



## The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences

**Joven Albert Castillo**

Graduate Student/Instructor, Polytechnic University of the Philippines/FAITH Colleges,  
Tanauan City, Batangas, Philippines

Email Correspondence: [jcastillo@firstasia.edu.ph](mailto:jcastillo@firstasia.edu.ph)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5113-316X>

**Received:** October 20, 2025

**Editor Score:** 98%

**Accepted:** February 21, 2026

**Similarity:** 5%

**Published:** March 30, 2026

### Recommended Citation:

Castillo, J. (2026). The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Convergence and the Limits of Critique in the Social Sciences. *Oro Journal of Sustainability and Development Research*, 1(1), 55-73. <https://doi.org/10.17613/keyyy-1gc29>

**Abstract.** *The paradox in the social sciences lies in their openness and critical thinking, yet they remain closed to others. However, they often operate within the ideological boundaries shaped by Karl Marx, Émile Durkheim, and other scholars both in the Philippines and abroad. This paper adopts a qualitative-descriptive approach, combining historical and theoretical analysis to understand how academic institutions and disciplinary traditions help sustain a left-leaning orientation within the field. Through meta-research on the genealogies of social theory and the textual analysis of contemporary scholarly works, the study identifies recurring rhetorical commitments to power and inequality that, once radical, have become routine disciplinary reflexes, leading to predictability and diminished critical depth. Findings suggest that ideological homogeneity limits the breadth of social inquiry. Therefore, this paper argues for a revival of social science's affiliations with heterogeneity, a renewal of the productive tension between justice and inquiry, and a revival of the discipline's reflexivity.*

**Keywords:** *academic discourse, critical inquiry, epistemological diversity, ideological conformity, intellectual pluralism, social sciences*



## **A. Introduction**

The social sciences have long established themselves as the conscience of modernity, the disciplines through which people learn to question their own social and moral structures. Social sciences present themselves as rigorous yet humane, critical yet constructive, theoretical yet practical. This dual position has granted them authority as both an intellectual enterprise and a moral project. However, contained within this same position, we can locate a subtle contradiction. The social sciences often pride themselves on valuing multiplicity, debate, and reflexivity, but they tend to gradually come to embrace a clear ideological uniformity. This ideology, rooted largely in leftist paradigms of critique, has shaped the epistemic and institutional character of modern academic scholarship (Bourdieu, 1998).

Being aware of this pattern is not to charge the social sciences with hypocrisy, but to appreciate how ideas sediment into habits. As Pierre Bourdieu notes, every intellectual formation produces its own habits - a set of dispositions, assumptions, and styles that condition what is sayable, who can speak, and what is credible knowledge. In today's university, this habitus has largely intermingled with progressive values, equality, justice, and emancipation, as well as with the critical vocabulary bequeathed to us by Marxism, feminism, postcolonialism, and critical theory. These theories have been essential in revealing the structural forms of domination that warp our contemporary experience, but their prominence has also led to a constricting of intellectual space.

The problem, then, is not the political content of leftist thought but its institutional naturalization. As Chomsky (1999) notes, power operates most effectively when it becomes invisible. The moment a set of assumptions ceases to appear ideologically, it becomes a background against which all alternatives seem strange or reactionary within many sectors of the social sciences. Progressive thought has achieved precisely this invisibility. Its categories, such as hegemony, intersectionality, neoliberalism, and systemic inequality, constitute a moral grammar that orients scholarly inquiry. To question this grammar is often perceived not merely as an intellectual divergence, but as a moral departure.

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

As Foucault (1975) recalls, power is productive as well as dictatorial, and it not only silences but also organizes the conditions for what can be said. Within contemporary academic contexts, the prominence of progressive paradigms may, in some cases, contribute to the filtering of dissenting perspectives through routine practices such as hiring committees, peer review, grant funding, and departmental curricula. Over time, ideological homogeneity is reinforced. Students trained within this framework often inherit the assumptions of that same thinking without awareness of alternative possible interpretations. Consequently, those who criticize an assumed linguistic tool pose the danger of becoming an agent of the same conformity.

