and the dominant. Overlooking human subjectivity, the traditional conception of resistance also does not account for its multifaceted nature and the influence of time and space in resistive practices.

This orientation toward resistance as “fixed” can be located in critical social science. Alvesson and Deetz (2000) explained that critical social science addresses how cultural traditions and practices of powerful members “freeze social reality” (p. 9) to the advantage of certain sectional interests at the expense of others, consistent with the modernist assumptions embedded in organizations and the dominant research traditions of either a positivist or Marxist thinking. For instance, F. Taylor’s (1947) and Weber’s (1921) concepts of rationalization and bureaucratization follow the modernist logic of instrumentalization of people through scientific-technical knowledge. In a similar light, the unitary view of resistance as overt and cohesive, aimed at forming a class-based struggle to abolish private ownership also follows a deterministic and predictable logic of positivism (Jermier et al., 1994). Inspired by Marxist sensibilities, the traditional approach tends to treat workers’ opposition as a natural reaction that emanates from the structural economic relations of production. Fleming and Sewell (2002) rightly observed that this dialectics of class relations implies workers are bound to resist to neutralize the capitalist forces and to champion their real interests.

Postmodern Approaches

The emergence of critical theory and postmodernism in communication coincided with the changing organizational contexts in a more turbulent economy and the critique of modernism in communication scholarship as more and more scholars became interested in the limits of the modernist project (Mumby, 1997). Whereas critical theory traditionally sought to critique modernism from within, still espousing some of the ideals of the enlightenment project such as emancipation and progress, Mumby noted that postmodernism typically situated itself in opposition to modernity as an external critique of the modernist project. Alvesson and Deetz (2000) asserted:

The increased-size of organizations, rapid implementation of communication/information technologies, globalization, the changing nature of work, reduction of the working class, less salient class conflicts, professionalization of the workforce, stagnant economies, widespread ecological problems and turbulent markets are all parts of the contemporary context demanding a research response (p. 9).

These changes shifted the focus to service industries as the most dominant economic form over and above the manufacturing industries in the post-industrial Western world. Elucidating the implications of these shifts, Alvesson

and Deetz (2000) argued that these changes challenged instrumental rationality by imposing structural limits on control and emphasizing new themes such as culture, identity, mind power instead of labor power, and recognizing subjectivities of employees. Stakeholders constitute individual identities in ways that support the power and control of the dominant social actors, through the stories that circulate in the culture narrated through organizations (schools, workplaces etc.), media, and other dominant cultural systems (Kellner, 1989; Rosen, 1985, 1988; Witten, 1993).

In health communication, as grand narratives of the biomedical model came under scrutiny, scholars became increasingly interested in the role of identities as entry points for understanding health meanings, circulating and resisting dominant meanings of health (Ellingson, 2005; Frey et al., 2000; see related arguments by Zoller & Kline, this volume). Similarly, interpersonal communication scholars became interested in the subjective human experience as an entry point for resisting dominant meanings that circulated in cultures. Mumby (1997) characterized postmodernism with the phrase “discourse of vulnerability” which not only questions the notion of “a Truth,” but also depicts “... the ways in which the postmodern intellectual has given up the ‘authority game’ as a uniquely positioned arbiter of knowledge claims, exchanging a priori and elitist assumptions for a more emergent and context-bound notion of what counts as knowledge” (p. 14). The postmodern individual is constituted and constructed through knowledge structures (Foucault, 1979, 1980a, 1980b); according to Mumby, s/he comprises a product of discursive practices and processes that operate to “normalize and institutionalize our subjectivity” (p. 15).

In the absence of totalizing, collective consciousness under critical postmodernism, the focus shifted more to localized forms of resistance and subjectivity. Social construction of reality remains central to critical postmodernism; as individuals socially constituted identities through discursive apparatuses, these discursive formations also facilitate resistance (Collinson, 2002; Murphy, 2001; Tretheway, 1997; see also related arguments by Bartesaghi & Castor, this volume). Participants create and recreate meaning in discursive spaces, thus rendering communication problematic (Mumby, 1997). Mumby suggested that communication is simultaneously stable and unstable as some challenge centered communicative practices (or those that emerge from centers of power) from the margins.

Postmodern communication scholars continue to explore the ways in which apparently seamless communicative processes and discourses at the center are resisted from the margins and simultaneously transformed (Mumby, 1997). For instance, Bell and Forbes (1994) described the ways in which female secretaries utilize official bureaucratic structures for the purposes of creating resistive spaces to bureaucracy. Questioning the grand metanarratives of class consciousness, critical postmodernism disputes the taken-for-granted and conventional wisdom that circulate in cultures. Critical postmodernism strives

to disrupt the status quo and support silenced or marginalized voices (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Kilduff & Mehra, 1997; Mumby, 1997). Hence, resistance intersects with subjectivity and, since individuals create subject positions in a number of competing discourses, self-identity is always fragmented and ruptured.

Burawoy's (1984) critical ethnography drew early attention to subjectivity by exploring development of consent among shop floor factory workers engaged in the "game of making out" (Jermier et al., 1994, p. 7; see also Mumby, 2005). Burawoy detailed constitution of the labor process, which works toward obscuring and securing surplus labor. While Burawoy's research highlights the subjective constitution of the labor process, where workers compete and mask their common membership, it also reflects how construction of employee identities fulfills the dominant interest. His research does not have a direct implication for understanding shop floor resistance. However, the workers' practices indicate presence of resistance when they consent to the rules on their own terms. According to Burawoy, such actions exemplify an emancipated society with people consciously making history for themselves.

Health communication scholars also emphasize subjectivity as an entry point for resistance, especially scholars who examine the ways in which individuals navigate their identities in response to the control exerted by the biomedical model and its dominant practices (Frank, 1991, 1995; Sharf, 2005). Sharf detailed the role of identity in the context of the physician-patient relationship. In her chapter, Sharf discussed the way in which she fired her surgeon. In this instance, the individual identity of the patient and her negotiation of this identity in the context of a health care interaction provided a starting point for interrogating the traditional doctor-patient relationship and fundamentally resisting the normative ideals of the accepted biomedical model even as she participated in the biomedical framework. Her identity impacted her relationship with the physician and, in turn, the relationship shaped how she negotiated her identity through the interaction. Sharf's negotiation and renegotiation of her identity challenged the dominant discursive framing of physician-patient relationships even as she participated within the traditional framework of the relationship. By firing her surgeon, Sharf renegotiated the traditional power dynamic that places physicians at the center of the physician-patient relationship.

Drawing from Foucault (1980a), the constitution of subjectivity suggests the complex relation of power that is tied to knowledge production and information. Collinson (1994) illustrated resistances shaped by certain subjective orientations to power, knowledge and information. While Collinson's "resistance through distance" (p. 50) indicates how employees in an engineering factory concealed their knowledge to minimize involvement with the company, "resistance through persistence" (p. 40) demonstrates how employees in an insurance case study acquired knowledge to challenge managerial practices. However, resistance is always intricately linked to organizational discipline, power, and control such

that oppositional practices often mutually facilitate control and resistance. Hence, resistance forms do not represent institutionalized labor conflict but take place on a “local, immediate and often informal level” (Gottfried, 1994, p. 107). This everyday form of resistance includes covert and subtle forms like even “sabotage and theft” (p. 107) that outsiders may not easily recognize as resistance. James Scott (1985) regarded such occasions as mundane resistance. Such routine and creative forms of resistance serve as hidden agenda because others do not perceive them in dominant spheres that play out articulations of power. They are neither documented in any public record nor do they involve any collective action. Scott offered the following definition of resistance:

At a first approximation, I might claim that class resistance includes any act(s) by members(s) of a subordinate class that is or are intended either to mitigate or deny claims...made on that class by superordinate classes... Finally, it focuses on intentions rather than consequences, recognizing that many acts of resistance may fail to achieve their intended result (p. 290).

Routine resistance has been described to some extent in organizational communication as informal organization (P. Prasad & A. Prasad, 2000). P. Prasad and A. Prasad developed a four-fold typology to categorize resistance as (1) open confrontations, (2) subtle subversions of control systems through gossip, (3) employee distance, and (4) ambiguous accommodations. Most of these resistances are ubiquitous and manifest in mundane practices. In sociology, Fleming and Sewell (2002) created the concept of *svejkism*. They conceptualized *svejkism* after the character in Jaroslav Hasek’s (1973) novel, *The good soldier, svejk*, who actively disengages and complies without conforming to resist the army practices. Gottfried (1994) suggested that withdrawal of cooperation can take symbolic expressions such as subverting dress codes. Viewing cooperation and accommodation by employees as absence of resistance undermines human agency in the context of power relations. Gottfried asserted that “resistance implies human agency in the context of power relations, where agency can be understood in terms of consciousness or action, whether structurally or subjectively determined, either collectively or individually engaged” (p. 105).

Hence, the everydayness of struggle demonstrates ways in which social relations of daily existence are enmeshed in resistance, thereby rendering power tenuous (Haynes & Prakash, 1992). It dislocates power and resistance from the monolithic and autonomous form of social structure that people challenge only at dramatic moments of revolt. This commonplace idea of struggle need not result in any material or structural transformation. In this sense, according to Haynes and Prakash, resistance becomes innocuous practices of subordinate groups that contest hegemonic social formations, where presence of consciousness is not necessary. This daily act of resistance rearticulates and renegotiates the position of the subordinate with respect to the dominant and continues to disrupt and fragment power. Haynes and Praksash contended that “[i]n sum,

neither domination nor resistance is autonomous” (p. 3). The intertwined nature of domination and resistance fragments the singular conception of power and renders it fluid, particularly lending itself to the complexly layered and intertwined nature of globalization politics (Appadurai, 2000). Everyday forms of resistance emerge, for instance, in the culturally situated practices of workers in call centers that simultaneously reify and challenge the dominant U.S.-centric ideology of the workplace (Pal & Buzzanell, in press). Similarly, Dutta-Bergman (2004a, 2004b) articulated the everyday resistive practices of Santalis in rural Bengal as they participate in their health care decision making, simultaneously using biomedicine with homeopathic and Ayurvedic medicines and resisting the Cartesian dualistic framework of the biomedical model. Critical postmodernism draws attention to the fractured and fragmented nature of global public spheres within which interested parties debate, contest, and articulate issues and policies; the discursive formations around such policies are embedded with the possibilities of change as stakeholders construct and articulate new meanings and interpretations. (Dutta & Pal, 2007).