Recognizing this interpretation does not intend to favor a conservative reactionary position but rather to insist on knowledge pluralism. The vitality of any discipline depends on speculative and other types of diversity. When an inquiry is conducted within a limited framework, it risks becoming predictable. The same terms, such as oppression, domination, or emancipation, are recycled across contexts and flatten the complexities of human experience. Social phenomena that might otherwise be understood through cultural, psychological, or economic lenses are sometimes reduced to a single interpretation of structural injustice. Even as the analyses produced are morally compelling, they also risk becoming shallow, seeing little depth, nuance, or contradiction.

In this light, the issue of ideological homogeneity is closely tied to the issue of academic form. The way we think reflects the structure of our institutions. The dominance of certain discourses, such as critical theory over empirical sociology, implies a larger hierarchy of legitimacy. Bourdieu (1998) explained this as the "field" effect: how institutions produce an internal logic that rewards adherence to institutional standards. The field of social science, by privileging a certain type of critique, reproduces its own ideological conditions. To challenge those conditions is not an external revolt, but an



internal reorientation, and to see ideology where one has been taught to see truth.

However, it is important to recognize the distinction between the paradox of engagement and that of advocacy. Engagement aims to comprehend, but advocacy aims to convince. While advocacy has an important place in certain traditions within the social sciences, the discipline's broader intellectual promise lies in its capacity to sustain inquiry across differences. They have sought to hold opposing truths in tension and comprehend the universe in all its paradoxes. Scholars must retrain themselves to listen to differences in thought, not just demographic differences, but also epistemic differences, to achieve this goal, because a variety of viewpoints is essential to research. Thus, to attain justice risks becoming dogmatic without agreeing to this.

Those ideological beliefs serve as the anchor for this paper, which begins by arguing and criticizing their academic impact. The goal is to shed light on how ideological commitments influence knowledge production rather than criticize the social sciences' ideological homogeneity. It queries whether the field's interpretive scope has been limited by the predominance of socialist frameworks and whether intellectual variety could enhance rather than diminish its moral goal.

The investigation into ideological uniformity is also an exploration of the knowledge of critique. The real question ought not to be whether scholars should be political to prove separateness. Rather, the emphasis should be placed on how these politics organize the ambit of thought. It is the same morality that continues to provoke the conscience of social science, resisting the temptation to make its own claims into a moral consensus. It must relearn the art of disagreeing with a willingness to consider the other's presence as a site for thought and creativity, rather than a threat to virtue. Then, its classic promise may be realized, not just in the interpretation of various worlds, but also in their grasp in all wonderful complexity.

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the  
Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

## **B. Methodology**

### **Philosophical and Theoretical Orientation**

The method of this paper is grounded in a qualitative-descriptive tradition rooted in interpretive social inquiry. It presupposes that ideology is both material and discursive, a system of meanings embedded in academic institutions, practices, and texts. Drawing on the theoretical foundations of Foucault (1975) and Bourdieu (1998), knowledge is understood not as a neutral description but as a social act created within a specific historical and institutional context. The controlling assumption is that the intellectual leftward inclination of social science cannot be researched out of the context of the systems that support it. The field, according to Bourdieu, creates its own forms of capital, and those forms dictate which ideas are circulated, which are rewarded, and which are disregarded.

With this philosophical stance, the study positions itself to align with epistemological introspection, the belief that research must continually question its premises. It is not aimed at judging the political legitimacy of left-leaning thought, but at arguing about the mechanisms that reproduce it. In this way, the methodology is acting in what Mills (2000) terms the sociological imagination: the ability to interrelate personal, institutional, and historical spheres of thought. An ideological homogeneity is considered here as a sociological artifact, as a pattern of habits that is historically constructed by the past and becomes reproduced through academic structures.

### **Research Design**

Based on interpretive social inquiry, this paper conceptualizes ideology as both material and discursive, a system of meanings grounded in academic institutions, practices, and texts. Drawing on Foucault (1975) and Bourdieu (1998), knowledge is understood as a social practice created under specific historical and institutional circumstances rather than as a manifestation of neutrality. From this perspective, the intellectual orientation of the social sciences is shaped by the very systems that sustain them.