Discourse-centered Approach

The everydayness of resistance shifts focus from what Mumby (2005) called the dualistic to a dialectical relationship between control and resistance, foregrounding the discursive nature of resistance. The discourse-centered approach to resistance emphasizes talk and language in social interaction and pursues discourse at the site of the dialectical relationship between control and resistance (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004). Research on dialectics of control and resistance in organizational communication literature has been inadequate in conceptualizing the interactive and dynamic nature of resistance (Clegg, 1994; Jermier et al., 1994; Mumby, 2005; P. Prasad & A. Prasad, 2000). Much of the critical literature tends to privilege one over the other without really looking at the discursive spaces in which they continually constitute each other. Inspired by post-structuralism, primarily Foucault (1980a, 1980b), critical research in organizational communication predominantly examines how organizations, similar to Foucault’s prisons, establish disciplinary mechanisms to produce docile bodies and sustain managerial interest (Barker, 1993; Burawoy, 1984; Deetz, 1992; Holmer Nadesan, 1997; Kunda, 1992). This body of research focuses on discursive construction of control that perpetuates hegemony and normalizes domination.

For instance, Holmer Nadesan (1997) argued that the discourse of personality exams functions as a form of government by providing authorities with a technique for engineering the workplace and disciplining the employees. Kunda’s (1992) “tech culture” pays attention to construction of a culture that fulfills company goals. In other words, management compels people to behave in ways that a company finds rewarding. This emphasis on managerial control that works to perpetuate hegemony obscures the presence of resistance. In

opposition, a significant body of research on resistance has romanticized it, treating it in a theoretical lacuna that doesn't acknowledge its relationship with methods of control (Mumby, 2005). Because of this polarized perspective, Mumby deemed this literature on control and resistance as dualistic. Much of the critical literature on employee behavior tends to "overstate either consent or resistance and to separate one from the other...Rather they are usually inextricably and simultaneously linked, often in contradictory ways within particular organizational cultures, discourses and practices" (Collinson, 1994, p. 29).

Elucidating Foucault's philosophy, Clegg (1994) wrote that certain practices through state institutions discipline the body and regulate the mind to privilege institutionalized bodies of knowledge. Since such knowledge emerges through institutional and organizational practices, it constitutes "discursive practice." Discourse becomes the means to institute power. Even when members invoke resistance, it becomes subsumed within the system that acts to reaffirm the disciplinary practices of power. Foucault (1980a) observed:

I would say that the State consists in the codification of a whole number of power relations which render its functioning possible, and that Revolution is a different type of codification of the same relations. This implies that there are many different kinds of revolution, roughly speaking as many kinds as there are possible subversive recodifications of power relations, and further that one can perfectly well conceive of revolutions which leave essentially untouched the power relations which form the basis for the functioning of the State (p. 123).

Suggesting the notion of power as a process rather than a possession and stressing the role of discourse in power relationships, Foucault (1980a) further argued that "there are manifold relations of power which cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of discourse" (p. 93). Power is simultaneously both productive and repressive, and participants create, perpetuate, and contest it through discourse. Discourses become sites of legitimizing as well as challenging the dominant structures of power. Foucault noted that "[d]iscourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are...Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it" (pp. 100–1). Discursive formations can also fluctuate (Broadfoot et al., 2004; Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). Noting this transitivity of discourse, Broadfoot et al. observed:

[B]ecause discourses are systems of signification the meanings of any objects and subjects constructed discursively are necessarily vulnerable, fleeting and temporary as they depend on the sustenance and longevity

of the specific discourses through and by which they are constituted... thus, discursive formations as articulated series or collages of discourses always carry the seeds of their own transformation and restructuring in the form of alternative others that lie latent, awaiting the necessary social and historical context in which to become dominant (p. 196).

Emphasizing this discursive shift in studies of resistance, Mumby (2005) called for a more dialectical approach to studying resistance that simultaneously interrogates the complex interplay of control and resistance. The dualistic approach can recognize the dialectical relationship between control and resistance; however, critics dispute its underlying assumption that power and control upstage resistance, thereby undermining the intricacies of the power-resistance dynamic (Jermier et al., 1994; Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994; Kondo, 1990; Mumby, 2005). According to Mumby, poststructural analyses need to analyze work place resistance as a discursive practice that is “complex, often contradictory, and socially situated attempts to construct meanings and identities” (p. 36). In this dialectical relationship, resistance is neither an authentic nor a pristine form of opposition, nor is it perpetually reproducing dominant interest. Within this poststructuralist framework, scholars primarily consider resistance in organizational communication to be embedded in the routine discourses, the meaning of which depends on the context in which disciplinary power gets normalized (Tretheway, 2000; Weedon, 1997, 1999).

As Mumby (2005) noted, much of the current resistance literature in organizational communication (Buzzanell & Liu, 2005; Clair, 1994; Collinson, 2002; Murphy, 2001; Tretheway, 1997) examines the discursive practices in organizations to understand resistance as a routine yet complex social process that draws its meaning from the contextual aspects of organizing. Scholars have studied a variety of discursive practices such as humor and joking (Ezzamel et al., 2001), “bitching” and gossip (Sotirin & Gottfried, 1999), modes of dress (Gottfried, 1994), and discursive distancing as forms of resistance (Collinson, 1994). Collinson’s study of discursive construction of humor suggests that the ambiguity in humor facilitates effective forms of resistance. Manufacture of humor as a form of managerial control through discursive constructions of joking relations does not necessarily invoke social cohesion or dialogic communication. It can prompt tensions, conflicts, and power inequalities, thereby underpinning the possibility of resistance. Humor by subordinates can be expressed in satire by mocking managerial practices, silence by distancing from managerial humor, or cynicism by not trusting the managerial joking practices. Murphy described how flight attendants enact agency on flight and disrupt their historically feminized roles. Similarly, in their analysis of maternity leave discourse, Buzzanell and Liu (2005) observed the ways in which women productively negotiated their identities and determined what courses of action to take as they complied with and resisted the dominant interpretations of maternity leave.

Other scholars, drawing from structuration and dramaturgical perspectives, articulate the storied nature of resistance (Harter et al., 2005; Harter et al., 2006; Morgan & Krone, 2001). For instance, in their ethnographic fieldwork with Passion Works, a nonprofit collaborative art studio that serves approximately 160 adults with mental retardation and developmental disabilities, Harter et al. (2006) detailed how the narrative of freedom through flight disrupt and transcend the dominant interpretations of disability, and artistic self-expression “thrives as embodied performance” (p. 14). Examining the self-story of Cathy Hainer, a journalist whose reflections on her journey with cancer were published in the *USA Today* in the late 1990s, Beck (2005) explored the capacity of narrative to prompt alternative meanings and provide new languages for talking about illness experiences. Similarly, in Dutta-Bergman’s (2004b) research conducted in the Santali communities of rural India, peasant members of marginalized communities that have minimal access to resources discussed the ways in which structural constraints impede their health choices, and they resisted dominant meanings of health by narrating stories as one of the key markers of their lived experience. The narratives of health articulated by the participants draw attention away from the dominant stories that construct health as a matter of individual choice and instead locate it in the context of structural constraints and economic resources (see related arguments by Zoller & Kline, this volume).

Resistance renegotiates and redefines the same practices that it confronts and, in doing so, facilitates a point of change. It validates the belief that, despite power being omnipresent, space remains for resistance. These resistances occur through covert, non-confrontational, routine discursive practices. Hence, studies examine the processes through which subjects engage in meaning making in their daily experience of organizing. Understanding such meanings suggests possibilities for constructing alternative, resistant, counterhegemonic accounts of organizing (Mumby, 2005).

Another key development in the discursive approach involves an emphasis on identity. Foucault (1980a, 1980b) suggested that identities comprise continuous outcomes of subjectivities since self-formation is a complex consequence of subjugation. According to Jermier et al. (1994, p. 8), “Power then does not directly determine identity but merely provides the conditions of possibility for its self-formation—a process involving perpetual tension between power and resistance or subjectivity and identity.” Holmer Nadesan (1997) proposed that personality exams become a government mechanism to subjugate employees by articulating the desired identity in the workplace in terms of race, class, and gender-based norms.

This tension between identity and power is clearly evident in the study by Ezzamel et al. (2001). They explored the resistance strategies utilized by workers at an engineering plant, where opposition by the workers stemmed from experiences with the new identity formations. The workers opposed new methods of production introduced by managers because the identities invoked

by the new practices made them value the experiences that they enjoyed earlier. The conflict with the self-identity and the new methods imposed by power relations sparked resistance. Though the new methods were discursively constructed as “empowering” and “involving,” the workers did not passively accommodate but exercised their agency and challenged the discourse that was made available to them. Thus, intricately tied to resistance and discourse, identities are multidimensional and emergent through discursive practices (Ashcraft, 2005). Health communication scholars also demonstrate the ways in which the negotiation of identity becomes the entry point for re-constituting alternative narratives in the realm of illness; these narratives resist the dominant stories of health that circulate in the culture and are reified by the dominant social institutions (Frank, 1995).

The interconnections among discourses, identities, and resistance enable individuals to challenge dominant positions in global politics as discourses from marginalized contexts circulate in counter-public spheres and eventually navigate mainstream public spheres through overt and covert organizing strategies; counter-publics find their ways in dominant discursive spaces by setting themselves in opposition to some other, wider public (Asen, 2000). Suggesting a dual character of counter-publics, Fraser (1992, p. 123) articulated that, on the one hand, counter-publics “function as spaces of withdrawal and regroupment; on the other hand, they function as bases and training grounds for agitational activities directed toward wider publics” (p. 124). The discursive location of counter-publics in relationship with a wider public fosters resistive politics. These discourses and communicative strategies provide new possibilities for thinking about global policies and resisting policies that marginalize.