As Bourdieu argues, every scholarly discipline develops its own kind of knowledge and determines what is accepted as legitimate knowledge and what is on the margins. Consistent with this view, the present study adopts a non-judgmental approach to political positions, guided by epistemological reflexivity, to uncover the mechanisms by which they are reproduced.

In line with Mills's (2000) concept of the sociological imagination, this implies links between personal, institutional, and historical processes, where ideological homogeneity is considered, a habit constantly re-created in academic life.

### **Data Sources and Corpus**

Data for this study are derived from three interrelated sources:

First, a theoretical Review of Sociological Paradigms was conducted to trace the development of the dominant ideological framework within the academic

Second, a textual sample of social science literature was analyzed. This corpus consisted of selected books and scholarly works that explicitly engage with critical frameworks.

Third, the study examined institutional discourses, including policy statements, course syllabi, and scholarly communications related to diversity, justice, and reform.

Taken together, these sources provide a triangulated understanding of how ideological homogeneity emerges in academic discourse. The argument was based on purpose and focused on writings that demonstrated the common pattern of social science aligning with progressive politics. All materials were examined in accordance with ethical and scholarly standards to avoid generalizations about the context.

### **Analytical Procedure**

The analysis followed a four-stage interpretive process: textual identification, interpretive coding, thematic clustering, and conceptual synthesis.

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

**Textual Identification.** Selected works identified as representative of academic literature were those that explicitly addressed themes of inequality, emancipation, and criticism.

**Interpretive Coding.** The selected materials were systematically coded to identify recurring conceptual patterns. Key codes included references to systemic oppression, social justice, and neoliberal critique. Coding was iterative, allowing categories to emerge and evolve during analysis.

**Thematic Clustering.** Budding codes were clustered into meta-themes that reflect historical and theoretical orientations.

**Conceptual Synthesis.** The final stage involved identifying patterns and synthesizing them to show how ideological homogeneity occurs in various fields of social science scholarship.

This analytical process reflected in Giddens's (2009) theory of structuration, sees social structures as both facilitating and constraining. In the same way, human agency recreates social norms and scholarly practices to reproduce ideological expectations. The repetition of analysis enables the generation of meaning in an organic, engaging way, drawing on the theoretical perspectives of Marx, Foucault, and Bourdieu.

### **Validity and Reflexivity**

In this study, qualitative rigor is ensured through reflexivity rather than the possible replication of knowledge. The scholar recognizes this position in the academic domain because no analysis can be completely external to its object. The study itself embodies the reflexivity it proposes by placing interpretation within the intellectual flow it criticizes. The integration of theoretical perspectives (Marx, Foucault, Bourdieu) and multiple data sources (texts, discourses, and meta-research) ensures triangulation and fosters interpretative richness rather than prioritizing generalizability.

Consistent with Foucault's (1975) view of knowledge and power as co-constitutive, each act of analysis is understood as an intervention in meaning-making. Similarly, Bourdieu (1998) cautions against the false objectivity that conceals the social nature of thinking. This paper considers reflexivity as both a methodological practice and an ethical commitment, an imperative to challenge the role of the researcher's subject perspective within the field of ideology under study.

### **Ethical Considerations**

The study's ethical position aligns with intellectual transparency. It does not consider ideological positions to be correct or incorrect; instead, it seeks to examine and understand their role in academic discourse. It is the patterns of dominance and exclusion that create what credible knowledge is. It also emphasizes the importance of criticality in examining one's own assumptions alongside those of others. Intellectual freedom, according to Chomsky (1999), is conditioned by the ability of one to condemn his side as strictly as he opposes it.

### **Methodological Rationale**

The approach used in methodological explanation enables what Habermas (1981) calls communicative rationality, which attempts to understand through dialogue rather than assertion. The power of this method lies in its ability to render visible what is typically invisible or what is often taken for granted: the inner logic of thought at work in academic practice. The study repositions intellectual diversity as a methodological imperative rather than a political motto, and by mapping the conceptual complexities of ideological understanding.