These studies illustrate that, while discourse can be an instrument to perpetuate power, it can also be an act of resistance, drawing attention to the simultaneity of power and resistance. Furthermore, studies of the rhetoric of social movements highlight the role of discourse in collective mobilization for transformative politics (Stewart et al., 2006). According to Stewart et al., strategies such as identification, polarization, and power in language (accompanied by discursive tactics such as slogans, songs, labeling, ridicule, obscenity, and symbolic acts) build and mobilize collective identities for the purposes of the movement. For instance, in the 1900s, the Industrial Workers of the World produced the little red book of *Songs of the Workers to Fan the Flames of Discontent*, and songs such as “We Shall Overcome” helped African-Americans during the civil rights movement confront institutional violence and hatred. Similarly, slogans such as “Freedom, freedom, freedom” (civil rights movement in the United States), “We will remember in November” (women’s liberation movement in the United States), and “Inquilaab Zindabad” (movement of the Left in India) facilitate both identification and polarizing functions, offering the discursive basis for collective mobilization. Symbols such as the red flag embodying the solidarity of workers not only mark the identity of the collective for the members of

the collective but communicate the fundamental message of the collective to external stakeholders. The power of discourses and symbols to organize and activate collective identities also occur in performative avenues of change such as street theater, protest theater, resistance songs, and resistance dance (Boal, 1985, 1998; Chatterjea, 2004; Hashmi, 2007). Zoller (2005) referred to this organizing function of discourse and its collective mobilizing capacity in the health care sector when she stressed the need for critical and multisectoral communication scholarship in health activism.

Feminist Approaches

Conceptualization of resistance with respect to identity also appears in a growing body of research on gender in communication, particularly in the context of the patriarchal values and norms that gender organizational practices and the ways in which such values and norms might be challenged (Allen, 2005; Mumby, 2005). In the introduction to the book, *Reworking Gender*, Ashcraft and Mumby (2004) detailed the premises for studying the gendered nature of organizations: (1) gender is constitutive of organizing; (2) gendering of organizations that involves a struggle over meaning, identity, and difference is embodied in a discursive struggle; and (3) these discursive struggles privilege certain interests. Ashcraft and Mumby argued that struggle for gendered meaning entails a deeply material matter, for it produces preferred truths and selves as well as tangible systems of advantages and disadvantages. Feminist authors have illustrated the constitution of gendered subjectivities in organizational contexts within relations of power. Over previous decades, feminist research has either examined the interplay between gender, organizing, identity, and power or explored these issues individually (Allen, 2000; Ashcraft, 2000; Buzzanell, 1994, 1995, 2000; Murphy, 1998; Tretheway, 1997, 2000). This body of work advances the idea that organizations comprise the “site of gendered communication practices” (Mumby, 2000, p. 3). In the preface of *Rethinking Organizational and Managerial Communication From Feminist Perspectives*, Buzzanell (2000) wrote that the book sought to stimulate greater thinking about how organizing itself can be “gendered and exclusionary” (p. x). Hence, the theme of resistance is central to feminist approaches as it aims to “prompt continued change toward greater equality, dignity, and justice for women and men...an equitable and ethical vision for organizational lives and processes” (p. x). According to Allen, this body of research suggests that social discourse about gender influences gender relations within organizations and vice versa.

Inspired by this belief, a significant portion of the literature on resistance in feminist approach extends from the discursive logic, critiquing the communicative processes in organizations. For instance, challenging the conceptions of glass ceiling, Buzzanell (1995) urged rethinking about the practice. Buzzanell argued that defining the glass ceiling merely as an invisible

barrier for women's advancement to the top makes us lose sight of gender as an organizing aspect of our lives. Instead, it oversimplifies the issue and offers superficial solutions.

Collinson (1988) revealed how workers in a trucking industry discursively used humor to conform and resist managerial power, where one of the key elements of discursive practices of identity formation encompassed producing a strong masculine culture on the shop floor. Ezzamel et al. (2001) advanced similar observations. Also, Ashcraft and Mumby (2004) explored the discursive legacy of the airline industry that is mired in gender, race and class formations. As Ashcraft and Mumby inquired, "How did the aviator become symbolically and materially involved, nestled in a white male body, and how did he secure unprecedented professional standing?" (p. 132). Ashcraft and Mumby argued that these gendered identities are institutionalized with specific interests in the political economy. Company officials strategically invoke the "dashing male" image associated with pilots to maintain a gendered nature of commercial flying, a perception as important to pilots as to the consumers. Since the occupation constitutes a discursive struggle over the right for occupational control, Ashcraft and Mumby contended that diversifying pilot identity means resisting the system.

However, diversification of pilot identity brings up another way of thinking about resistance. Ashcraft (2005) examined how pilots employ discursive strategies to incorporate instructions to empower crew members and to oppose the threats of feminization associated with such instructions. Through this analysis, Ashcraft asserted that resistance can come from the threat of identity loss and also from privileged voices.

The human body as a site of struggle has been another feature of resistance in the discursive feminist approach. Inspired by a poststructuralist Foucauldian analysis, Tretheway (2000) and Murphy (1998) specified bodies as a site of struggle. Women's embodied identities work toward resisting gender domination rather than normalizing it. Though women's bodies are subordinated and tend to accommodate the norms, women still resist control and discipline by disrupting dress, style, and other signifying gendered practices. Murphy's work on flight attendants demonstrates the panopticon conditions under which they operate. Flight attendants disrupt the gendered expectations of having to wear high heels and wear lipstick by not doing so except on days of appearance checks or while flying through cities that have supervisors. As Tretheway explained, these embodied resistance practices that reverse the panopticon reveal the different subject positions that women may assume.

In health communication, the narrativization of identity as a resistive strategy is evident in the writings of the feminist writer Audre Lorde (1980) as she reflected on her experiences with cancer. She described the necessity to reclaim oneself by making the self available after her mastectomy. Lorde explained that "[i]n order to keep me available to myself, and be able to concentrate my energies on the challenges of those worlds through which I

move, I must consider what my body means to me” (p. 65). Through her story, Lorde sought to find a language that allowed her to speak as a one-breasted woman, thus not only connecting with her self but with other women who have experienced mastectomy. As Lorde argued, making oneself available to oneself not only necessitates reconnecting with the body after the illness experience but also finding a connection with others who share the condition, thus resisting the dominant patriarchal articulations of the feminine and the definitions of feminine normalcy imposed by the biomedical model.

Overall, these studies encourage reflection about resistance as emerging from the interconnection between knowledge, power, and subjectivity. Kondo’s (1990) ethnographic study of a family-owned Japanese confectionary factory revealed the embedded nature of discourse, identity, compliance, and resistance. Kondo’s account of resistance demonstrates the ambiguities and shifting nature of power, providing conditions for multiple, gendered, fragmented selves. The female workers’ resistance is discursively constructed from their gendered role in Japan and their position in the workplace. Despite their marginalized status at the workplace, their traditional identity as caregiver prompts them to consider themselves superior to men in the workplace. Hence, the discursive construction of their resistive space embodies a dialectical tension that represents simultaneous coexistence of subjugation and resistance. As Mumby (2005, p. 35) concluded, “Such a tension is not resolvable but is central to the ongoing management of meaning in this workplace.”

Discourses contribute to individual identities as sites of contestation as well as organize collectives and signal the capacities of collective organizing in bringing about social change (Luthra, 2003). Chatterjea (2004) described the political capacity of performance, suggesting that women’s groups in India:

... aware of the constant breakdown of the judicial and legal system, often perform the social ostracizing of a wife batterer or dowry demander. Surrounding the house of such a person (a practice known as *gherao*), the women would sing songs articulating incriminating evidence any time a member of the offending household would emerge from the house. Grass-roots women’s organizations like the *Stree Shakti Shangathana* would also perform plays in the streets, using a great deal of ritualistic movement, about dowry deaths, women’s nutrition and other issues (p. 90).

This approach predominantly focuses on centrality of languages, movements, and images that become sites of contestation for male domination as they reconfigure new ways of thinking and looking at the world. In performance, resistance occurs through the materialization of new meanings in public discursive spaces (Conquergood, 1982a, 1982b, 1988, 1989, 1991). Collective movements of solidarity addressing oppressive patriarchal structures have been constituted discursively and materially through collective organizing of globally dispersed local groups utilizing a variety of performative avenues

that connect the body to the public sphere and place it as a disruption of the hegemonic structure (Chatterjea, 2004).

Another important body of scholarship that examines the centrality of language and materiality in constituting the self and the other in cultural terms is postcolonial theory (Narayan & Harding, 2000). Postcolonial theory is particularly relevant for the ways in which we theorize and understand resistance in a global context. The histories of colonialism define the relationships among geographically distributed spaces, creating openings for new spaces for constituting alternative discourses to dominant narratives of development and modernity. In the context of global organizing, these postcolonial narratives underscore the interplays of power in the definitions of nation states, civil societies, transnational corporations, and global publics.

Postcolonialism and Subaltern Studies

In his *Orientalism*, Edward Said (1978), one of the most influential postcolonial thinkers, stressed how the construction of the Orient comprises a systematic discursive production by the West. Arguing that Orient is not Oriental in a commonplace sense but was made to be Oriental, Said dislocated the “familiar” concept of the Orient. The Orient helps to define the West with its contrasting languages, images and experiences. According to Said, “The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony...” (p. 5). Said’s *Orientalism* suggested a postcolonial approach that facilitates understanding how certain Western labor and management practices become dominant as an act of “othering” non-Western practices. According to A. Prasad (2003, p. 32), “The postcolonial perspective can be helpful in understanding such ethnocentricism, and thereby, developing an alternative understanding of non-Western management.”

Postcolonial theory focuses on a Eurocentric colonial past and examines how practices in the non-Western locations negotiate Western domination. Challenging the universality of Western modernity, postcolonial theory encompasses an ongoing resistance to colonial experience (Narayan & Harding, 2000; Spivak, 1987). While colonialism involves an overt coercion taking the form of occupation of territories, imperialism comprises an act of economic and political domination. American imperialism operates through its control over institutions such as World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and International Monetary Fund (IMF) (A. Prasad, 2003). The economic and political control cannot function without cultural control. For instance, in his analysis of public relations efforts of U.S. democracy promotion in nations of the South, Dutta-Bergman (2005a) detailed how the concept of democracy serves undemocratic agendas that co-opt the participatory capacity of citizens and instead seek to promote pro-U.S., pro-market, neoliberal logics. In yet another analysis of health promotion efforts, Dutta (2007) demonstrated the ways in which stakeholders utilize dominant articulations of health promotion

abroad in order to serve U.S. geo-strategic, military, and market interests, thus exposing the links between the cultural constructions of development and the material benefits of such constructions to the colonial agenda.

Hence, the endeavor of postcolonialism requires a “genuine global decolonization at political, economic and cultural levels” (A. Prasad, 2003, p. 7). A. Prasad explained that, unlike poststructuralism, where scholars emphasize the interconnected nature of ideology and discourse, postcolonialism highlights the linkages between material and the ideological. Postcolonial theory enables organizational scholars to critically engage with practices that are instituted through disciplinary mechanisms to perpetuate Western domination (Munshi & Kurian, 2005). For instance, Dutta and Basnyat (2006) interrogated the very logic of development and participatory democratic processes embedded in a USAID-sponsored radio drama in Nepal that seeks to promote family planning; promoters employed the veil of democratic audience participation as a co-optive strategy to push the family-planning agenda of campaign planners and to further advance the hegemonic logic of dominant social actors who frame questions of poor health in subaltern sectors in terms of individual lifestyle instead of addressing structural issues surrounding health inequities.

This line of work further demonstrates that discourses of development often serve the political economy of dominant social actors; the missionary zeal embodied in the rhetoric of emancipation ultimately serves as a façade for colonial and imperial agendas (Dutta, 2006; Dutta & Basnyat, 2006). Suggesting the relevance of understanding the workings of images during the U.S. war with Afghanistan in the backdrop of the actual economic and geopolitical aims of the United States, Cloud (2004) suggested that mercenary motives to control the world oil supply were couched under the rhetoric of saving the people and, more specifically, the women of Afghanistan. In a similar vein, Dutta-Bergman (2006) observed that the rhetoric of liberating Iraqi people from dictatorship and bringing democracy to Iraq served as the chador for U.S. neo-imperialism embodied in Operation Iraqi Freedom. By its endeavor to engage with and give legitimacy to non-Western experiences, postcolonial scholarship remains peripheral to Western modernity as a resistive act (Dutta-Bergman, 2004a, 2004b). A. Prasad (2003) argued that, since “defamiliarization” constitutes one of the primary interests of critical organizational scholarship, postcolonial theory provides opportunities for perpetual surprises. Just as feminism offers a new meaning of organization by explaining it as a gendered site, postcolonial theory suggests defamiliarization in new ways.

Postcolonialism is relevant for the study of management and organizations, especially given rapidly changing global political and economic activities. Instead of a dominant single center over the peripheries forming the global processes, a number of competing centers bring about shifts in the global balance of power between nation-states “forging new sets of interdependencies” (Featherstone, 1995, p. 13). As more players participate in the game, they demand the access and the right to be heard. Much earlier, Said (1978) suggested that the West

cannot now avoid listening to the other or assume that the latter is at an earlier stage of development. Under these changing conditions, postcolonial insights can provide understanding of the implications of these changes (A. Prasad, 2003). These changes raise the following questions that merit examination. How does global culture produce differences, power struggles, domination, and resistances? How is the colonialist other reformulated through new formations of transnational relations of capital and culture? In other words, what is the new form of the other (Shome & Hegde, 2002)?

Some of the tensions at the workplace in the global economy can be seen in a new light using a postcolonial lens. For instance, Bhabha's (1994) notion of *ambivalence* holds the potential to open up new vistas of research (A. Prasad, 2003). Ambivalence represents the empowering intentions of the colonizer by way of civilizing the primitive, and it also speaks of violent colonization of the other. Hence, ambivalence ruptures the monolithic discourse of colonization by revealing the cracks and fissures for potential resistance by the colonized. Bhabha advanced the ideas of *mimicry* and *hybridity* to enumerate the potential for resistance through ambivalence. Bhabha's conceptualization of the colonized's mimicry of the colonizer's discourse rearticulates existential heterogeneities as the colonized's copy of the colonizer displaces the established dominations. Mimicry upsets the stasis between the original and the copy as mimicry is "almost same, but not quite" (p. 127). According to A. Prasad, while mimicry has been traditionally viewed as continuation of the colonizer's hegemony with the perpetual dependence of the colonized, Bhabha noted that mimicry can also be viewed as a space for resistance.

Bhabha's (1994) concept of hybridity is the other robust idea that enables the rise of postcolonial resistance. Hybridity, similar to mimicry, refers to a process of cultural assimilation that is never congruous or complete. According to Bhabha, the process of hybridization ruptures colonizer's discourse with differential knowledge and positionalities, enabling a "strategic reversal of the process of domination" (p. 114). Also, hybridity comprises an act of resistance because it disrupts the colonizer's intentions and expectations by misappropriating the colonizer's demands. Bhabha's ideas of mimicry and hybridity also reject the essentialist and singular construction of social subjects and problematize the totalizing notion of power. It coincides with critical organizational scholars who reject the "triumph of hegemony" (A. Prasad & P. Prasad, 2003, p. 110).

A. Prasad (2003) elucidated applicability of ambivalence in managerial discourses. Managerial discourses emphasize workers' autonomy and empowerment, while simultaneously inscribing strategies of surveillance and control at the workplace. More specifically, the existence of multiple subcultures in individual organizations replete with cultural differences exemplifies the possibility of hybridity in postcolonial theory. Application of these concepts has the potential to open up new areas of inquiry. According to A. Prasad and P. Prasad (2003),

“For instance, management researchers might investigate the ways in which differences (e.g. of cultural categories, their meanings, their prioritization etc.) across organizational subcultures often distort processes of planned organizational change...” (p. 113).

Establishing the relevance of such thinking, A. Prasad called for postcolonial intervention in organizational research that can expand the scope of workplace resistance.

A. Prasad (2003) introduced the relevance of postcolonial studies for organizational communication; however, he merely touched on the tenets of subaltern studies. Subaltern studies involve writing history from below (Guha, 1981), thus challenging dominant constructions of knowledge. Subaltern studies, as an intervention in South Asian scholarship, came into existence to interrupt the Indian historiography dominated by “colonialist elitism and bourgeois-nationalist elitism” (p. 1). The Subaltern Studies project chronicles the historiography of the people by documenting their agency and politics, which had always been left out of dominant discursive spaces of knowledge. Subaltern studies were launched with the initiative and inspiration of Ranajit Guha, “an extraordinarily brilliant Indian historian and political economist” (Said, 1988, p. v). Guha, along with five other scholars from South Asia, published several volumes of an editorial collective, entitled *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, with Guha editing the first six volumes (see e.g., Guha, 1983).

Drawing from Gramsci (1971), the themes of subaltern studies pay considerable attention to the dominant class, as the subaltern exists in a binary relationship with the dominant. Subaltern studies offer a complex critique of modernity. Said (1988) argued:

As an alternative discourse then, the work of the Subaltern scholars can be seen as an analogue of all those recent attempts in the West and throughout the rest of the world to articulate the hidden or suppressed accounts of numerous groups—women, minorities, disadvantaged or disposed groups, refugees, exiles, etc... This is another way of underlining the concern with politics and power (p. vi–vii).

Subaltern studies radically challenge modernist epistemologies and monolithic notions of modernity, inspired by postcolonial thinking (Beverly, 2004; Prakash, 1994). Since subaltern scholars strive to recover the history of the marginalized “other” against the institutionalized system of knowledge constructed by the West and the national elite in postcolonial states, it becomes a critique of the dominant system of knowledge production itself, legitimized by the West. At the same time, Beverly characterized it as postmodern because it endeavors to bring about “epistemological rupture” (p. 15) or what Lyotard (1984) regarded as interrupting grand metanarratives. Dynamic in their

multidisciplinarity, subaltern studies allows for investigations of different colonial situations. Establishing its relevance across territories, Guha (2001) elucidated that, though subaltern studies extend from South Asian experience, it informs the experiences of any silenced subordination. Though it relies on postcolonialism, Prakash argued that it remains distinct in its scholarly inquiry because it preserves the record of colonial domination and tracks the “(subaltern) positions that could not be properly recognized and named” (p. 1486). Hence, Guha positioned it as a study to destabilize issues of power from the elitist agenda by drawing attention to the “other.” The postcolonial strand plays out in global movements such as the Narmada Bachao Andolan and the Chipko movement that articulate alternative meanings of development based on diverse ways of knowing that directly contradict Eurocentric bases of knowledge (Dutta & Pal, 2007).

The study of resistance presented in these different strands of communication scholarship offer opportunities for exploring both micro- and macropolitics of resistance. Whereas the traditional approach to resistance involves collective practices of resistance, critical postmodernism and discourse-based approaches emphasize more of the individualized forms. Both feminist and postcolonial approaches explore the intersections between the individualized and collective forms of resistance as they simultaneously engage with possibilities of individualized narratives of resistance through the crafting of alternative discourses and the possibilities of collective organizing that challenge the dominant structures. Critics of postmodern and discourse-centered approaches claim that the emphasis on individualized forms of resistance is antithetical to the agendas of collective struggle (Ganesh et al., 2005). With the increasing disparities between the haves and have-nots in the recent past, a marginal reemergence of interest in the traditional genre of resistance has occurred (Cloud, 2001; Ganesh et al., 2005). Ganesh et al. expressed concern over research on resistance in organizational communication which, they argue, has been explored in largely individualized terms. With much work focusing on a dialectical model of resistance and control, resistance gets conceptualized as “individual awareness of power inequities” (p. 174) or “individual’s ability to articulate alternative meanings to that of dominant constructions” (p. 174).