### **Summary of the Methodological Framework**

In a nutshell, the arguments in this research are interpretive, reflexive, and historical. It interprets social science as an intellectual and political initiative. It attempts to reveal how ideological homogeneity is created, reproduced, and justified through qualitative analysis and critical

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

interpretation. This approach, true to the ethos of Eric Hayot, teaches a thinking grounded in the spirit of style and in epistemic self-awareness and questioning its assumptions, methods, and limits.

### C. Results and Discussion

The results lay out what was discovered from the descriptive analysis of the evidence, namely, patterns of ideological convergence in social science academia. At the same time, the discussion engages with the theories of Marx, Foucault, and Bourdieu to highlight the social logic behind the dominance of ideological homogeneity in the social sciences. Taken together, the findings address the study's central question: *how does moral commitment to justice (once the strength of the social sciences) threaten the integrity of epistemological interpretation?*

#### **Key Findings:**

Analysis of the data produced three connected findings that reflect the form of ideological homogeneity within the social sciences:

A. The ascendancy of left-leaning paradigms as a standard way of thinking for those in social science academia.

B. The institutional influence of ideological orientations through public discourse and formal policies in social science academia.

C. The internalization of these patterns into both academic identity and practices of critical reflection in social science academia.

Each of these dimensions illustrates how, although historically justified by a commitment to equality, the discipline's ethical orientation, in certain contexts, has become a structure that impedes pluralism and constrains theoretical innovation.



## **Superiority of Left-Positional Paradigms**

The analysis suggests that left-leaning paradigms are nearly hegemonic across the social sciences. Reading from academic journal articles published over the past decades, as well as conference proceedings and brochures from that period, reveals a recurring focus on critical, post-structural, and intersectional frameworks. These paradigms, initially built for the critique of social domination, have become the normative grounds for this argumentative inquiry.

This development reflects what Fraser (2019) writes that the progressive tradition has played an important role in exposing injustice but has become mired in a concern with its moral authority, turning critique into a repetition. In the same vein, Alexander & Smith (2021) draw attention to the emerging sociology of ideas in academia, where praise is reserved only for dissent when the purview of moral frameworks aligns and is acceptable. This creates a paradox: while knowledge is ideologically divergent, stances are honored in rhetoric, but not in practice.

This pattern supports the core argument of this paper that criticism descends into a lack of reflexivity when it becomes habitual. The same tools that formerly disrupted hierarchies can become tools of compliance. In this sense, the dominance of left-leaning paradigms is seen as both a historical achievement and an epistemological limitation, a self-perpetuating epistemological habit that dictates which questions are answerable only within the field of social science academia.

## **Consolidation of Ideological Beliefs**

The second finding demonstrates how institutional discourse undergoes and legitimizes ideological homogeneity. Analysis indicates that universities, funding agencies, and academic publishers frequently frame academic excellence in terms that align with progressive ideals (e.g., equity, inclusion, and sustainability), which are significant but, when combined, become unquestioned norms.

This phenomenon may contribute to what Collins (2019) pointed that the institutionalization of moral vocabulary creates and sustains “critical orthodoxy,” a situation in which a discourse or claim related to justice

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

becomes a form of legitimacy, rather than questioning itself. This point supports Ahmed's (2021) argument that complaints about the diversity of cultures in universities can lead individuals to replace the structural evolution of knowledge with acts of moral performance. Collectively, these cases exemplify how institutional ethics routinely function as symbolic disciplinary systems that dictate which ideas may linger in academic contexts.

These institutional limitations validate the knowledge gaps this paper argues for, namely that ideological unity can obscure the complexities of social life. While the language of justice is morally necessary, it can also function as an apparatus of normalization and generalization. When universities make virtue synonymous with orthodoxy, critique becomes predictable, and the imagination of knowledge production is reduced.

### **Integration and Reflexive Practice**

The third finding concerns how scholars internalize and explain ideological expectations. Many scholars, even those who express dissatisfaction with orthodoxy, continue to adopt its predicament for either strategic or moral reasons. These findings support the abstract's contention for intellectual reflexivity, questioning not only structures of power but also one's own complicity in them.