Also, given the focus on U.S. organizations, the organizational literature perhaps overlooks instances of collective resistances in other parts of the world. Ganesh et al. (2005) cautioned that the emphasis on individual strategies does not get connected to the realm of collective resistances, thus limiting the possibilities for transformational politics in the context of neoliberalism. Similarly, Cloud (2001) argued that current critical organizational communication theorizing predominantly focuses on identity politics without really exploring the transformative aspects of communication. However, though the conceptualization of traditional resistance in this neo-liberal age gets redefined in many ways, much of its essence remains the same in terms of its goal and collective appeal. Ganesh et al. characterized resistance as effort

with transformation potential, which attempts to “effect large-scale, collective changes in the domains of state policy, corporate practice, social structure, cultural norms, and daily lived experience” (p. 177).

Furthermore, the study of resistance in public relations practice offers an opportunity for exploring the role of resistance in the realm of collective organizing as it engages with issues of global activism (see Holtzhausen, 2005; Pal & Dutta, in press). The interrogation of the ways in which activist publics organize themselves in a global landscape offers an entry point to theorize collective organizing that connects the local sites of resistance with global support through digital media

RESISTANCE IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT

Each of the existing approaches to resistance provides possibilities for theoretically engaging with the concept in the realm of globalization. In this section, we identify key elements in global resistance that draw on the existing communication literature on resistance and specify new vistas for exploration.

Transnational Activism: The New Global Movement

As Harvey (2000) observed, globalization has particular bearing on postmodern thinking that necessitates theorizing in new directions. Transnational activism connects the structural and cultural dimensions of global resistance, demonstrating the dialectical tension between control and resistance (M.J. Papa et al., 2006). Global resistance, the authors suggested, is at once modern and postmodern; it draws on the impetus of critical theory to explore the material roots of global inequities and simultaneously foregrounds the temporality of discourse that continuously shifts amid complexly layered global structures. According to Papa et al., the “complex interplay of economic and cultural dynamics” (p. 201) in transnational activism necessitates an understanding of its implications for communication research. For instance, scapes, detailed earlier in this chapter, demonstrate that public consciousness no longer stretches across national spaces but “ignites the micro-politics of a nation-state” (Appadurai, 2000, p. 236).

Hence, what are the challenges for communication research in view of these complex global shifts? While working in a community-based setting, grassroots organizers increasingly network with transnational activists to affect changes in specific communities, thereby connecting the local and the global (Naples & Desai, 2002). According to Tarrow (2005), though transnational activism is not a new phenomenon, it is particularly striking given its connection to the current wave of globalization and its relation to the changing structure of international politics. The latter provides activists with focal points for collective action, expanded resources, and unity in transnational coalitions and campaigns.

Tarrow (2005) suggested that transnational activists link nonstate actors, their states, and international politics with the potential to create a new political arena. Tarrow and Della Porta (2005) explained such linkages by posing the concept of *complex internationalization* that involves “expansion of international institutions, international regimes, and the transfer of the resources of local and national actors to the international stage, producing threats, opportunities and resources for international NGOs, transnational social movements and, indirectly, grassroots social movements” (p. 235). These actors possess varying levels of power. The state constitutes the central actor; international institutions represent state interests and their bureaucratic claims; some NGOs gain direct access to both states and institutions, and social movements operate from outside this structure to influence its policies.

Della Porta and Tarrow (2005) summarized five key changes that have expanded the scope of contemporary wave of transnational contention: (1) the institutions representing neoliberalism (IMF, WB, and the WTO) have become central to targets of resistance; (2) these institutions provide a focal point for the global framing of a variety of domestic and international conflicts; (3) new electronic technologies enhance the organizing of movements in many venues at once; (4) within transnational contention, tendencies can be seen toward formation of transnational campaigns and coalitions; and (5) partial but highly visible successes of campaigns by non-state actors such as the international support for the liberation movement in South Africa, the anti-landmine campaign, the international solidarity movement with the Zapatista rebellion among others. However, development of conflicts over global issues is not necessarily organized around transnational social movement organizations. Instead, they are rooted at the local and national levels, turning simultaneously to various governmental agencies and making linkages between different social and political actors.

In addition to active interaction between domestic and international populations of movement organizations, members form local and global coalitions. A local coalition can occur by changing the framing of domestic political conflicts. However, Della Porta and Tarrow (2005) characterized global social justice as a masterframe of new mobilizations. In turn, this framework creates loosely coupled transnational networks that organize around particular campaigns or series of campaigns, using varied forms of protests. In other words, Della Porta and Tarrow argued that local issues of such struggles remain distinct even though they get connected by sharing a common global agenda. They explained:

Specific concerns with women’s rights, labor issues, the defense of the environment, and opposition to war survive, but are bridged together in opposition against ‘neoliberal globalization.’ In order to keep different groups together, ‘tolerant’ inclusive identities develop, stressing differences as a positive quality of the movement (p. 12).

Awareness about local phenomena getting increasingly linked with broader global processes has gained immense importance in the twentieth century (Seidman, 2000). The new global perspective on identities, networks, and communities (and the way in which international processes shape and redefine local ones) has prompted social movement theorists to reconsider many of their basic assumptions. Some of the questions, Seidman summarized, evoke special interests: (1) when does a social process become a global one; (2) when does a local social movement become linked enough with the global processes to be considered a global social movement; (3) what do global processes mean for the very local processes through which movements create collective identities; (4) who represents movements on the global stage, and how are those representations redesigned internationally; (5) how do local movements change in response to global resources or audiences; and (6) what roles do global organizations play in provoking local movements?

In terms of mobilization of resources, Della Porta and Tarrow (2005) identified two emerging challenges for movements. First, the fragmentation in the social structure has expanded social heterogeneity affecting formation of social groups that used to be an important basis for many social movements. Second, increasing individualization of cultures has led to declining solidarity in the society. However, Della Porta and Tarrow asserted that transnational mobilization embraces different movement strategies as a means of coping with such changes. For instance, flexible networks allow heterogeneous social forces to become part of one movement.

These networks of groups and activists imbibe an emerging identity, involve in conflictual issues, and follow non-traditional forms of participation. A large majority of the activists who participate in demonstrations against international summits identify themselves with movement related to globalization. Different names have been proposed for it (no global, Seattle people, globalization from below, global justice, etc.), indicating that its core goals remain to be crystallized. Tarrow (2005) suggested that availability of resources and opportunities facilitate this era of transnational activism. Greater access to higher education, emergence of English as the main language of international trade and services, and evidence of formulation of decisions that affect people's lives at international avenues contribute to generating activist interest.

Generating Issues and Mobilizing Resources

While considerable attention has been paid to global protests, scholars have attended less to how global issues affect the civic and political life at the local level. Diani (2005) specifically inquired about the impact of global issues on grassroots political organizations' strategies and orientations. Diani espoused that stakeholders generally perceive environmental conditions, labor rights, and migrants' rights as global issues. Yet, such perceptions largely depend on the interpretations attributed to issues by social actors. Sometimes involved parties

treat issues as existing agendas, such as ones related to developing countries' debts are considered to be agendas of traditional Leftist politics. Diani provided an analysis of issue structures that explains the new global movement and argued that presence of a distinctive set of issues does not necessarily imply that the protest activities and other forms of collective actions on such issues will be promoted. Social movements comprise sustained series of campaigns that may be linked to broader chains of protests through framing and discursive practices, and also through multiple attachments of actors. Diani's study of two different local U.K. settings suggests mobilization of global issues relies on specific alliances based on identity bonds within British civil society. Global issues are pervasive and distinctive and, thus, not always equally appealing to civic bodies. Global issues resonate with organizations with networks and share a common identity.

Smith et al. (1997) contended that issue networks aid communication and strategic coordination facilitating movement activity when linked by a common interest in advancing a particular value. Coalitions among actors in issue networks typically form around campaigns, which involve attempts to coordinate movement actions around a particular policy.

McCarthy (1997) argued that case studies in locations outside the United States provide six core concepts that are central to these movements: strategic framing processes, activist identities, mobilizing structures, resource mobilization, political opportunity structures, and repertoires of contention. Activist groups draw from institutional structures in mobilizing around issues of concern. For instance, support of the church guarantees providing personnel, access to technology and financial resources.

Alger (1997) identified five categories of transnational social movement activity: creating and mobilizing global networks, participating in multilateral political arenas, facilitating interstate cooperation, acting within states, and enhancing public participation. Tarrow and Della Porta (2005) explained transnational social activism through three broad categories of diffusion, internalization, and externalization that encompass many of the factors enunciated by international relations scholars. Diffusion concerns adoption or adaptation of organizational forms of one country in another. In this sense, particular practices or frames can be transferred from one country to another through cheap travel, knowledge of common languages, and access to Internet. According to Tarrow and Della Porta, internalization refers to addressing issues that originate externally, and externalization means organized interests looking for alliances with international institutions for mobilization of resources.

Though these models and categories of mobilization of issues and resources comprise a step forward in approaching social movements as rational responses rather than as examples of deviancy (Mayo, 2005), they still remain limited to rational functionalist models that are inadequate for addressing some of the concerns that have emerged with globalization. Focusing on actors' choices, these models provide a top-down approach that does not take the wider

structural context into account. For instance, as Mayo noted, availability of resources, such as the political freedom to organize, needs to be considered. Also, we should craft space for movements that organize on the peripheries of civil societies. Bound within the limits of rationality and reason, the categories operate within the dominant episteme without encouraging marginalized subaltern voices.

Transformative Potential

To understand the promise of the new social movements, we must illustrate the features that distinguish the new from the old. According to Mayo (2005), new social movements represent a new form of transformative politics. The old social movements represent class-based politics struggling to gain control of the state. On the contrary, Mayo argued, new social movements involve multiple social actors establishing their presence in a fragmented social and political space. Old social movements focused on the working class, especially industrial projects that struggled for improvements and wages and conditions. The old movements were also problematic because of their bureaucratic forms that resulted in professional leaderships rather than grassroots level action. In contrast, new social movements comprise a transformational politics that fosters new forms of life and decentralized and non-bureaucratic politics.

In this sense, resistance in the context of globalization occurs amid fragmented communicative processes that challenge globally situated politics from local contexts. Local communities become the sites of mobilizing and yet intersect with multiple local communities elsewhere in the globe. This complexly intertwined and fragmented nature of transnational activism suggests the necessity for new theorizing of resistance that simultaneously connects the local and the global, discusses structurally situated politics, and yet attends to global influences through local narratives and locally situated forms of organizing (Dutta & Pal, 2007; Juris, 2004). In articulating the processes through which global activist publics offer resistance to the dominant hegemonic configurations, the literature on transnational activism demonstrates the relevance of theorizing about the discursive openings and material strategies through which stakeholders initiate shifts in the macro-level structures (Tarrow, 2005)

CONCLUSION

As we close this chapter, we offer a few suggestions for further exploration in terms of theory building, empirical investigation, and development of praxis in terms of global resistance. First, we note the relevance of future theorizing in global resistance that studies the intersections between the global-local

and material-symbolic dialectics. This intersection is both practically and theoretically relevant as globally dispersed local publics engage in material and symbolic practices of resistance. What are the instances of local direct action where material practices become meaningful, and what are the ways in which these material practices connect with symbolic practices both locally and globally? How do local symbolic practices impact globally situated material ones? How do stakeholders mobilize global material practices for purposes of local resistance? These questions also hold pragmatic value in terms of suggesting guidelines for organizing that connects the local with the global and develops a matrix of symbolic and material practices.

Second, the intersections of workplace practices of resistance and community-based practices of resistance in the realm of mainstream public spheres and subaltern public spheres should be studied further. What are the possibilities for labor politics of resistance in the realm of the public spheres of community life? What are the possibilities for the politics of citizenship in the realm of access to work? How does access to work play out in the realm of access to political platforms? What resistive strategies are available for transforming these very platforms to which subaltern groups have limited access because of their limited economic resources?

Third, future scholarship on resistance ought to explore the linkages between the individual and collective aspects of resistance. What are the ways in which individual identities play out in terms of collective mobilization? What roles do individualized discourses play in collective mobilizations of resistance? Emphasizing the individual *and* the collective provides a valuable alternative to examining them separately. Instead, narratives articulating individual identities become entry points for interpreting and mobilizing collective resistance.

Fourth, globalization processes simultaneously impact various aspects and contexts of human life, ranging from workplace practices to mediated practices to health practices. Simultaneously, our review of resistance demonstrates the multiple contextual settings within which resistance is played out. Therefore, future empirical work on resistance in the context of globalization ought to explore the intersections among the different contexts of communication, calling for more interdisciplinary work on resistance. For instance, workplace practices of resistance are simultaneously intertwined with resistive practices of healthcare that seek to transform unhealthy workplace practices. Similarly, resistive practices in the realm of securing access to affordable health care are often intertwined with questions of work and income.

Fifth, this review argues that postcolonialism has immense potential to offer new ways of thinking about power, domination and resistance, particularly in the context of globalization. Central to postcolonialism is repudiation of Eurocentric knowledge and identities instituted through Western domination. While it ruptures and resists Eurocentric metanarratives by articulating conditions of marginality created by Western domination, its theme of ambivalence also provides a space for resistance in the new age global economy.

Communication scholars should further explore the sensibilities of postcolonial scholarship for their work on global resistance.

Sixth, this literature review suggests the relevance of creating discursive openings in the literature on resistance for the voices of cultural participants who have typically been erased from the dominant modes of inquiry and mainstream civil society platforms. Subaltern studies scholarship is particularly suitable in answering questions of erasure and voice in the realm of global hegemony. Subaltern voices find new avenues in the realm of transformative politics as we look at various movements of global activism that connect positions of subalternity with the globally situated movements (as demonstrated in the case of the Narmada Bachao Andolan discussed earlier; Dutta & Pal, 2007; Grosfoguel, 2005; Kriesberg, 1997). This review documents the communicative possibilities for resistance in terms of the new social movements as responses to global forces of domination. Future theorizing and research ought to explore the ways in which subaltern strategies capture mainstream public spheres and bring about discursive and material shifts in these structures. Furthermore, much work is needed in exploring the ways in which deep-seated structures of knowledge are resisted by alternative ways of knowing that emerge from subaltern spaces? How do these forms of knowing simultaneously get co-opted by dominant structures, impact dominant epistemic structures, and open up transformative avenues for changing these structures?

Seventh, although the various existing approaches to resistance outlined in this review have been presented separately as seemingly mutually exclusive categories, the materially situated and discursively constituted nature of global resistance suggests the necessity of exploring the boundaries and shared spaces among these approaches (see also Broadfoot et al., 2004). For instance, with the increasing material disparities across the globe, how can traditional approaches to resistance be coupled with critical postmodern approaches to understand the ways in which identities are negotiated through material practices and simultaneously offer spaces for transforming these material practices?

We began this review with the goal of being as comprehensive as possible in reviewing the literatures on resistance in communication. To this extent, we surveyed the existing scholarship in organizational communication, public relations, health communication, gender studies, rhetoric, and performance studies, with the greatest focus on organizational communication because of the wide treatment of resistance within this sub-discipline. Though we could not include related works from interpersonal communication, family communication, critical media studies, or cultural studies owing to space constraints, we acknowledge their importance and encourage future examinations of linkages between those bodies of work and the ones discussed in this chapter.

Future communication scholarship might explore the intersections between the concepts of interpretations as resistance and practices of resistance in mediated contexts. We also note the need for communication scholarship

that bridges the current and growing scholarship on resistance in areas such as social movement studies, sociology, philosophy, geography, women's studies, and political science; communication scholars might contribute to the discussions in these areas by seeking to understand the meaning-making processes underlying various forms of resistance and the communicative practices through which resistance is articulated (Cheney, 1998; Ganesh et al., 2005). Though we have attempted to be international in our scope of the review, we have perhaps omitted some of the increasingly available literature on global resistance beyond Europe, North America, and South Asia. We hope that this review will spark additional theorizing of global resistance that draws on other cultural contexts and particularly attends to issues of subalternity in postcolonial contexts. In conclusion, we hope that this review offers the basis for additional communication scholarship that celebrates and engages with opportunities for resistive politics in the realm of the neoliberal agendas of globalization.

REFERENCES

- Alger, C.F. (1997). Transnational social movements, world politics, and global governance. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics* (pp. 260–75). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Allen, B. (2000). "Learning the ropes": A black feminist standpoint analysis. In P.M. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 177–208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Allen, B. (2005). Social constructionism. In S. May & D.K. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication theory and research: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 35–53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing critical management research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Appadurai, A. (2000). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (pp. 230–8). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Asen, R. (2000). Seeking the "counter" in counterpublics. *Communication Theory*, 10, 424–46.
- Ashcraft, K.L. (2000). Empowering "professional" relationships: Organizational communication meets feminist practice. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 347–92.
- Ashcraft, K.L. (2005). Resistance through consent? Occupational identity, organizational form, and the maintenance of masculinity among commercial airline pilots. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19, 67–90.
- Ashcraft, K.L., & Mumby, D.K. (2004). *Reworking gender: A feminist communicology of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Auyero, J. (2003). *Contentious lives: Two Argentine women, two protests, and the quest for recognition*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Bardhan, N. (2003). Rupturing public relations metanarratives: The example of India. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 15, 225–48.
- Barker, J.R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 408–37.
- Bartesaghi, M., & Castor, T. (2008). Social construction in communication: Revisiting the conversation. In C.S. Beck (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 32* (pp. 1–39). New York: Routledge.
- Beck, C.S. (2005). Becoming the story: Narratives as collaborative, social enactments of individual, relational and public identities. In L.M. Harter, P.M. Japp, & C.S. Beck (Eds.), *Narratives, health and healing: Communication theory, research, and practice* (pp. 61–81). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bell, E.L., & Forbes, L.C. (1994). Office folklore in the academic paperwork empire. The interstitial space of gendered (con)texts. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 14, 181–96.
- Beverly, J. (2004). *Subalternity and representation: Arguments in cultural theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Boal, A. (1985). *Theater of the oppressed* (C.A. McBride & M.L. McBride, Trans.). New York: Theater Communications Group.
- Boal, A. (1998). *Legislative theatre* (A. Jackson, Trans.). London: Routledge.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Braverman, H. (1984). The real meaning of Taylorism. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy* (pp. 55–61). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Broadfoot, K., Deetz, S., & Anderson, D. (2004). Multi-leveled, multi-method approaches in organizational discourses. In D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Osrick, & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational discourse* (pp. 193–211). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bullert, B. J. (2000). Progressive public relations, sweatshops and the net. *Political Communication*, 17, 403–7.
- Burawoy, M. (1984). Organizing consent on the shop floor: The game of making out. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy* (pp. 134–43). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Buzzanell, P.M. (1994). Gaining a voice: Feminist organizational communication theorizing. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 7, 339–83.
- Buzzanell, P.M. (1995). Reframing the glass ceiling as a socially constructed process: Implications for understanding and change. *Communication Monographs*, 64, 327–54.
- Buzzanell, P.M. (2000). Preface. In P.M. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. ix–xii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Buzzanell, P.M., & Liu, M. (2005). Struggling with maternity leave policies and practices: A poststructuralist feminist analysis of gendered organizing. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 33, 1–25.
- Chatterjea, A. (2004). *Butting out: Reading resistive choreographies through works by Jawole Willa Jo Zollar and Chandralekha*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