This process of reflexivity is called *performative reflexivity*. Performative reflexivity is a form of critical self-awareness of ideological sameness while still being trapped within it. They publicly criticize conformity while, in their own work, arguing about its language and frameworks. This internalization leads to what might be termed moral inertia, in which noticing that you are operating within the dominant ideological construction leads you to feel that engaging ideas outside the paradigm may result in professional marginalization and exclusion.

Ahmed (2021) emphasizes that higher education cultures are always aligned with institutional tales of virtue, where performance of awareness substitutes for structural change. It supports the paper's argument that, when critique takes on a habituation, inquiry becomes shadow. The need to be morally correct in thinking trumped the opportunity to think otherwise.

The result of this research indicates that ideological homogeneity in the social sciences is not a power conspiracy but a **belief structure**, a recursive alignment among **theory**, **institution**, and **identity**. First, these theoretical traditions give meaning to the vocabulary of justice, then institutions encode this vocabulary in bureaucratic norms, and lastly, scholars internalize that normativity as virtue.

As the paper argues, while this must be coherent, moral and intellectual knowledge has something to do with historical significance, it yields an unintentional consequence – the creation of the epistemic horizon and the diversity of political knowledge. The results, therefore, indicate a need for renewed pluralism in an academic culture that values disagreement, dissent, and other forms of diversity, rather than viewing these differences as a betrayal of academic tradition.

These insights pave the way for the discussion in this paper, which examines the theoretical implications of this ideological structure through the intersecting frameworks of Marx's critique of power, Foucault's discourse analysis, and Bourdieu's sociology of habits.

## Discussion

The discussion interprets the patterns and conclusions from the results and incorporates them within a broader theoretical and historical understanding. It elaborates on how ideological homogeneity in social science, while emerging from admirable ideals of equity and justice, has become a quite nuanced mechanism of epistemic restriction. Through the conceptual frameworks of Marx, Foucault, and Bourdieu, and the recent work of Ahmed (2021), this study aims to investigate how power, knowledge, and sociological habits interact to shape the intellectual culture in modern academia, especially in the social sciences. The relationship among

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

theoretical underpinning, institutional practice, and scholarly agency positions a recursive loop of influence. Structures create ideas, structures dissolve dispositions, and dispositions reproduce ideas.

### **Ideology, Power, and Knowledge**

The first layer of the discussion's interpretation addresses the connection between ideology and power. For Marx, ideology is a tool that hides the material conditions of social existence. It naturalizes inequality by presenting historically contingent relationships as universal truths. In today's social science, the prevalence of left-wing paradigms represents a reversal of Marx's logic. Instead of hiding inequality, discipline places it at the center of social science discourse, but at the same time it runs the risk of creating a new form of discourse. This new discourse argues that power does not come from silence but rather from moral authority.

Foucault (1975) explains that power does not just repress but also produces knowledge and determines the conditions for truth and who can speak it. The paradoxical meanings of "justice" and "equity" evident in institutional discourse constitute a discursive regime and a set of truths regulating academic conduct. As Ahmed (2021) and Berglund (2025) argue, universities have institutionalized these moral vocabularies by treating ethical determinations as bureaucratic categorizations. This results in an "economy of virtue" where acting in accordance with institutional ethics becomes a requirement for professional legitimacy.

Marx's interpretation of "false consciousness" explains not in terms of pure ignorance, but in terms of misrecognition. Social scientists may see their discourse as emancipatory when a reproduction of social power aims to critique as well as destroy. So, ideological unity must be seen as a historically specific form of control rather than a moral hegemony that supplants the economic determinism of a bygone era with systems of symbolic and cultural



authority. As Bourdieu (1998) points out, symbolic power tends to work best when it is least scrutinized and when players are confused by the rules of their own games.

### **Field, Habitual Practices, and Reproduction**

The second interpretive layer of this discussion relates to the sociology of knowledge and academic habitual practices. Bourdieu (1998) theorizes the academic field as a constituted space of positions and position-taking defined by the accumulation of economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital. It is within this field that ideological homogeneity is reproduced by the internal logic of reproduction rather than coercion. Even scholars may seek legitimacy by following the most accepted norms, not because they are compelled or anyone is forcing them, but because they have internalized the value of the ideas and rules that confer intellectual legitimacy within the field of social sciences.

The findings of this study illustrate this dynamic. The prevalence of progressive paradigms in social scientific discourse is not a form of knowledge uniformity but a common habit. Scholars do not reproduce ideological habits consciously; they do so unconsciously, and they interpret the interconnection of these aspects with ethical rationality. Evidence characterizes this as performative reflexivity, the act of seeming self-reflexive, while still residing within the boundaries of institutional virtue. In this context, critique itself becomes a form of symbolic capital, a performance of self-awareness that neither challenges nor threatens the legitimacy of the hegemonic order or power within its boundaries.

This interpretation aligns with Foucault's understanding of knowledge and power as productive, shaping the conditions under which truth is recognized. The university itself, not the university scholar, maintains its authority, not by mandating proof of belief, but by setting the conditions by which beliefs and policies become believable. As a result, ideological conformance is not determined from above but is evidenced through everyday university scholarly practices, such as peer review, referencing, hiring, and conversation. The field reproduces itself through what Bourdieu refers to as *doxa*, the unspoken belief that normativity is evidenced above

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

within the frame of respect and authority. Through this doxa, these norms become taken for granted, rendering alternative frameworks less visible or legitimate.

Thus, ideological homogeneity emerges as an effect of intellectual success, imposed through academic influence. Over time, revolutionary ideas become paradigms, paradigms become norms, and norms become invisible. In such conditions, critique risks becoming routinized, leading to a narrowing of inquiry rather than its expansion.

### **The Ethical Economy of Academia**

The third dimension of the discussion is what might be called the ethical economy of academic life, structured around the currencies of virtue, trust, and belonging. Collins (2019) argues that the institutionalization of intersectionality and social justice discourse, while crucial for responding to systemic inequality, produces another hierarchy of ethics capital. In this ethical economy, being on the side of progressive power acts as both an ethical and professional currency. Scholars who display ethical consciousness obtain weak forms of legitimacy and power, whilst those who challenge notions and orthodoxy may experience sudden exclusion within academia.

This moral economy resonates with Fraser's (2019) concept of "progressive neoliberalism," wherein moral idealism becomes intertwined with managerial logic. In universities, the administrative structure assimilates and executes the language of justice and questioning and translates the language of justice into outputs that can be measured, for example, diversity statements, ethical research metrics, and public stature. This ideological coherence may enhance institutional stability, but it limits intellectual evolution.

From a Marxian perspective, this dynamic is like a virtue being commodified. As capitalism slowly commodifies labor, the modern academy commodifies moral engagement into an institutional measure of performance. Therefore, the language of performance becomes a tool for self-



legitimation. To borrow from Foucault, power is “capillary,” circulating throughout the micro-practices of virtue and extending its reach to society.

### **Reflexivity and the Limits of Critique**

If ideological homogeneity continues not through coercion but reflexive complicity, then it is easy to create a sort of reflexivity that moves beyond performance. The findings suggested that some scholars were aware of the narrowing of intellectual space but felt constrained by the moral and professional consequences of dissent. The situation mirrors Mills's (2000) concept of "**trapped imaginations**," the inability to link one's feelings of discomfort to the possibility of structural change and to the possibility of exclusion.

Thus, critical reflexivity does not reject progressive values, but questions the institutional forms those values have taken. Similarly, some institutions encourage scholars to rethink questions and curiosity as methods of knowledge, actions that expose the contradictions in moral stances often valued as central to institutional life.

Lastly, the idea of resistance could argue that the point of change lies exactly here, within these contradictions. For Foucault, power is never complete because it creates its own rupture points. In the social sciences, these rupture points are evident in an increased interest in methodological pluralism, decolonial epistemologies, and post-critical theory, particularly in the modern era. These things assert that ideological closure may be a valuable statement, but it is not absolute. The challenge is to turn reflexivity from performance to praxis, a way of thinking that is critically aware of its own conditions of possibility.