- Cheney, G. (1998). *Values at work: Employee participation meets market pressure at Mondragon*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Cheney, G., & Cloud, D. (2006). Doing democracy, engaging the material: Employee participation and labor activity in an age of market globalization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19, 501–40.
- Clair, R.P. (1994). The use of framing devices to sequester organizational narratives: Hegemony and harassment. *Communication Monographs*, 60, 113–36.
- Clair, R.P., & Thompson, K. (1996). Pay discrimination as a discursive and material practice: A case of extended housework. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 24, 1–20.
- Clegg, S. (1994). Power relations and the constitution of the resistant subject. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy* (pp. 274–325). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Cloud, D. (1994). The materiality of discourse as oxymoron: A challenge to critical rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58, 141–63.
- Cloud, D. (2001). Laboring under the sign of the new. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 268–78.
- Cloud, D. (2004). “To veil the threat of terror”: Afghan women and the “clash of civilization” in the imagery of the U.S. war on terrorism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90, 285–306.
- Collinson, D. (1988). Engineering humor: Masculinity, joking and conflict in shop-floor relations. *Organizational Studies*, 9, 181–99.
- Collinson, D. (1994). Strategies of resistance: Power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace. In J.M. Jermier, D. Knights, & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Resistance and power* (pp. 25–68). New York: Routledge.
- Collinson, D. (2002). Managing humor. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39, 269–88.
- Conquergood, D. (1982a). Communication as performance: Dramaturgical dimensions of everyday life. In J.I. Sisco (Ed.), *The Jensen lectures: Contemporary communication studies* (pp. 24–43). Tampa, FL: University of South Florida Press.
- Conquergood, D. (1982b). Performing as a moral act: Ethical dimensions of the ethnography of performance. *Literature in Performance*, 5, 1–13.
- Conquergood, D. (1988). Health theater in a Hmong refugee camp. *The Drama Review*, 32, 174–208.
- Conquergood, D. (1989). Poetics, play, process, and power: The performative turn in anthropology. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 9, 82–8.
- Conquergood, D. (1991). Rethinking ethnography: Towards a critical cultural politics. *Communication Monographs*, 58, 179–94.
- Coombs, T.W. (2007). *Ongoing crisis communication: Planning, managing, and responding*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cox, J.R. (2004). “Free Trade” and the eclipse of civil society: Barriers to transparency and public participation in NAFTA and the Free Trade Area of the Americas. In S.P. Depoe, J.W. Delicath, & M-F. Aepli Elsenbeer (Eds.), *Communication and public participation in environmental decision making* (pp. 201–19). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Curtin, P.A., & Gaither, K.T. (2005). Privileging identity, difference, and power: The circuit of culture as a basis for public relations theory. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17, 91–115.

- Curtin, P.A., & Gaither, K.T. (2006). Contested notions of issue identity in international public relations: A case study. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 18*, 67–89.
- Deetz, S.A. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Della Porta, D., & Tarrow, S. (2005). Transnational processes and social activism. In D. Della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational protest and global activism* (pp. 1–17). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- DeSouza, R., & Dutta, M. (in press). Global and local networking for HIV/AIDS: The case of the Saathii E-Forum. *Journal of Health Communication*.
- Diani, M. (2005). Cities in the world: Local civil society and global issues in Britain. In D. Della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational protest and global activism* (pp. 45–67). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Dozier, D.M., & Lauzen, M.M. (2000). Liberating the intellectual domain from the practice: Public relations, activism and the role of the scholar. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 12*, 3–22.
- Drache, D. (2001). *The market or the public domain: Global governance and the asymmetry of power*. New York: Routledge.
- Dutta, M. (2006). Theoretical approaches to entertainment education campaigns: A subaltern critique. *Health Communication, 20*, 221–31.
- Dutta, M. (2007). Communicating about culture and health: Theorizing culture-centered and cultural sensitivity approaches. *Communication Theory, 17*, 304–28.
- Dutta, M., & Basnyat, I. (2006). The radio communication project in Nepal: A culture-centered approach to participation. *Health Education and Behavior, XX*, 1–13.
- Dutta, M., & Pal, M. (2007). The Internet as a site of resistance: The case of the Narmada Bachao Andolan (Save the river Narmada movement). In S. Duhe (Ed.), *New media and public relations* (pp. 203–15). New York: Peter Lang.
- Dutta-Bergman, M. (2004a). The unheard voices of Santalis: Communicating about health from the margins of India. *Communication Theory, 14*, 237–63.
- Dutta-Bergman, M. (2004b). Poverty, structural barriers and health: A Santali narrative of health communication. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*, 1–16.
- Dutta-Bergman, M. (2005a). Civil society and public relations: Not so civil after all. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*, 267–89.
- Dutta-Bergman, M. (2005b). Theory and practice in health communication campaigns: A critical interrogation. *Health Communication, 18*, 103–12.
- Dutta-Bergman, M. (2006). U.S. public diplomacy in the Middle East: A critical cultural approach. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 30*, 102–24.
- Edwards, R. C. (1984). Forms of control in the labor process: An historical analysis. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy* (pp. 86–119). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Ellingson, L.L. (2005). *Communicating in the clinic: Negotiating frontstage and backstage teamwork*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ezzamel, M., Wilmott, H., & Worthington, F. (2001). Power, control and resistance in the factory that time forgot. *Journal of Management Studies, 38*, 1053–79.
- Fairhurst, G., & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory, 14*, 5–26.
- Featherstone, M. (1995). *Undoing culture*. London: Sage.

- Fleming, P., & Sewell, G. (2002). Looking for the good soldier, *svejk*: Alternative modalities of resistance in the contemporary workplace. *Sociology*, 36, 857–873.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1980a). *Power/knowledge. Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980b). *The history of sexuality: Volume I* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books/Random House.
- Frank, A. (1991). *At the will of the body: Reflections on illness*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Frank, A. (1995). *The wounded storyteller: Body, illness, and ethics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 109–42). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Freeman, R.B., & Medoff, J.L. (1984). *What do unions do?* New York: Basic Books.
- Freeman, J., & Rogers, J. (1999). *What workers want*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Frey, L., Adelman, M., Flint, L., & Query, J. (2000). Weaving meanings together in an AIDS residence: Communicative practices, perceived health outcomes, and the symbolic construction of community. *Journal of Health Communication*, 5, 53–72.
- Friedman, A.L. (1977). *Industry and labor: Class struggle at work and monopoly capitalism*. London: Macmillan.
- Ganesh, S., Zoller, H., & Cheney, G. (2005). Transforming resistance, broadening our boundaries: Critical organizational communication meets globalization from below. *Communication Monographs*, 72, 169–91.
- Gentile, A. (2003, August). *Workers with citizens; workers as citizens: Dockers contending neoliberal globalization and post-Sept. 11 statism*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston.
- Giddens, A. (2000). The globalization of modernity. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (pp. 92–103). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gottfried, H. (1994). Learning the score: The duality of control and everyday resistance in the temporary-help service industry. In J.M. Jermier, D. Knights, & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Resistance and power* (pp. 102–27). New York: Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G.N. Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.
- Greenhouse, S. (2000, February 26). Labor, in switch, urges amnesty for all illegal immigrants. *The New York Times* [national edition], p. A1.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2005). The implications of subaltern epistemologies for global capitalism: transmodernity, border thinking, and global coloniality. In R.P. Appelbaum & W.I. Robinson (Eds.), *Critical globalization studies* (pp. 283–92). New York: Routledge.
- Grossberg, L. (1993). Cultural studies and/in new worlds. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 10, 1–22.
- Grunig, J. E. (2001). Two-way symmetrical public relations: Past, present and future. In R.L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 11–30). London: Sage.