### **Reclaiming Pluralism and the Future of Inquiry**

The final interpretive thread of this discussion concerns the possible revitalization of the social sciences. As this paper argued, the way forward is not about disregarding justice, but about rethinking justice as a plural power. Justice must also be thought of with epistemic diversity in mind. The findings of this study advocate for what can be referred to as reflexive pluralism: a

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

willingness to accept multiple, even contradictory, approaches to understanding and accepting different knowledge within the social world.

According to Alexander and Smith (2021), this renewal is encouraged by the “**new sociology of ideas**,” which emphasizes dialogue across traditions of thought rather than a strict adherence to a single moral argument. In this view, pluralism does not mean dispersal or redundancy but a kind of vitality, in which dissent is a source of creativity. This proposition contends that the future of critique may depend on its ability to critique itself, to know when its own categories are used as instruments of stasis rather than transformation.

The discussion has shown that ideological coherence in social sciences can be understood as a form of symbolic power operating across theory, institutional power, and self. While Marx's critique of materialism, Foucault's discourse of power/knowledge, and Bourdieu's conception of habits perfectly explain how ideals of justice transform into systems of legitimacy, the work of Ahmed (2021) and other scholars extends this discussion by demonstrating how moral vocabularies, institutional norms, and reflexive performances combine to create this ideological wholeness.

However, such coherence does not necessarily indicate intellectual degeneration or exclusion. It is a historical moment, a moment of self-recognition from which renewal can arise. The future of the social sciences depends on its ability to revisit pluralism as a style of thought rather than simply as a tolerance for difference: its disciplined heterogeneity will be able to criticize even its own statements.

#### **D. Conclusion**

This research argues for the continuity of ideological homogeneity in the social sciences, uncovering how a discipline grounded in the ideals of openness and critique has nevertheless come to occupy a narrow moral and intellectual horizon. Given the theory, institutions, and practices, the social

sciences have internalized a common orientation to justice, equity, and emancipation as necessary values that have become forms of epistemic closure. The evidence presented in this study shows that ideological coherence is not a matter of political preference but of structural reproduction. It emerges out of institutional policy, linguistic conventions, and the reflexive orientations of scholars who, in attempting to criticize power, invariably reproduce its logic.

By examining the moral coherence of the social sciences, both its strengths and limitations, this study demonstrates the continuous relevance of Marx, Foucault, and Bourdieu in understanding contemporary academic culture. What had once been a revolutionary vocabulary of justice in the discipline now represents a symbolic economy of legitimacy, a means of enforcing institutional virtue through a system of reward. Universities, as pointed out earlier, regularly take ethical ideals and turn them into administrative instruments; hence, a mode of bureaucratic performance of moral intention. The same has happened with academic research; critique has become a normal, habitual part of scholarship, and reflexivity, an act of self-preservation.

Thus, the implications of this study go beyond mere ideological critique. This paper revived pluralism, a reconfigured intellectual milieu in which justice converges with methodological pluralism, and dissent is not perceived as antagonism, but as a fundamental condition for comprehension. This pluralism does not abandon the ethical commitments of the social sciences, but rather furthers them by suggesting that truth, like justice, is most meaningful in a state whose power is grounded in pluralism.

To conclude, the challenge is not to abolish the principles that support discipline but rather to revive their creative tension. Social sciences should again practice critical analysis, even of the language of critique, and conceptualize freedom not as agreement but as the ability to think differently. A very plural, self-renewing intellectual tradition could be formed amid that tension between conviction and curiosity, knowledge and humility.

*The Illusion of Openness: Ideological Conformity and the Crisis of Critique in the Social Sciences*

---

Castillo, J.A.

## References

- Ahmed, S. (2021). *Complaint!*. Duke University Press.
- Alexander, J. C., & Smith, P. (2021). *The new sociology of ideas*. Polity Press.
- Berglund, L. (2025). *Autonomy and critique in the goal-oriented university: The paradox of teaching reflexivity*. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 59(1), 31–42.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On television*. The New Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. Seven Stories Press.
- Collins, P. H. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Fraser, N. (2019). *The old is dying, and the new cannot be born: From progressive neoliberalism to Trump and beyond*. Verso.
- Giddens, A. (2009). *Sociology* (6th ed.). Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981). *The theory of communicative action*. Beacon Press.
- Mills, C. W. (2000). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford University Press.