- Guha, R. (1981). Preface. In R. Guha (Ed.), *Subaltern studies: Writings on South Asian history and society* (Vol. 1, pp. vii–viii). Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R. (Ed.). (1983). *Subaltern studies: Writings on South Asian history and society* (Vol. 2). Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R. (2001). Subaltern studies: Projects of our time and their convergence. In I. Rodriguez (Ed.), *The Latin American subaltern studies reader* (pp. 35–46). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Harter, L.M., Kirby, E., Edwards, A., & McClanahan, A. (2005). Time, technology and meritocracy: The disciplining of women's bodies in narrative constructions of age-related infertility. In L.M. Harter, P.M. Japp, & C.S. Beck (Eds.), *Narratives, health and healing: Communication theory, research, and practice* (pp. 83–106). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harter, L.M., Scott, J.A., Novak, D., et al. (2006). Freedom through flight: Performing a counter-narrative of disability. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 34, 3–29.
- Harvey, D. (2000). Time–space compression and the postmodern condition. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (pp. 82–91). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hasek, J. (1973). *The good soldier, svejk* (Cecil Parrott, Trans.). London: Heinemann.
- Hashmi, S. (2007). The first ten years of street theater. In S. Deshpande (Ed.), *Theater of the streets: The Jana Natya Manch experience* (pp. 11–16). New Delhi: Janam.
- Haynes, D., & Prakash, G. (1992). Introduction: The entanglement of power and resistance. In D. Haynes & G. Prakash (Eds.), *Contesting power: Resistance and everyday social relations in South Asia* (pp. 1–22). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Heath, R.L. (2001). Public relations in cyberspace. The frontier of new communication technologies. In R.L. Heath (Ed.) *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 579–81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Herod, A. (1997). From a geography of labor to a labor geography: Labor's spatial fix and the geography of capitalism. *Antipode*, 29, 1–31.
- Holmer Nadesan, M. (1997). Constructing paper dolls: The discourse of personality testing in organizational practice. *Communication Theory*, 7, 189–218.
- Holmer Nadesan, M. (2001). Fortune on globalization and the new economy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 498–506.
- Holtzhausen, D.R. (2005). Public relations practice and political change in South Africa. *Public Relations Review*, 31, 407–16.
- Jermier, J.M., Knights, D., & Nord, W.R. (1994). Introduction. In J.M. Jermier, D. Knights, & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Resistance and power in organizations* (pp. 1–24). New York: Routledge.
- Juravich, T., & Bronfenbrenner, K. (2000). *Ravenswood: The steelworkers' victory and the revival of American labor*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Juris, J. S. (2004). Networked social movements: Global movements for global justice. In M. Castells (Ed.), *The network society* (pp. 341–62). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Karlberg, M. (1996). Remembering the public in public relations research: From theoretical to operational symmetry. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 8, 263–78.
- Kellner, D. (1989). *Critical theory, Marxism and modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Keohane, R.O. (2002). *Power and governance in a partially globalized world*. New York: Routledge.
- Kilduff, M., & Mehra, A. (1997). Postmodernism and organizational research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22, 453–81.
- Knights, D., & Vurdubakis, T. (1994). Foucault, power, resistance and all that. In J.M. Jermier, D. Knights, & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Resistance and power* (pp. 102–27). New York: Routledge.
- Kondo, D.K. (1990). *Crafting selves: Power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kriesberg, L. (1997). Social movements and global transformation. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 3–18). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Krugman, P. (2002). *The great unraveling: Losing our way in the new century*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and communication in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. New York: Verso.
- Larson, G., & Tompkins, P. (2005). Ambivalence and resistance: A study of management in a concertive control system. *Communication Monographs*, 72, 1–21.
- Lordan, E.J. (2001). Cyberspin: The use of new technologies in public relations. In R.L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 583–9). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Lorde, A. (1980). *The cancer journals*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Luthra, R. (2003). Recovering women's voice: Communicative empowerment of women of the South. In P.J. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 27* (pp. 45–65) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. (G. Bennington & B. Massouari, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marx, K. (1967). *Capital*. New York: Dutton. [Original work published 1867]
- Marx, K. (1975). *Early writings*. London: Penguin Books. [Original work published in 1833–4]
- Mayo, M. (2005). *Global citizens: Social movements and the challenge of globalization*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- McCarthy, J.D. (1997). The globalization of social movement theory. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics* (pp. 243–59). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- McKie, D., & Munshi, D. (2005). Tracking trends: Peripheral visions and public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 31, 453–7.
- McMichael, D.P. (2003). *Development and social change: A global perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Melkote, S.M., & Steeves, H.L. (2001). *Communication for development in the third world: Theory and practice for empowerment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Millen, J., & Holtz, T. (2000). Dying for growth, Part I: Transnational corporations and the health of the poor. In J. Kim, J. Millen, A. Irwin, & J. Gershman (Eds.), *Dying for growth: Global inequality and the health of the poor* (pp. 177–223). Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Millen, J., Irwin, A., & Kim, J. (2000). Introduction: What is growing? Who is dying? In J. Kim, J. Millen, A. Irwin, & J. Gershman (Eds.), *Dying for growth: Global*

- inequality and the health of the poor* (pp. 3–10). Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Mittelman, J.H., & Chin, C. (2000). Conceptualizing resistance to globalization. In J.H. Mittelman (Ed.), *The globalization syndrome: Transformation and resistance* (pp. 165–78). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Miyoshi, M. (1995). A borderless world? From colonialism to transnationalism and the decline of the nation-state. *Critical Inquiry*, 19, 726–51.
- Moody, K. (1988). *An injury to all: The decline of American unionism*. New York: Verso.
- Morgan, J., & Krone, K.J. (2001). Bending the rules of professional display: Emotional improvisation in caregiver performances. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 29, 317–40.
- Mumby, D.K. (1993a). Critical organizational communication studies. The next ten years. *Communication Monographs*, 60, 18–25.
- Mumby, D.K. (Ed.). (1993b). *Narrative and social control: Critical perspectives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Mumby, D.K. (1997). Modernism, postmodernism, and communication studies: A rereading of an ongoing debate. *Communication Theory*, 7, 1–28.
- Mumby, D.K. (2000). Communication, organization, and the public sphere: A feminist perspective. In P.M. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 3–23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mumby, D.K. (2005). Theorizing resistance in organizational studies: A dialectical approach. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19, 19–44.
- Munshi, D., & Kurian, P. (2005). Imperializing spin cycles: A postcolonial look at public relations, greenwashing and the separation of publics. *Public Relations Review*, 31, 513–20.
- Murphy, A.G. (1998). Hidden transcripts of flight attendant resistance. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 11, 499–535.
- Murphy, A.G. (2001). The flight attendant dilemma: An analysis of communication and sensemaking during in-flight emergencies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 29, 30–53.
- Murphy, P., & Dee, J. (1992). DuPont and Greenpeace: The dynamics of conflict between corporations and activist groups. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 4, 3–20.
- Naples, N.A., & Desai, M. (2002). Women's local and translocal responses. An introduction to the chapters. In N.A. Naples & M. Desai (Eds.), *Women's activism and globalization* (pp. 34–41). New York: Routledge.
- Narayan, U., & Harding, S. (Eds.) (2000). *Decentering the center: Philosophy for a multicultural, postcolonial, and feminist world*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Pal, M., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2008). The Indian call center experience: A case study in changing discourses of identity, identification, and career in a global context. *Journal of Business Communication*, 45, 31–60.
- Pal, M., & Dutta, M. (in press). Public relations in a global context: The relevance of critical modernism as a theoretical lens. *Journal of Public Relations Research*.
- Papa, M.J., Singhal, A., & Papa, W. (2006). *Organizing for social change: A dialectic journey of theory and praxis*. New Delhi, India: Sage.

- Prakash, G. (1994). Subaltern studies as postcolonial criticism. *The American Historical Review*, 99, 1475–90.
- Prasad, A. (2003). The gaze of the other: Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement* (pp. 3–43). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, P., & Prasad, A. (2000). Stretching the iron cage: The constitution and implications of routine workplace resistance. *Organizational Science*, 11, 387–403.
- Prasad, A., & Prasad, P. (2003). The empire of organizations and the organization of empires: Postcolonial considerations on theorizing workplace resistance. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement* (pp. 95–119). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Robins, K. (2000). Encountering globalization. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (pp. 195–201). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Rosen, M. (1985). Breakfast at Spiro's: Dramaturgy and dominance. *Journal of Management*, 11, 31–48.
- Rosen, M. (1988). You asked for it: Christmas at the bosses' expense. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25, 463–80.
- Routledge, P. (2000). Our resistance will be as transnational as capital: Convergence space and strategy in globalizing resistance. *GeoJournal*, 52, 25–33.
- Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Said, E.W. (1988). Foreword. In R. Guha & G.C. Spivak (Eds.), *Selected subaltern studies* (pp. v–xii). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, J. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Seidman, G.W. (2000). Adjusting the lens: What do globalizations, transnationalism, and the anti-apartheid movement mean for social movement theory? In J.A. Guidry, M.D. Kennedy, & M.N. Zald (Eds.), *Globalizations and social movements: Culture, power, and the transnational public sphere* (pp. 339–57). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Sharf, B.F. (2005). How I fired my surgeon and embraced an alternative narrative. In L.M. Harter, P.M. Japp, & C.S. Beck (Eds.), *Narratives, health, and healing: Communication theory, research, and practice* (pp. 325–42). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shome, R., & Hegde, S.R. (2002). Postcolonial approaches to communication: Charting the terrain, engaging the intersections. *Communication Theory*, 12, 249–70.
- Silver, B.J. (2003). *Forces of labor: Workers' movements and globalization since 1870*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, J. (2001). Globalizing resistance: The battle of Seattle and the future of social movements. *Mobilisation*, 6, 1–20.
- Sotirin, P., & Gottfried, H. (1999). The ambivalent dynamics of secretarial "bitching": Control, resistance, and the construction of identity. *Organization*, 6, 57–80.
- Smith, J., Pagnucco, R., & Chatfield, C. (1997). Social movements and world politics. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics* (pp. 59–77). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Spivak, G. (1987). *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Methuen.

- Springston, J.K. (2001). Public relations and new media technology: The impact of the Internet. In R.L. Heath (Ed.) *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 603–14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sriramesh, K., & Vercic, D. (2003). A theoretical framework for global public relations research and practice. In K. Sriramesh & D. Vercic (Eds.), *The global public relations handbook* (pp. 1–19). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Stewart, C., Smith, C., & Denton, R. (2006). *Persuasion and social movements*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2005). *The new transnational activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S., & Della Porta, D. (2005). Conclusion: “Globalization,” complex internationalism, and transnational contention. In D. Della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational protest and global activism* (pp. 227–46). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Taylor, F. (1947). *Scientific management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Taylor, M., Kent, L.M., & White, J.W. (2001). How activist organizations are using the Internet to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 27, 263–84.
- Tilly, C. (1995). Globalization threatens labor’s rights. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 47, 1–23.
- Tracy, S.J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotion labor, self subordination, and discursive construction of identity in a total institution. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 90–128.
- Tretheway, A. (1997). Resistance, identity, and empowerment: A postmodern feminist analysis of clients in a human service organization. *Communication Monographs*, 64, 281–301.
- Tretheway, A. (2000). A feminist critique of disciplined bodies. In P.M. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 177–208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Turner, L. (2006). Globalization and the logic of participation: Unions and the politics of coalition building. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48, 83–97.
- Weber, M. (1921). *Economy and society*. Totowa, NJ: Bedminster.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Weedon, C. (1999). *Feminism, theory and the politics of difference*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Williams, H.L. (1999). Mobile capital and transborder labor rights mobilization. *Politics and Society*, 6, 55–68.
- Witten, M. (1993). Narrative and the culture of obedience at the workplace. In D.K. Mumby (Ed.), *Narrative and social control: Critical perspectives* (pp. 97–118). London: Sage.
- Zoller, H. (2005). Health activism: Communication theory and action for social change. *Communication Theory*, 14, 341–64.
- Zoller, H., & Kline, K. (2008). Theoretical contributions of interpretive and critical research in health communication. In C.S. Beck (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 32* (pp. TBA<this vol update when known>). New York: Routledge.